



PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

ATAR course examination 2022

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

(3 marks)

Because consent is a necessary condition for justice, if I don't agree to abide by the government's laws, then those laws are unjust. It follows from this example that consent is required for justice.

For the above argument:

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

Description	Marks
The conclusion is underlined (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as shown above. Nothing else is underlined.	1
Total	1

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

Cogent

Not cogent

Description	Marks
The words 'NOT COGENT' are circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

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

Description	Marks
The argument begs the question OR the argument is circular.	1
Total	1

Question 2

(2 marks)

People who are distrustful of medical experts are more likely to hold extreme political opinions than those who are more trusting. This shows that distrust of medical experts leads to political extremism.

For the above argument:

- (a) Circle the inference indicator. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
'This shows that' is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as shown above. Nothing more is circled. Nothing less is circled.	1
Total	1

- (b) Name the fallacy. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
confusion of correlation and causation or <i>cum hoc ergo propter hoc</i>	1
Total	1

Question 3

(1 mark)

It's ridiculous that passengers should have to wear a seatbelt in the car. It won't be long before they will be forcing us all to wear crash helmets.

Name the fallacy in the above argument.

Description	Marks
Slippery slope or slippery precedent or adverse consequences.	1
Total	1

Question 4

(5 marks)

- (a) Is the following statement analytic or synthetic?

If Olivia is a female, then she is her mother’s daughter.

(1 mark)

Description	Marks
analytic	1
Total	1

- (b) Express the following sentence as a disjunction (X or Y) statement.

(1 mark)

If Tom eats animal products, then Tom is not a vegan.

Description	Marks
Either Tom eats animal products or Tom is a vegan. or Tom is a vegan or Tom eats animal products. or Either Tom does not eat animal products or Tom is not a vegan. or Tom is not a vegan, or Tom doesn’t eat animal products.	1
Total	1

- (c) (i) It’s not true that Callum and Vera can both sing well.
(ii) Either Callum can’t sing well or Vera can’t sing well.

Do sentences (i) and (ii) mean the same thing? Circle the correct answer.

(1 mark)

Yes

No

Description	Marks
The word ‘YES’ is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

- (d) In order to join the Weld Club, you must be a man.

Underline the **two** sentences that mean the same as the above sentence.

(2 marks)

- (i) You can join the Weld Club only if you’re a man.
(ii) If you are a man, then you can join the Weld Club.
(iii) Being a man is sufficient for joining the Weld Club.
(iv) To join the Weld Club, it is necessary that you are a man.

Description	Marks
Sentence (i) is underlined (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way).	1
Sentence (iv) is underlined (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way).	1
Total	2

Question 5

(4 marks)

(1) {If Australia is going to take the threat of climate change seriously, then we should start investing in nuclear power generation immediately.} The first reason is that (2) {nuclear is the only serious alternative to fossil fuel in providing the necessary base load power consistently and reliably.} This is because (3) {other energy sources not reliant on fossil fuel, such as wind and solar, are subject to the vagaries of the weather.} Other reasons are that (4) {Australia has its own large deposits of uranium,} and that (5) {it is a very geologically stable environment in which to safely dispose of nuclear waste.}

(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) Using the numbers from part (a), draw a diagram of the argument. (3 marks)

Description	Marks
Shows (3) supporting (2), in turn, supporting (1).	1
Shows (4) and (5) converging to support (1).	1
Shows (1) as the main conclusion.	1
Total	3
*if candidate does not separate (4) and (5) in their answer to (a) then they should be awarded 1 mark for showing (4) supporting (1).	

Question 6

(3 marks)

Cigarettes are harmful because they contain arsenic, lead, and tar. Vaping products do not contain any of these ingredients, so they cannot be harmful.

(a) Write out in full the conclusion. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Vaping products cannot be harmful. or Vaping products are not harmful.	1
Total	1

- (b) Write out in full the premises. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
(1) Cigarettes are harmful because they contain arsenic, lead, and tar. Or (1) Cigarettes are harmful (2) Cigarettes contain arsenic, lead, and tar. and (2)/(3) Vaping products do not contain arsenic, lead or tar. or (3)/(4) Vaping products do not contain any of the ingredients, arsenic, lead and tar (No other statement is to be provided.)	1
Total	1
Note: This question is intended to test candidates' ability to clarify the referent of a demonstrative pronoun.	

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

Description	Marks
Non-sequitur	1
Total	1

Question 7 (2 marks)

The editing and revision of Hollywood films prior to distribution in authoritarian countries should not be seen as state censorship and propaganda, rather it should be understood as the careful reframing of a narrative arc to ensure that it is culturally sensitive.

- (a) Underline the 'weasel' phrase from the above passage. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
All or most of the phrase ' <u>the careful reframing of a narrative arc to ensure that it is culturally sensitive</u> ' is underlined shown above.	1
Total	1

- (b) Give a concise reason why the phrase you underlined is a 'weasel' phrase. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The phrase 'the careful reframing of a narrative arc to ensure that it is culturally sensitive' is being used as a euphemism for state censorship and propaganda, and in doing so trying to make state censorship and propaganda sound less wrong.	1
Total	1

Question 8

(7 marks)

(1) {Stacy will probably not have an allergic reaction to Celephrex.} (2) {Allergic reactions to Celephrex occur in only 0.05% of the general population.} (3) {Studies also show that those who do have such reactions are usually diabetic with blood type A,} and (4) {neither of these is true of Stacy.} But (5) {even if an allergic reaction does occur, it will not be a severe one.} **(So)** (6) {Celephrex is safe for Stacy to take.}

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

Description	Marks
Brackets and numbers are placed in the exact locations as shown above. In (5) the word 'even' may be left outside the brackets.	1
Total	1

(b) Circle any inference indicators. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The word 'so' is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as shown above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

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

Weak

Moderate

Strong

Description	Marks
The word 'Strong' is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

(d) Using the numbers from part (a), draw a diagram of the argument. (4 marks)

Description	Marks
<pre> (2) (3) + (4) \ / (1) / \ (6) (5) </pre>	
Shows (2) giving convergent support to (1).	1
Shows (3) and (4) linked, giving convergent support to (1).	1
Shows (1) giving convergent support to (6).	1
Shows (5) giving convergent support to (6).	1
Total	4
If the conclusion is shown correctly, but diagram is otherwise incorrect, 1 mark.	

Question 9

(3 marks)

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

- (1) Loving and supportive family environments are a source of inequality in society.
- (2) If loving and supportive family environments confer social advantages later in life, then they are a source of inequality in society.
- (3) Loving and supportive family environments should be eradicated.
- (4) Growing up in a loving and supportive family environment confers social advantages later in life.
- (5) All sources of inequality should be eradicated.

Description	Marks
(4) + (2) ↓ (1) + (5) ↓ (3)	
Shows (4) and (2) linked to support (1).	1
Shows (1) and (5) linked to support (3).	1
Shows (3) as the main conclusion.	1
Total	3

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 of the contributions of each participant	
Summarises accurately and succinctly the contributions of each participant.	2
Summarises the contribution/s of the participants with only partial accuracy or without succinctness.	1
Total	2
Criterion 2: Clarification of the contributions	
Clarifies the contributions of both participants succinctly and accurately by explaining their arguments, using relevant examples where appropriate. A clear and accurate understanding of the philosophical concepts at issue in the dialogue is demonstrated throughout.	6
Provides clarification of the contributions of both participants, but at times lacks in brevity and accuracy. Some demonstration that philosophical concepts at issue in the dialogue are accurately understood.	4–5
Makes some relevant claims about the contributions of the participants but merely describes rather than clarifies the arguments. Some errors in comprehending the philosophical concepts at issue in the dialogue.	2–3
Limited clarification of the contributions of either participant.	1
Subtotal	6
Criterion 3: Critical Evaluation	
Provides a targeted and coherent critical evaluation of the contributions of each participant in the context of a dialogue, giving clear reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency, correctly referring to fallacies where necessary, and accurately using the appropriate disciplinary terminology.	11–12
Provides a critical evaluation of the contributions of each participant in the context of a dialogue, giving some reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency, identifying some fallacies where necessary, and using the appropriate disciplinary terminology.	9–10
Some evidence of critical evaluation of the contributions of each participant, with stated reasons for premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. May not mention fallacies where relevant. Some inaccuracies using the appropriate disciplinary terminology.	7–8
Some evaluation of the contributions of each participant, with assertions about premise acceptability, inferential strength or overall cogency. May not mention fallacies where relevant. Disciplinary terminology used inaccurately or participant contributions not evaluated in their dialogic context.	5–6
Makes assertions about the cogency of the arguments presented by the participants. Disciplinary terminology used inaccurately and participant contributions not evaluated in their dialogic context.	3–4
Limited critical evaluation of the contributions.	1–2
Subtotal	12
Total	20

Question 10 (continued)

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

Summary:

Angie is arguing that life in Virtual World (VW) would be meaningful – as rich in meaning as life in the actual world. Bob argues that life in VW would not be meaningful. Angie appeals to the rich social life that one would have in VW, claiming it is this that constitutes a meaningful life. Bob attempts to rebut her position by claiming that social interaction doesn't entail a meaningful life, which he thinks can only be had in the actual world.

Contribution 1 clarification:

Angie's argument:

P1: a meaningful life is defined as one that is rich in social interaction.

P2: Life in VW would be rich in social interaction.

Conclusion: Life in VW would be meaningful – as rich in meaning as life in the actual world.

Critical evaluation:

The argument form is valid. But P1 commits the definist fallacy by defining a meaningful life in such a way as to tilt the debate in favour of the social definition. There are other proposed ways in which life is said have meaning, such as by communing with nature, acting ethically, having a perceived relationship with God, etc. Social interaction may be neither necessary nor sufficient for a meaningful life. While P2 has some plausibility, it needs further support. There could be factors about VW that inhibit it from being a socially rich environment – or at least anywhere as rich as actual world. This is especially true for people whose social interactions are enmeshed with outdoor pursuits.

Contribution 2 clarification:

Bob responds by stating that life in VW would not be meaningful. His overall argument for this claim is that even if we accept the premise that life in VW would be filled with rich social interaction, it doesn't follow that such a life is meaningful.

In more detail:

P1: Corrupt corporations motivated by financial gain are probably controlling VW.

P2: If corrupt corporations motivated by financial gain are controlling VW, then (even during rich social interaction) we will not have any agency over what we say and do.

P3: If we lack such agency then life would lack meaning.

Conclusion: Life in VW lacks meaning.

Critical evaluation:

Bob's argument has the merit of engaging with Angie's assumption about life in VW is socially rich, so he is not talking past her. As it stands, the premises strongly support the conclusion, although not quite valid b/c of word 'probably'. And P1 could be said to have some plausibility based on what we know about corporate behavior in the actual world (although this too can also be contested). Bob's argument is however flawed on a number of counts. P2 contains the fallacy of slippery slope. There is no evidence to suppose that if corrupt corporations were in control of VR, it would extend to everything we say and do. There is some credibility to the idea in P3 that if we lack agency, then life lacks meaning, although this needs further support. Issues of freewill and determinism come into play here.

Contribution 3 Clarification:

Angie responds by arguing that even if we accepted Bob's idea that corporations would steal our agency and turn us into puppets it wouldn't follow that our lives would be drained of meaning.

Argument:

P1: If we believe our rich social interactions to stem from real agency then our lives are meaningful.

P2: We do believe our rich social interactions to stem from real agency in the virtual world,

C: Our lives are meaningful.

P2 is in turn supported by an argument by analogy: since we believe that we have agency in the real world, we will believe we have agency in VW.

Critical Evaluation:

Main argument form is valid. P1 may be challenged by arguing that a false belief in our agency would undermine the meaning that such life has. For instance, it could be argued by analogy that if someone you trust is betraying you behind your back, your relationship with them is diminished regardless of what you believe. Matters of subjective versus objective meaning and value come into play here. P2 might be challenged by pointing to a disanalogy between the case of actual world and VW. If you already suspect that corporations are messing with your agency in VW, then you are less likely to believe that you are as free in VW as you are in the actual world.

Contribution 4 Clarification:

Bob re-asserts his stance that life in the VW would lack meaning. His supporting reason is that life can only have meaning in the actual world.

Critical Evaluation:

Bob's reason begs the question, assuming the conclusion that he seeks to prove. For stating that only life in the actual world is meaningful implies that life in the VW lacks meaning.

Part B

20% (20 Marks)

Question 11

(20 marks)

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

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

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Summary of the passage	
Summarises the passage accurately and succinctly.	2
Summarises the passage only partially or with only partial accuracy.	1
Total	2
Criterion 2: Clarification of the argument of the passage	
Clarifies the argument of the passage succinctly and accurately by explaining its inferential structure, correctly identifying its main conclusion and the rationales (sub-arguments, premises, or examples) advanced in support. Demonstrated proficiency with philosophical concepts at issue in the passage.	8
Provides clarification of the argument of the passage and its inferential structure, identifying its main conclusion and the rationales advanced in support, but at times lacks in brevity and accuracy. Some evidence of proficiency with philosophical concepts at issue in the passage.	6–7
Provides clarification of the argument of the passage and its inferential structure, but at times lacks in brevity and accuracy. May demonstrate some misunderstandings of the argument structure and/ or the philosophical concepts at issue in the passage.	4–5
Makes some relevant claims about the argument of the passage but merely describes rather than clarifies the inferential structure and philosophical concepts.	2–3
Limited clarification of the argument of the passage.	1
Subtotal	8
Criterion 3: Critical evaluation of the passage	
Provides a targeted and coherent critical evaluation of the passage giving clear reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. Where relevant, fallacies are correctly identified, theoretical positions are clarified, counter arguments are elaborated and the disciplinary terminology is used appropriately.	9–10
Provides a critical evaluation of the passage giving some reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. Some evidence of having identified fallacies, clarified theoretical positions and elaborated counter arguments where relevant, with appropriate use of the disciplinary terminology.	7–8
Some evidence of critical evaluation of the passage with stated reasons for premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. May not mention fallacies or counter arguments where relevant. Some inaccuracies using the appropriate disciplinary terminology or in demonstrated understandings of the relevant theoretical viewpoints.	5–6
Some evaluation of the passage, with assertions about premise acceptability, inferential strength or overall cogency. May not mention fallacies or counter arguments where relevant. Disciplinary terminology used inaccurately.	4–5
Makes assertions about the cogency of the argument in the passage. No mention of fallacies or counter arguments where relevant.	2–3
Limited critical evaluation of the passage.	1
Subtotal	10
Total	20

Note: The following model answers and notes for Passages One, Two and Three 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.

Passage One

The main contention of the passage is that deontological ethical theories are implausible. In my view, the passage fails to present a cogent argument for this position. In what follows, I provide an outline of the argument and a justification for this assessment of its cogency.

The first half of the passage presents a brief account of what deontological ethical theories are, and gives an outline of the author's objection to them. A basic feature of deontological ethical theories is that when evaluating the moral worth of our actions, priority is given to rules about what it is morally permissible for rational creatures to do to one another over any evaluation of the consequences that might result. For deontologists, this means that there are some things we just can't do to one another (or ourselves), regardless of what valuable states of affairs might obtain if we did. However, for the author of the passage, this basic feature is a basic error, because it can sometimes prevent us from bringing about valuable states of affairs.

Up to this point what the author has provided is merely an assertion of the consequentialist ethical viewpoint over against the deontologists. But such an assertion does not demonstrate that the deontologist's theory is not plausible. It only highlights that the two theories have different ideas about where the moral value of our actions resides. In order to show that deontological theories were implausible, the author would need to highlight something contradictory or unjustifiable about the theory itself; or else demonstrate that the moral judgments generated by deontological theories are out of step with common-sense moral judgments in obvious and extreme ways. The passage takes the latter option and tries to present an example where it is obvious that the moral course of action would involve us acting in ways that deontological theories consider immoral. Unfortunately, the example used in the passage is not fit for this purpose.

The example concerns the forcible sterilisation of some human beings so as to limit growth in the human population on earth. The author apparently thinks readers will agree that it is obvious that the state of affairs in which the human population does not exceed the earth's carrying capacity is so valuable that it is permissible to injure the bodies of some human beings to prevent them from reproducing. There are a number reasons that this example is not convincing as a demonstration of the implausibility of deontology.

Firstly, the author has not provided any argument showing that the forcible sterilisation of some human beings is required for the realisation of a sustainable human population. Without such a demonstration, a policy for achieving this aim which involves the violation of bodily autonomy seems entirely gratuitous. It is possible that the human population might be moderated through a voluntary sterilisation program, or a global program of contraception education. Alternatively, as the human population approaches the limits of the earth's resources, this might exert a natural moderating influence on our reproductive choices without the need for drastic intervention. The burden of proof is on the author to demonstrate that these options are not viable and that sterilisation is required.

Secondly, it isn't obvious that the outcome of limiting the human population to a sustainable level actually does outweigh the harm of forcible sterilisation. Forcible sterilisation is arguably a violation of a person's body that is highly immoral, and it is a virtue of deontological ethical theories that they can provide a compelling explanation for that intuition. Denying the consequentialist perspective on the case might seem question begging, but it is no more so than the consequentialist's denial of the deontologist's perspective. Once again, the deontologist's view is not made implausible simply because it differs from the consequentialist's (or vice versa).

Lastly, it isn't even clear from a consequentialist perspective that limiting the earth's population is the most moral thing to do. If the most moral thing to do is, as the utilitarians suppose, to act so as to create the greatest good for the greatest number, then one way of achieving this might be to ensure that there is a greater number of us around – so long as each person's life, however miserable, had some small amount of good in it to add to the aggregate in total.

Question 11 (continued)

Passage Two

The thesis of the passage is that the ideal society is not a democracy. A crucial first step in the argument for this claim is that democracy is defined as a form of governance which 'gives each citizen an equal say.' But this is ambiguous between giving citizens an equal say in all decisions (direct democracy), and giving them an equal say in voting for representatives who will then make decisions on our behalf (representative democracy). The passage then presents a convergent argument, offering three reasons for thinking that giving each citizen an equal say would lead to bad outcomes:

1. Most citizens are not intelligent enough to understand the issues of politics and governance.
2. A society that required all citizens to understand and stay informed about all political issues in order to participate in decision making would be inefficient.
3. Most citizens will vote self-interestedly, putting the common good in jeopardy.

I will discuss each of these claims in turn, but at the outset it is worth pointing out that (1) and (2) only seem to be relevant as criticisms of direct forms of democracy. And, whilst the third reason presents a legitimate concern, it is likely to be even more of a problem for other forms of government, such as where the many are ruled by one, or by the few. For these reasons, the thesis of the passage, that the ideal society is not a democracy, is not well supported.

Regarding (1), the worry seems to be that, if people don't understand what they are being asked to make a decision about they are unlikely to be able to make a good decision. This is said to be like allowing children to make decisions for themselves. This analogy is objectionable. We are not talking about children here. We are talking about adults who need to be respected as capable of making decisions for themselves. And it is a mark of this respect to allow them to participate in collective decisions that will affect them. Further, it is false that most people are as unintelligent as the passage has claimed. And it is false that all issues of politics and governance are as complicated as the author suggests. But even if some political issues are so complex that only a minority of citizens can really understand them enough to make an informed decision, the problem that this raises for the quality of decision making can be minimised by putting in place a representative form of democracy rather than a direct form.

(2) is even less persuasive. We can accept that requiring every citizen to vote on every decision of government would be an unwieldy and inefficient form of government. But we do not need to accept that this is what democracy requires. The ideal of giving every citizen an equal say is compatible with a more efficient social division of labour. Representative democracy is an obvious compromise.

Lastly, I think we can largely accept the point made in claim (3), that citizens are likely to vote in self-interested ways, or in ways that prioritise the interests of groups that they belong to. But this does not support the claim that democracy is not the ideal. If self-interested decision making at the expense of the common good is a problem for democracy, it is even more of a problem for a dictatorship, or for an aristocracy, where power is wielded by fewer people. Further, it can be argued that by giving every citizen an equal say in at least some part of the collective decision making, and increasing the amount of competition between interests, we stand a chance of minimising the worst excesses of self-interested political action.

Passage Three

Summary:

The passage outlines and attempts to counter an argument ostensibly made by phenomenologists for the claim that the scientific method cannot provide us with an adequate account of human experience. The position argued in response by the passage is that science is the only reliable and accurate method for the production of knowledge about ourselves and our world.

Clarification:

The target argument:

1. Any scientific account of human experience will exclude subjective experiences.
2. Culture, art and religion (CAR) have subjective experience as their foundation.
- SC. Any scientific account of human experience will fail to account for CAR [1 & 2, linked]
3. CAR are important domains of human experience and knowledge.
- C. The scientific method cannot provide us with an adequate account of human experience [SC & 3, linked].

The response argument:

Against 3:

R1. CAR only provide interpretations of reality grounded in either unreliable subjective accounts, or inherited traditions.

SC1. No real knowledge about ourselves and the world can be found in CAR [R1].

SC2. It is not a problem that a scientific account of human experience would ignore CAR [SC1.]

Against C:

R2. The reason that the scientific method reliably and accurately produces knowledge is that it is objective and independent of particular perspectives.

C. Science is the only reliable and accurate method for the production of knowledge about human experience [R2 & SC1, linked].

Evaluation.

The main problem with the response argument is that it begs the question against the phenomenologist's claim (3). R1 might be thought to present a false dichotomy, but even if it is accepted for sake of argument, (SC1) does not follow. This is because (SC1) has assumed without argument that the only kind of knowledge worth having is that which is acquired through the scientific method. In doing so, it excludes any kind of knowledge that requires immersion in specific aspects of human perspectives, cultures or experiences: what we might call knowledge by acquaintance. This is question begging.

The argument against (3) also appears to be attacking somewhat of a strawman. By pitting CAR against science as rival sources of knowledge, it attributes to phenomenologists the idea that CAR have the same aims as science, namely, that of providing factual knowledge about the external world, its causes and explanations. It is open to the phenomenologist to reply by clarifying their position. A better response to the target argument as presented in the passage might have been to point out that (1) is false, since the sciences of psychology, neuroscience, biology and anthropology all frequently have subjective human experience as their object of study. It is therefore false that the scientific method cannot account for CAR. Nonetheless, this sort of response merely highlights ambiguities in the passage's presentation of the phenomenologists' view regarding what an adequate account of human experience consists in.

A more charitable interpretation of the phenomenologists' claim is that through immersion in CAR, we gain knowledge of the human condition, and that such knowledge is necessary for an adequate account of human experience. It can be plausibly argued by analogy that just as one needs to subjectively experience redness in order to fully understand what redness is, one needs to immerse themselves in a cultural or artistic or religious milieu in order to fully understand various aspects of it, and so, to have knowledge. In this way, whilst the sciences of psychology, neuroscience, biology and anthropology might have accounted for CAR in some sense, they will not have accounted for the aspects of CAR that the phenomenologist considers most important. Namely, what these things are like from the inside. The important point for the phenomenologist is that we can never gain knowledge of this sort through a methodology committed to the idea that we must strip away all perspective.

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
Subtotal	10
Criterion 2: Philosophical arguments	
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
Limited relevant argument (e.g. fails to address the question).	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
Limited structure and clarity (e.g. fails to clarify key terms, unclear argument structure).	1
Total	5
Total	30

Copyright

© School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2022

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 (the 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 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.

An *Acknowledgements variation* document is available on the Authority website.

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