



PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

ATAR course examination 2019

Marking key

Marking keys are an explicit statement about what the examining panel expect of candidates when they respond to particular examination items. They help ensure a consistent interpretation of the criteria that guide the awarding of marks.

Section One: Critical reasoning

30% (30 Marks)

Question 1

(2 marks)

Are the following statements analytic or synthetic?

- (a) If Sam lied to Eleanor, then Andrew must know what Jen did. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The statement is synthetic.	1
Total	1

- (b) If Sam is younger than Eleanor, and Andrew is younger than Sam, then Eleanor is younger than Andrew. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The statement is analytic.	1
Total	1

Question 2

(3 marks)

- (a) Sixteen-year-olds can get their learner's permit, but they cannot vote.

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence. (1 mark)

- (i) If you are sixteen, you can either get your learner's permit or you can vote.
 (ii) Sixteen-year-olds cannot vote; they can get their learner's permit.
 (iii) If you can vote, then you are sixteen and you can get your learner's permit.

Description	Marks
Sentence (ii) is underlined as shown above (or otherwise marked in a distinctive and unambiguous way).	1
Total	1

- (b) The car won't start unless there is petrol in the tank.

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence. (1 mark)

- (i) If there is no petrol in the tank, then the car won't start.
 (ii) If the car won't start, then there is no petrol in the tank.
 (iii) If there is petrol in the tank, then the car will start.

Description	Marks
Sentence (i) is underlined as shown above (or otherwise marked in a distinctive and unambiguous way).	1
Total	1

- (c) Express the following sentence as a conditional (If X, then Y) statement. (1 mark)

This drink is either tonic water or it is soda water.

Description	Marks
If this drink is not tonic water, then it is soda water. or If this drink is not soda water, then it is tonic water. or If this drink is a type of water, then it is tonic or soda.	1
Total	1

Question 3

(3 marks)

We must either fight against terrorism and extremism in foreign countries or we must fight against those forces at home. The last thing we want is to have to fight against terrorism and extremism in our own country, hence we must keep fighting to deal with terrorism and extremism overseas.

For the above argument:

- (a) Underline the conclusion. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The conclusion is underlined exactly as shown above.	1
Total	1

- (b) Evaluate the cogency of the argument. Circle the correct answer. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The words 'Not cogent' are circled. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

- (c) Give **one** reason that justifies your evaluation of the cogency. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The argument is not cogent because the first premise presents a false dichotomy. or The argument is not cogent because the second premise is not acceptable – there may be many things we want less than to fight against terrorism in our own country.	1
Total	1

Question 4

(3 marks)

- (a) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

As the sales of smartphones has increased, so too has the number of people who die from falling down stairs. This shows that people must now be so addicted to their phones that they forget to look where they are going.

Description	Marks
Confusion of correlation and causation or <i>Cum hoc ergo propter hoc</i> .	1
Total	1

- (b) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

Veganism is the best diet for human health, because human beings achieve optimum health when they eat a diet entirely free from animal products – not just red meat but also eggs, milk and even honey.

Description	Marks
Begging the question or circular argument.	1
Total	1

- (c) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

The vote for Brexit in the United Kingdom was 52% for and 48% against. That the majority of people voted for Brexit shows that Brexit will be economically beneficial and the United Kingdom should leave the European Union as soon as possible.

Description	Marks
Fallacious appeal to popularity or <i>ad populum</i> fallacy or <i>non sequitur</i> fallacy.	1
Total	1

Question 5

(1 mark)

The hospital recognises that the passing away of your mother was a case of therapeutic misadventure and we are looking into the causes of such negative patient-care outcomes, so that in the future we can ensure that those outcomes are managed better.

Underline **one** 'weasel' word or phrase from the above passage and give a concise reason why it is a 'weasel' word or phrase.

Description	Marks
<p>Students may underline any of the above. The following are possible reasons why the underlined phrases are 'weasel' words. This list is not exhaustive. In cases where the candidate provides an answer not listed below, markers must use their judgement to decide if the candidate provides a sufficient reason. 'passing away' is a euphemism for dying. 'therapeutic misadventure' is a euphemism for something like the doctors having made a mistake in their treatment. 'negative patient-care outcomes' is a euphemism for patients dying. To 'ensure that those outcomes are managed better' is deliberately vague.</p>	1
Total	1

Question 6

(4 marks)

(1) {God is a being who has every perfection, including omniscience, omnipotence and omnibenevolence.} (2) {Existence is also a perfection} because, (3) {for any object, it is more perfect if it exists than if it does not exist,} so (4) {God is a being who has existence.}

For the above argument:

- (a) Bracket and number the separable statements. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Brackets and numbers are placed in the exact locations as shown above.	1
Total	1

- (b) Circle the word that **best** describes the overall inferential strength of the argument. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The word 'Strong' is circled. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

- (c) Using the numbers given in part (a) above, draw a diagram of the argument. (2 marks)

Description	Marks
(3) ↓ (2) + (1) ↓ (4)	1-2
1 mark for showing (3) as a premise supporting (2) 1 mark for showing (2) linked with (1) to support the conclusion (4)	
Total	2
Note: The conventions that need to be formally observed and applied correctly are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the arrow to represent a relationship of inference • the placement of the arrow exactly between the premise (or linked premises) and the conclusion that are in the inferential relationship. 	

Question 7

(4 marks)

If you want to maximise your job opportunities right after you finish university, then you need to major in Commerce. But, if you want to achieve the highest success in your career, you need to be able to think critically. You won't learn to do that by majoring in Commerce, but if you major in Philosophy you will. So, it follows that if you want to achieve the highest success in your career, you need to forget about maximising your job opportunities right after you finish university.

For the above argument:

- (a) Circle any inference indicators. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The inference indicator 'So, it follows that' is circled. Nothing more or less than the words 'So, it follows that' is circled. The candidate may use two circles – one around 'so' and one around 'it follows that'.	1
Total	1

- (b) According to the argument, what major should you **not** do if you want to achieve the highest success in your career? (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The major you should not do is Commerce.	1
Total	1

- (c) Number and write **in full** the separable statements in their order of occurrence. (2 marks)

Description	Marks
(1) If you want to maximise your job opportunities right after you finish University, then you need to major in Commerce.	1
(2) If you want to achieve the highest success in your career, you need to be able to think critically.	
(3) You won't learn to [think critically] by majoring in Commerce.	
(4) If you major in Philosophy you [learn to think critically].	1
(5) If you want to achieve the highest success in your career, you need to forget about maximising your job opportunities right after you finish University.	
Total	2
The square brackets are not required but the phrases inside them are.	

Question 8

(2 marks)

Construct a deductively-valid argument that uses **all** the following statements only **once**. Use a diagram to represent the argument you construct.

- (1) Another necessary condition for agency is that your movements are causally efficacious, which means that they make things happen in the world.
- (2) To be an agent, your movements must be autonomous, which means that they must be chosen freely.
- (3) For your movements to be causally efficacious you must act according to the hypothetical imperative.
- (4) To be an agent, you must act according to the hypothetical and categorical imperatives.
- (5) For your movements to be autonomous, you must be acting according to the categorical imperative.

Description	Marks
<p style="text-align: center;"> $((1) + (3)) + ((2) + (5))$ \downarrow (4) </p> <p>or</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> $(2) + (1) + (3) + (5)$ \downarrow (4) </p> <p>1 mark for showing (1) and (3) and (2) and (5) as linked (rather than 1+3 and 2+5 giving convergent support). 1 mark for showing (4) as conclusion.</p>	1–2
Total	2
<p>Note: The conventions that need to be formally observed and applied correctly are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the arrow to represent a relationship of inference • the placement of the arrow exactly between the premise (or linked premises) and the conclusion that are in the inferential relationship. 	

Question 9

(8 marks)

(1) {Elite sporting competitions that depend on strength and speed should be segregated according to biological sex.} (2) {There is a significant performance difference between males and females because (3) {on average, males have a performance advantage of at least 10% over females.} And, (4) {if the performance difference between males and females is significant, then we should segregate elite sporting competitions according to biological sex.} Another reason is that (5) {not segregating elite sport according to biological sex poses serious risks to the safety of female participants.}

For the above argument:

- (a) Bracket and number the separable statements. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Brackets and numbers are placed in the exact locations as shown above.	1
Total	1

- (b) Circle any inference indicators. (2 marks)

Description	Marks
Circles one correct inference indicator ('because' or 'Another reason is that')	1
Circles one correct inference indicator and any other incorrect word(s)	1
Circles two correct inference indicators and any other incorrect word(s)	1
Circles two correct inference indicators only	2
Total	2

- (c) Using the numbers given in part (a) above, draw a diagram of the argument. (3 marks)

Description	Marks
	1-3
1 mark for showing (3) as a premise supporting (2) 1 mark for showing (2) linked with (4) to support the conclusion (1) 1 mark for showing (5) giving independent support for (1)	
Total	3
Note: The conventions that need to be formally observed and applied correctly are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the arrow to represent a relationship of inference • the placement of the arrow exactly between the premise (or linked premises) and the conclusion that are in the inferential relationship. 	

- (d) Circle the word that **best** describes the overall inferential strength of the argument. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The word 'Strong' is circled. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

(e) Give **one** reason for your conclusion in part (d).

(1 mark)

Description	Marks
One or more of the following: The inference from (2) + (4) to (1) is deductively valid. The inference from (3) to (2) is evidence-based. The inference from (5) to (1) is strong because we should be worried about safety in sport.	1
Total	1

Section Two: Philosophical analysis and evaluation

40% (40 Marks)

Part A

20% (20 Marks)

Question 10

(20 marks)

The following dialogue is an excerpt from a community of inquiry.

You are required to:

- summarise the contributions of each participant (2 marks)
- clarify these contributions (6 marks)
- evaluate them critically. (12 marks)

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)	
For each of two participants (1 mark each)	
Identifies the main position of the participant	1
Subtotal	2
Criterion 2: Clarification (6 marks)	
Concepts	
States clearly and engages critically with philosophical concepts in the dialogue	2
Refers to some philosophical concepts in the dialogue	1
Subtotal	2
Arguments	
For each of two participants (2 marks each)	
Explains the arguments (e.g. by using relevant examples)	2
Describes the arguments	1
Subtotal	4
Criterion 3: Evaluation (12 marks)	
Examples	
Explains and engages critically with examples/counter examples in the dialogue	2
Refers to examples/counter examples in the dialogue	1
Subtotal	2
Premises	
For each of two participants (2 marks each)	
Provides relevant reasons to justify their stated acceptability of the premises	2
States the acceptability of the premises	1
Subtotal	4
Inferences	
For each of two participants (2 marks each)	
Provides relevant reasons to justify their stated strength of the inferential moves	2
States the strength of the inferential moves	1
Subtotal	4
Cogency	
Provides a detailed and accurate assessment of the cogency of the arguments, pointing out any fallacies	2
Makes assertions about cogency	1
Subtotal	2
Total	20

Question 10 (continued)

Chris: I hear Milo Yiannopoulos is coming to speak at the University of Western Australia. It's so refreshing to see someone intelligent argue for unpopular views – it shocks people out of their comfortable political beliefs. Liberal democratic states like ours always benefit from giving their citizens unlimited freedom of expression. This is because allowing everyone the freedom to express their opinions is fundamentally to the advantage of a liberal democracy.

Michael: But we just can't allow speakers from the far right of the political spectrum, like him, on university campuses. If we allow that, then we have no way of preventing radicals and extremists from hosting fascist, racist rallies, and if we can't prevent that then, inevitably, violence and racism will become normalised on campus and no one will ever be safe.

Chris: You don't make society safer by giving the state the power to police people's thoughts. If we allow any ideas to be repressed, no matter how outrageous, we will wind up with a dystopian society, like in George Orwell's novel *1984*, where every speech act, private or public, is censored.

Michael: I totally disagree. The ideal society is one where people are prohibited by law from saying things that other people find offensive. It's entirely consistent with the principles of liberal democracy that people be protected from anyone expressing ideas that might harm or offend them. So, we have to legislate more strongly to prevent people from saying things that might offend marginalised groups.

Note: The following notes for Question 10 are not exhaustive and are to be used as a guide to judgement according to the marking key. Candidates are not required to make all of the following points to achieve full marks.

Analysis and evaluation

The main position argued by Chris is that freedom of speech is a key liberty of the liberal democratic state and that any censorship at all impinges on this liberty. The main position argued by Michael is that, in order to create a good society it is important to restrict all speech that might be harmful or offensive. The dialogue is about the notion of freedom of speech in liberal democratic societies and touches on the idea of utopia and dystopia in works of fiction.

Candidates should note that Chris's first contribution is question begging, as it presupposes liberal democratic states benefit from unlimited freedom of speech in order to conclude with the same claim.

Michael's response exemplifies the fallacy of slippery slope, by supposing that if we let a speaker from the far right on campus, then it will lead to the normalisation of such events as fascist rallies, violence, racism and an overall lack of safety. There is no good reason given to suppose that this would be the inevitable outcome.

Chris's response straw-mans Michael's argument by depicting it as claiming that the state should have the power to police people's thoughts, when that is not Michael's claim. Chris also presents a slippery slope fallacy of his own, by supposing that the repression of any ideas whatsoever, will wind up with a dystopian society, such as that portrayed in the fictional novel *1984*.

Michael's final contribution presents a short argument to the conclusion that we need to legislate against people saying anything others find offensive. There is some loaded language used in his appeal to wanting not to offend marginalised groups in particular. Candidates have a range of possible ways to engage with these claims.

Part B

20% (20 Marks)

Question 11

(20 marks)

Choose **one** of the following passages and:

- summarise the passage (2 marks)
- clarify its meaning (8 marks)
- evaluate it critically. (10 marks)

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)	
Topic	
Identifies the topic	1
Subtotal	1
Conclusions	
Identifies the main conclusions	1
Subtotal	1
Criterion 2: Clarification (8 marks)	
Concepts	
Explains and critically engages with core concepts	3
Describes core concepts	2
States core concepts	1
Subtotal	3
Arguments	
Identifies the arguments in the passages and clarifies the premises and inferences	5
Identifies the arguments in the passages and clarifies some of the premises and inferences	4
Identifies the arguments in the passages and refers to some of the premises and inferences	3
Identifies the arguments in the passages	2
Identifies an argument or some arguments in the passages	1
Subtotal	5
Criterion 3: Evaluation (10 marks)	
Premises	
Identifies the major premises and accurately critically evaluates their acceptability, giving relevant reasons	4
Identifies the major premises and evaluates their acceptability	3
Identifies the major premises and states their acceptability	2
Identifies some of the major premises	1
Subtotal	4
Inferences	
Identifies the inferential moves and accurately critically evaluates inferential strength, giving relevant reasons	4
Identifies the inferential moves and evaluates inferential strength	3
Identifies some inferential moves and makes some assertions about inferential strength	2
Identifies some inferential moves	1
Subtotal	4
Cogency	
Assesses the cogency of the argument based on their evaluation of premise acceptability and inferential strength	2
Makes assertions about cogency	1
Subtotal	2
Total	20

Question 11 (continued)

Note: The following notes for Question 11 are not exhaustive and are to be used as a guide to judgement according to the marking key. Candidates are not required to identify all of the premises listed in order to achieve full marks.

Passage One

Voluntary assisted euthanasia should be legal, but accessible only to those in chronic pain with fewer than six months left to live. This is firstly because, in a secular liberal democracy, we should maximise the opportunity for people to exercise autonomy in their life choices. Secondly, if it is legal, then it can be safe. People who choose to end their life should be able to do so in a safe environment with the assistance of a qualified physician. However, voluntary assisted euthanasia should be accessible to only those who are in chronic pain and have fewer than six months left to live. If we don't have clear and strictly enforced restrictions on the availability of euthanasia, then access to assisted euthanasia will be opened up to vulnerable people who it is our duty to help flourish, not to help die.

Summary: Passage One is about applied ethics, in particular the ethics of euthanasia. The passage provides an argument to the conclusion that voluntary euthanasia should be made legal, but access limited.

Clarification:

The conclusion of the argument is the first sentence: Voluntary assisted euthanasia (VAE) should be legal, but accessible only to those in chronic pain with fewer than six months left to live.

(P1) In a secular liberal democracy, we should maximise the opportunity for people to exercise autonomy in their life choices.

(P2) If it is legal, then it can be safe.

(P3) People who choose to end their life should be able to do so in a safe environment with the assistance of a qualified physician.

(SC1) VAE should be legal. (from P1 and (P2 linked with P3), convergent)

(P4) If we don't have clear and strictly enforced restrictions on the availability of euthanasia, then access to assisted euthanasia will be opened up to vulnerable people who it is our duty to help flourish, not to help die.

(P5, implied) We should not open up access to euthanasia to people who it is our duty to help flourish.

(SC2) Voluntary assisted euthanasia should be accessible to only those who are in chronic pain and have fewer than six months left to live. (from P4 and P5, linked)

(C) Voluntary assisted euthanasia (VAE) should be legal, but accessible only to those in chronic pain with fewer than six months left to live. (from SC1 and SC2, linked)

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the argument should focus on

(1) the support the premises give to the conclusion and the sub-conclusion, and

(2) the acceptability of the premises.

One aspect of the argument that could be discussed is the illegitimate move from P2 and P3 to SC1. This part of the argument is a case of the deductively invalid move of *affirming the consequent*. Being legal is given as a sufficient condition for euthanasia being able to be safe, but (P3) gives a moral claim that 'euthanasia should be safe' and this doesn't give us a sufficient condition for it being legal. The premise needed is 'If it should be safe then it should be made legal'. Candidates might also argue that this part of the argument is question begging. The premise (P3) assumes that people should be allowed to end their life safely, which is what the argument is trying to show in the first place.

On the other hand, candidates might argue that this is a non-fallacious use of affirming the consequent where the relationship between legality and safety that is being expressed is not one of sufficiency but one of causal connection. The implication might be that making something legal causes it to be safer because it can be more easily monitored. A similar argument is often used in the case of legalising drugs.

The move from P4 and the implied premise P5 to SC2 is problematic. The conclusion supported is that clear and strictly enforced restrictions on availability are needed, NOT that the particular restrictions suggested are needed. This would require further evidence.

Any of the premises could, and should, be questioned.

Passage Two

Creationism and evolutionary theory should be taught alongside one another at school in science classes. First, Darwin's theory of evolution is just as much an unproved theory about the origin of life as creationism. Because scientific theories are never really proven, their acceptance is no less a matter of faith than the acceptance of religious beliefs. Secondly, offering both theories will sharpen the students' critical thinking skills. This is because the best way to sharpen critical thinking is to allow students to make up their own minds on really important matters, such as this. Furthermore, to restrict science teachers to teaching the theory of evolution would be to cater only to the secular student, discriminating against all the rest, who believe in creationism. And we know that discrimination is always bad.

Summary: Passage Two is on science and society, Darwin's theory of evolution and creationism. The passage provides an argument to the conclusion that creationism and evolutionary theory should be taught alongside one another at school in science classes.

Clarification:

The conclusion of the argument is the first sentence: Creationism and evolutionary theory should be taught alongside one another at school in science classes. The argument has a simple structure with three simple sub-arguments providing convergent support to the main conclusion.

- (P1) Scientific theories are never really proven, their acceptance is no less a matter of faith than the acceptance of religious beliefs.
- (SC1) Darwin's theory of evolution is just as much an unproved theory about the origin of life as creationism. (from P1)
- (P2) The best way to sharpen critical thinking is to allow students to make up their own minds on really important matters.
- (SC2) Offering both theories will sharpen the students' critical thinking skills (from P2)
- (P3) To restrict science teachers to teaching the theory of evolution would be to cater only to the secular student, discriminating against all the rest, who believe in creationism.
- (P4) Discrimination is always bad.
- (SC3 implied) We shouldn't discriminate against creationists. (from P3 and P4, linked)
- (C) Creationism and evolutionary theory should be taught alongside one another at school in science classes. (SC1, SC2, SC3, convergent)

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the argument should focus on:

- (1) the support the premises give to the conclusion and the sub-conclusion, and
- (2) the acceptability of the premises.

One aspect of the argument that should be discussed is the sub-argument P3 and P4 to the implied sub-conclusion SC3. P3 presents a false dichotomy by assuming that students must be either secular or creationists. It also could be argued that there is equivocation in the use of the word 'discrimination'. There is some irony or hypocrisy here in the fact that in making the claim that all theistic students are creationists, all the religious non-creationists are discriminated against by being excluded. Discrimination is not always bad, only discrimination that is based on characteristics that are irrelevant to the question at hand. Discriminating against poorly established claims to truth is exactly what science teachers should be doing.

In the argument from P1 to SC1, P1 is not acceptable and the SC1 is, therefore, unsupported. There is a preponderance of scientific evidence for evolution, whereas there is a preponderance of evidence against creationism. If creationism is to be in a science class it should meet the same standards of evidence as well-founded scientific theories. It doesn't. The claims about critical thinking in P2 are beside the point. It is not the object of a science class to teach critical thinking.

Any of the premises could, and should, be questioned.

Question 11 (continued)**Passage Three**

Without death our life would lack any meaning. The natural life span of humans – at around 80 years – tends to follow a fairly typical narrative arc. We are born, we go through childhood, adolescence, we become independent, get married, have children, grow old and become grandparents and then we die. If we didn't die, none of these experiences would have the unique meaning in our lives that they do. We would just continue trudging on in a monotonous treadmill of endless repetitive experiences, with ever-diminishing pleasure until not another drop of enthusiasm could be squeezed out of our empty existences. A life without death would be like being forced to eat a giant chocolate bar that you could never finish. After a few delicious pieces the pleasure would rapidly start to fade and before long we would feel sick at the very thought of another bite.

Summary: Passage Three is on death and the meaning of life. The passage provides an argument to the conclusion that without death our life would lack any meaning.

Clarification:

The conclusion of the argument is the first sentence: Without death our life would lack any meaning.

- (P1) Life has a typical narrative arc that includes death.
- (P2) Death is the part of the narrative arc that gives the rest of the experience meaning.
- (P3) Without death all of life's experiences would be endlessly repetitive.
- (P4) Endless repetition would remove all the pleasure from life's experiences (supported by the chocolate bar analogy).
- (C) Without death our life would lack meaning. (P1, P2, P3, P4 linked)

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the argument should focus on

- (1) the support the premises give to the conclusion and the sub-conclusion, and
- (2) the acceptability of the premises.

The chocolate bar analogy is slightly question begging because it assumes that all of life's experiences would be homogenous, just like the taste of the pieces of chocolate. It might actually be the case that you could have an infinite kaleidoscope of different experiences and each one would be unique and pleasurable. On the other side of the argument, talking to people near the end of their life seems to support the claim that the pleasure gained from experiences diminishes over time, but not necessarily to nothing.

Candidates may point out that P1 and P2 are by themselves sufficient to provide support for C, and P3 and P4 are not really required. However, if 'pleasurable' is assumed to be equivalent to 'meaningful' then candidates might show that P3 and P4 give support to P2.

Any of the premises could, and should, be questioned. They may be supported or criticised.

Section Three: Construction of argument**30% (30 Marks)**

Marks will be awarded for demonstration of:

- philosophical understandings (10 marks)
- philosophical argument (15 marks)
- clarity and structure. (5 marks)

The marking key below applies to Questions 12 to 16.

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Philosophical understandings	
Demonstrates a critical understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses sophisticated philosophical language and concepts	9–10
Demonstrates understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses appropriate language and concepts	7–8
Demonstrates an understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses some appropriate philosophical language and concepts	5–6
Demonstrates some understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question	3–4
Demonstrates a limited understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question	1–2
Fails to demonstrate an understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question	0
Subtotal	10
Criterion 2: Philosophical argument	
Constructs a relevant, cogent argument, which demonstrates originality, and a deep understanding of philosophical method, e.g. relies on plausible assumptions, demonstrates logical insight, effectively uses examples and counter-examples where appropriate	14–15
Constructs a relevant, cogent argument, which demonstrates a sound understanding of philosophical method	12–13
Constructs a relevant, moderately cogent argument, which demonstrates some understanding of philosophical method	10–11
Constructs a relevant, moderately cogent argument, e.g. may contain some errors in reasoning or fails to consider possible objections where appropriate	8–9
Constructs a relevant, weak argument, e.g. may make controversial assumptions, beg the question and/or commit some other serious errors of reasoning such as informal or formal fallacies	6–7
Constructs a weak argument that makes few relevant claims, e.g. commits several serious errors of reasoning, has tenuous/occasional links with the question	4–5
Makes some claims relevant to the question but fails to construct any argument, e.g. merely makes assertions, merely discusses the thoughts of others	2–3
No relevant argument, e.g. fails to address the question	0–1
Subtotal	15
Criterion 3: Clarity and structure	
Writes with structure and clarity, e.g. clarifies key terms, sign-post key steps of the argument, logical ordering of topics	4–5
Writes with some structure and some clarity	2–3
Writing is poorly structured and lacks clarity, e.g. fails to clarify key terms, unclear argument structure	0–1
Subtotal	5
Total	30

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This document – apart from any third party copyright material contained in it – may be freely copied, or communicated on an intranet, for non-commercial purposes in educational institutions, provided that it is not changed and that the School Curriculum and Standards Authority is acknowledged as the copyright owner, and that the Authority's moral rights are not infringed.

Copying or communication for any other purpose can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with prior written permission of the School Curriculum and Standards Authority. Copying or communication of any third party copyright material can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with permission of the copyright owners.

Any content in this document that has been derived from the Australian Curriculum may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons [Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) licence.

*Published by the School Curriculum and Standards Authority of Western Australia
303 Sevenoaks Street
CANNINGTON WA 6107*