



PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

ATAR course examination 2020

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)

- (a) Express the following sentence as a disjunctive (either X or Y) statement. (1 mark)

If Kyra is playing poker, then she is gambling.

Description	Marks
Either Kyra is not playing poker, or she is gambling	1
Total	1

- (b) If Jon is able to attend an Australian university, then Jon has English competency. (1 mark)

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence.

- (i) Jon is able to attend an Australian university if he has English competency.
- (ii) Either Jon is able to attend an Australian university or he has English competency.
- (iii) Jon is able to attend an Australian university only if he has English competency.

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

- (c) Unless surgery is performed, the patient will not survive. (1 mark)

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence.

- (i) Surgery is a necessary condition for the patient's survival.
- (ii) Surgery is a sufficient condition for the patient's survival.
- (iii) Surgery is necessary and sufficient for the patient's survival.

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

Question 2

(3 marks)

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

Regardless of how minor their offenses against the law, climate-change protesters participating in civil disobedience cannot go unchallenged. If we allow these protesters to disrupt the flow of traffic, then anyone and everyone can block the streets for any reason.

Description	Marks
Slippery slope or slippery precedent or appeal to adverse consequences	1
Total	1

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

Since taxation is theft, there can be no moral justification for the imposition of taxes on citizens by their governments.

Description	Marks
Definist fallacy	1
Total	1

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

Barry is accused of murdering Paula, and there is significant evidence in favour of his guilt. But Barry is Paula's neighbour, so it is definitely not true that he murdered her.

Description	Marks
Non sequitur or fallacy of irrelevant reason	1
Total	1

Question 3

(3 marks)

We should be cautious about permitting human enhancement through the use of genetic engineering. Given the cost of such technologies, it seems very unlikely that governments would be willing to provide access to genetic engineering for all citizens. Inequality is already at an unacceptable level in our society, and genetic engineering will only further increase the divide between the rich and the poor.

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)

Cogent

 Not Cogent

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

- (c) give **one** reason for your answer to part (b). (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The following are possible reasons why the argument may be considered cogent. 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. Since a cogent argument involves (i) acceptable premises that give (ii) strong support to the conclusion, students may provide a reason that targets either criterion.	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is very modest, saying only that we should be cautious about genetic engineering not that we should ban it. The premises give ample support for this modest claim. • Whilst it is certainly possible that governments provide access to enhancement technologies to all citizens, it does seem unlikely, and the prohibitive cost provides good support for this claim. • It is common knowledge that inequality is currently putting strain on our social institutions, and we should be cautious about permitting things that stand to exacerbate it. 	
Total	1

Question 4

(5 marks)

If my beliefs are formed by reliable processes, then I have justification for my beliefs. If my beliefs are the product of an elaborate deception, then they have not been formed by reliable processes. But, since I cannot rule out the possibility that my beliefs are the product of an elaborate deception, I cannot rule out the possibility that my beliefs have been formed by unreliable processes. It follows that I cannot have justification for my beliefs.

For the above argument:

- (a) circle any inference indicators (2 marks)

Description	Marks
Circles one correct inference indicator ('since' or 'it follows 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

- (b) underline the conclusion (1 mark)

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

- (c) circle the word that **best** describes the strength of the inference to the conclusion (1 mark)

Weak

 Moderate

 Strong

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

- (d) give **one** reason for your answer to part (c). (1 mark)

Description	Marks
One or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denying the antecedent. • It has only been said that reliable processes of belief formation are sufficient for justification not that they are necessary for justification. • It doesn't follow from the fact that deception cannot be ruled out that there is good reason to think I am being deceived. • There may still be good reason to think that my beliefs are formed by reliable processes, and that the likelihood of being under an elaborate deception is quite small. 	1
Total	1

Question 5

(3 marks)

Are the following statements analytic or synthetic?

- (a) Whenever Lucy does physical exercise, she lifts weights. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
synthetic	1
Total	1

- (b) Whenever Lucy is lifting weights, she is doing physical exercise. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
analytic	1
Total	1

- (c) Either Lucy is not lifting weights or she is doing physical exercise. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
analytic	1
Total	1

Question 6

(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) The right to liberty entails a right to democratic participation.
- (2) Every individual has a right to liberty.
- (3) The right to self-government entails a right to democratic participation.
- (4) Every individual has a right to democratic participation.
- (5) The right to liberty entails a right to self-government.

Description	Marks
<div style="text-align: center;"> <p>(5) + (3)</p> <p>↓</p> <p>(1) + (2)</p> <p>↓</p> <p>(4)</p> </div> <p>1 mark for showing (5) linked with (3) to support the sub-conclusion (1)</p> <p>1 mark for showing (1) linked with (2) to support the conclusion (4)</p>	<p>1-2</p>
Total	2

Question 7

(5 marks)

Since (1) {God is all powerful}, (2) {there is evil in the world only if God is allowing it}. But (3) {God wouldn't allow evil in the world unless He had a good reason to}. (4) {There is evil in the world}. So, (5) {God must be allowing evil}, and we can conclude that (6) {He has a good reason for allowing it}.

For the above argument:

- (a) underline the conclusion (1 mark)

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

- (b) 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

- (c) using the numbers from part (b), draw a diagram of the argument. (3 marks)

Description	Marks
<pre> (1) ↓ (2) + (4) ↓ (5) + (3) ↓ (6) </pre>	1-3
1 mark for showing (1) as a premise supporting (2) 1 mark for showing (2) linked with (4) to support the sub-conclusion (5) 1 mark for showing (5) linked with (3) to support the conclusion (6)	
Total	3
<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 8

(6 marks)

(1) {If Stephen is found guilty of stealing from the liquor store, he should be sentenced to a minimum of 10 years in prison}. There are at least three reasons for this. Firstly, (2) {if Stephen is in jail he won't be able to rob another liquor store}. Secondly, (3) {Stephen's experience in prison will reduce the likelihood that he will commit any further offences after his release}. Finally, (4) {giving Stephen a sentence such as this would lead to a significant reduction in crime}.

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) write out the separable statements in full (2 mark)

Description	Marks
(1) If Stephen is found guilty of stealing from the liquor store, he should be sentenced to a minimum of 10 years in prison	1
(2) If Stephen is in jail he won't be able to rob another liquor store	
(3) Stephen's experience in prison will reduce the likelihood that he will commit any further offences after his release	1
(4) Giving Stephen [a 10-year jail sentence] would lead to a significant reduction in crime	
Total	2

- (c) evaluate the cogency of the argument. Circle the correct answer (1 mark)

Cogent

Not Cogent

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

Question 8 (continued)(d) give **two** reasons for your answer to part (c).

(2 marks)

Description	Marks
<p>The following are possible reasons why the argument may be considered not cogent. 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 has provided a sufficient reason.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is not obvious that the large sentence would have any impact on the frequency of petty crime within the community.• The punishment is out of proportion with the crime.• A ten year sentence is excessive for petty theft.• Spending time in prison might increase Stephen's desire to commit crime given the company he would be keeping.• The unusually harsh sentence may create public resentment. <p>Candidates must supply two reasons. 1 mark for each reason.</p>	1–2
Total	2

Section Two: Philosophical analysis and evaluation

40% (40 Marks)

Part A

20% (20 Marks)

Question 9

(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 9 (continued)

Note: The following notes for Question 9 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 dialogue concerns social contract theories and whether such theories can generate an obligation for citizens to obey government. More specifically, the argument between the participants Mitchell and Ariane is about whether or not citizens can be said to have implicitly consented to government and its laws. The main position argued by Mitchell is that social contract theory is false. Ariane's main position is that implicit consent can generate an obligation to obey the government.

Mitchell opens the dialogue by arguing that social contract theories are untenable, on the grounds that (i) he hasn't signed any actual contract in which he has given explicit consent to government, and that (ii) he has never seen anyone else sign a contract of this kind either. This brief argument succeeds only in refuting a parody version of social contract theory which takes the central idea of a contract far too literally. Social contract theorists do not typically claim that political authority is justified by any actual written contract. Candidates should note that Mitchell's first contribution is a straw-man argument.

In her reply Ariane attempts to correct Mitchell's mistake, clarifying that the contract which social contract theorists are talking about doesn't need to be an actual contract. Ariane argues that when you voluntarily accept the benefits provided by a functioning government and the rule of law, you can be said to have implicitly given your consent to political authority. This is the relevant sense of contract. She supports the idea of implicit consent with an analogy involving dining out at a restaurant. Ariane is certainly right that it would be absurd to refuse to pay after ordering and eating a meal by claiming that you hadn't explicitly consented to pay for it. In eating a meal it is clear that one has agreed to be billed for the meal, if only implicitly. However, the real issue is whether the restaurant case and the case of citizens and their governments is relevantly similar. Candidates should critically engage with Ariane's argument by analogy through consideration of relevant differences between the two cases that might impact on the plausibility of claiming that implicit consent has been conferred in both situations.

In Mitchell's second contribution he provides two responses to Ariane's argument. Unfortunately, the first response sees Mitchell attack another straw-man. He misinterprets Ariane's claim about 'accepting the benefits of government' and restricts the scope of this claim to 'accepting welfare payments from the government.' His remarks here are thus irrelevant. Mitchell's second response is much better. Mitchell argues, in effect, that explicit dissent trumps implicit consent. That is, if one gives an explicit indication of dissent, this should be taken more seriously than any supposed implicit indications of consent. Candidates should make note of the difference in cogency between these two responses. But this is not to say that Mitchell's second response cannot be criticised. Since (i) Mitchell has not demonstrated that he has not accepted any benefits of government (in the relevant sense), and since (ii) he has not argued that the acceptance of such benefits would not constitute a kind of implicit consent, his assertion that explicit consent overrides implicit consent seems disingenuous. If he was sincere in his dissent, he ought to ensure that he is not accepting any benefits of government.

Ariane closes the dialogue by once again seeking to correct Mitchell's understanding. Having seen that Mitchell has misinterpreted her remarks about 'accepting the benefits of government' Ariane offers a few examples to clarify what she had in mind. The examples are calling the police for assistance, going to public schools, and driving on the freeway. Her claim is that in accepting any of these benefits Mitchell would be implicitly consenting to government. There is some plausibility to the claim that the acceptance of such benefits involves implicit consent, but Ariane may need to add to her list of examples if Mitchell hasn't needed police assistance, public schools, or use of the freeway. Beyond this, Ariane can be criticised for failing to engage with Mitchell's second objection, which poses a more serious problem for her view.

Part B

20% (20 Marks)

Question 10

(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

Passage One**Summary:**

Passage one is about the moral obligations we have toward nonhuman animals and the nature of such obligations. The passage provides an argument to the conclusion that the goal of improving the treatment of animals may be better served by pointing out that our obligations toward animals derive from the obligations we have toward other human beings.

Clarification:

The conclusion is the final sentence: The goal of improving the treatment of animals may be better served by pointing out the real source of our obligations to animals, namely, that our obligations to animals derive from the obligations we have toward other human beings.

P1. Only beings who can make moral claims against one another and respond to such claims can have rights.

P2. Animals are not the kinds of beings that are capable of exercising and responding to moral claims.

SC1. Animals do not have rights. (From P1 and P2 linked.)

SC2. Those who are trying to ensure that animals are not mistreated are not doing their cause any favours when they try to insist that animals have rights. (From SC1.)

P3. Cruelty toward human beings is immoral.

P4. Those who are cruel in their treatment of animals are cruel in their treatment of human beings as well.

SC3. We should not be cruel to animals, and we ought to treat them humanely. (From P3 and P4, linked)

SC4. All our obligations to animals derive from the obligations we have toward other human beings. (From SC1 and SC3 convergent.)

C. The goal of improving the treatment of animals may be better served by pointing out that our obligations toward animals derive from the obligations we have toward other human beings. (From SC2 and SC4 convergent.)

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the argument should focus on

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

The inference from P1 and P2 to SC1 is valid.

The inference from SC1 to SC2 is suspect. Even if it is true that animals do not have rights, asserting that animals do have rights can be very persuasive.

The inference from SC2 and SC4 to C is questionable for similar reasons. Even if the true source of our obligations toward animals are the obligations we have toward other human beings, pointing this out may still not be the best way of improving the treatment of animals. The goals of animal welfare advocates may actually be better served by asserting that animals have rights, or by engaging our compassion for the plight of animal suffering more directly.

The inference from P3 and P4 to SC3 is strong.

The inference from SC1 and SC3 to SC4 is weak, and involves a hasty generalisation. There may be some obligations that we have toward animals that do not derive from claims about animal rights, or from our obligations to other humans. We may, for example, have obligations to animals because animals have an interest in not experiencing suffering.

Aside from P3, which should be uncontroversial, any of the premises can and should be questioned. e.g., P1 asserts a necessary condition for being a rights holder. The claim could be challenged by providing a counter example involving something that cannot make or respond to moral claims but which would usually be thought to have rights—an infant, say.

Question 10 (continued)**Passage Two****Summary:**

Passage two is about agnosticism and belief in the existence of God. The passage provides an argument by analogy to the conclusion that the only responsible position to take regarding belief in the existence of God is agnosticism.

Clarification:

The conclusion of the argument is the final sentence: The only responsible position to take regarding belief in the existence of God is agnosticism.

P1. It is irresponsible to believe that your car is roadworthy when you have good reason to doubt this belief.

P2. There are serious doubts about each of the major arguments in favour of God's existence.

P3. There are serious doubts about the adequacy of arguments which claim to prove that God does not exist.

P4. Believing that your car is roadworthy when you have good reason to doubt this belief, and believing that God exists when you have good reason to doubt this belief are similar in ways that are relevant to judgments about responsible belief.

P5. Believing that your car is roadworthy when you have good reason to doubt this belief, and believing that God does not exist when you have good reason to doubt this belief are similar in ways that are relevant to judgments about responsible belief.

P6. Like cases should be treated alike. (Implied premise.)

SC1. To ignore doubts about the major arguments in favour of God's existence and to believe in God is also irresponsible. (P1, P2, P4, P6 linked)

SC2. To ignore doubts about the major arguments in favour of God's existence and to believe in God is also irresponsible. (P1, P3, P5, P6 linked)

C. The only responsible position to take regarding belief in the existence of God is agnosticism. (SC2, SC3 linked.)

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the argument should focus on

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

The inference from P1, P2, P4 and P6 to SC1 is strong, but premises P2 and P4 are vulnerable to objections (see below).

The inference from P1, P3, P5 and P6 to SC2 is strong, but premises P3 and P5 are vulnerable to objections (see below).

The inference from SC1 and SC2 to C is moderately strong. To resist the inference, candidates may try to argue that agnosticism is not a genuine option (we must be atheists or theists). Another strategy is to say that the argument presents a false trilemma. Perhaps there is a 'fourth way'. Candidates may argue that, (i) commitment to a belief in God's existence, (ii) commitment to a belief that God does not exist, and (iii) commitment to agnosticism do not exhaust the range of responsible ways of engaging with the issue of God's existence.

P2 and P3 may be challenged on the grounds that they are in need of justification.

P4 and P5 may be challenged by highlighting relevant differences between the cases. For example, it is not at all obvious that believing without sufficient evidence that God exists (or that God does not exist) puts anyone in danger in the way that believing your car to roadworthy without sufficient evidence was said to. If this is so, the analogy may be faulty and the inferences to SC1 and SC2 can be resisted.

Candidates may wish to construct a counter analogy to further undermine inferences to SC1 and SC2. There may be some cases where believing beyond the evidence is not irresponsible at all. Candidates may try to find some way of saying that belief in God's existence, or belief that God does not exist is more like these unproblematic cases of believing beyond the evidence.

Passage Three

Summary:

Passage three is about environmental ethics and our obligations to future generations. The passage provides an argument to the conclusion that there is no moral obligation to do anything about climate change.

Clarification:

The conclusion of the argument is the first sentence.

P1. Those who are alive today won't be around to see the negative effects of failing to act to mitigate climate change.

SC1. Those who are alive today will not be harmed by the negative effects of failing to act to mitigate climate change. (From P1.)

P2. Persons living in a possible future where quality of life has decreased due to a failure to act to mitigate climate change would not exist if we had acted to mitigate climate change.

P3. If someone wouldn't exist had we acted to mitigate climate change, they cannot be said to have been harmed by our failure to act.

SC2. Persons living in a possible future where quality of life has decreased due to a failure to act to mitigate climate change cannot be said to have been harmed by our failure to act to mitigate climate change. (From P2 and P3 linked.)

SC3. We cannot make sense of the idea that future generations will be harmed by a changing climate. (From SC2.)

C. There is no moral obligation to do anything about our changing climate. From (SC1 and SC3 convergent.)

Evaluation:

Evaluation of the argument should focus on

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

P1 is unacceptable. The negative effects of failing to act to mitigate climate change are widely predicted to affect us during the current century. Thus, there are many persons alive today who will be impacted by a changing climate, and so harmed by any failure to mitigate these changes.

P2 is acceptable. It is clear that changes to our lifestyles will have some impact on when children are conceived. This will have a decisive impact on which sperm and egg pair are united in conception.

The inference from P1 to SC1 is undermined by the unacceptability of P1.

The inference from P2 and P3 to SC2 is valid (Modus Ponens).

The inference from SC2 to SC3 is weak. SC2 speaks of persons being harmed by our inaction. SC3 speaks of being harmed by change climate. Even if it is true that future persons have not been harmed by us and our failure to act now, it doesn't follow that we can't say that future persons haven't been harmed. It makes perfect sense to say that future persons would be harmed by a bushfire emergency.

The inference from SC1 and SC3 to C is weak. Even if we accept SC1 and SC3, there may still be moral obligations to do something about climate change. The only morally relevant factor which is mentioned in SC1 and SC3 is harm which can be causally attributed to an agent. There may be an obligation to act to mitigate climate change which derives from other moral considerations (e.g., deontic, or virtue theoretical considerations.)

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 11 to 15.

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.

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*