Philosophy

LEVEL 3	15 TCE CREDIT POINTS
COURSE CODE	PHL315118
COURSE SPAN	2018 — 2025
READING AND WRITING STANDARD	YES
MATHEMATICS STANDARD	NO
COMPUTERS AND INTERNET STANDARD	NO

This course was delivered in 2020. Use A-Z Courses to find the current version (if available).

The course enables learners to develop logical responses to questions without definitive answers, thus helping them to become comfortable with difficult intellectual challenges

The emphasis on epistemology, the scientific method and logic allows students to identify faulty or weak arguments and understand the limits of knowledge.

Rationale

The value of philosophy is that it teaches not what to think, but how to think. It is the study of the principles underlying conduct, thought, existence and knowledge. The skills it develops are the ability to analyse, to engage with and to question prevailing views and to express thoughts clearly and precisely. It encourages critical and creative problem solving through open-minded intellectual flexibility and examining existing paradigms in new ways.

Philosophy promotes respect for intellectual integrity and builds learners' capacity to be independent thinkers who can articulate and justify philosophical positions.

The course enables learners to develop logical responses to questions without definitive answers, thus helping them to become comfortable with difficult intellectual challenges. The emphasis on epistemology, the scientific method and logic allows students to identify faulty or weak arguments and understand the limits of knowledge.

The study of philosophy provides learners with an excellent introduction to the key areas of philosophical study; metaphysics, epistemology, ethics, questions on free will, understandings around science and faith as means of knowing and how to live the 'good life'. It is intellectually challenging but is also of great relevance to learners in today's society.

Aims

The Philosophy Level 3 course aims to develop learners':

- knowledge and understanding of the nature of philosophy and its methods
- capacity to undertake inquiry, including skills in research, evaluation of sources, synthesis of evidence, analysis of interpretations and representations, and communication of findings
- capacity to identify and articulate philosophical questions
- skills in understanding and analysing significant philosophical ideas, viewpoints and arguments, in their historical contexts
- capacity to be informed citizens with skills in analytical and critical thinking and to participate in philosophical questions and debates
- capacity to explore ideas, responding to central philosophical questions, viewpoints and arguments with clarity, precision and logic
- understanding of relationships between responses to philosophical questions and contemporary issues
- open-mindedness, reflecting critically on their own thinking and that of others, and exploring alternative approaches to philosophical questions.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this course, learners will be able to:

1. describe and explain philosophical ideas, issues and positions
2. describe and explain primary texts, and access relevant information from a variety of sources
3. identify strengths and weaknesses of philosophical arguments
4. formulate and provide relevant evidence to support philosophical questions
5. develop informed opinions on various philosophical issues
6. utilise organisational and time management skills
7. communicate ideas clearly and effectively in verbal and written forms
8. explain the significance of philosophical positions to contemporary issues.
9. Additionally, learners may appreciate the value of philosophy as a link to the world today, and as a basis for lifelong learning.

Pathways

Exploring Issues in Society Level 2, Making Moral Decisions Level 2, Religion in Society Level 2, and Studies of Religion Level 3 provide pathways to this course.

Successful completion of Philosophy Level 3 prepares learners for tertiary study in a range of areas including: History; Politics; Law; Religion; Ethics and Philosophy; Business; Sociology; Psychology; Natural Sciences; Journalism; Nursing; Medicine; and the Creative Arts.

Course Size And Complexity

This course has a complexity level of 3.

At Level 3, the learner is expected to acquire a combination of theoretical and/or technical and factual knowledge and skills and use judgment when varying procedures to deal with unusual or unexpected aspects that may arise. Some skills in organising self and others are expected. Level 3 is a standard suitable to prepare learners for further study at tertiary level. VET competencies at this level are often those characteristic of an AQF Certificate III.

This course has a size value of 15.

Course Requirements

Learners **will** study **five (5)** compulsory units.

Unit 1, Introduction to Epistemology is compulsory. Skills and understandings acquired in studying Unit 1 will be applied to all other units.

Units (2-5) are compulsory; one (1) elective topic in Unit 4 will be completed.

Each Unit is of approximately 30 hours duration.

Unit 1 **will** be delivered first; it is recommended that Units 2, 3, 4 and 5 are delivered sequentially.

Course Content and Requirements

COMPULSORY	ELECTIVE	TIME
Unit 1: Introduction to Epistemology	NA	30 hours
Unit 2: Mind/Body	NA	30 hours
Unit 3: Free Will	NA	30 hours
Unit 4: Two elective topics (one will be completed)	4.1: Contemporary Conflicts in Moral Theory ***OR*** 4.2: Life the Universe and Everything	30 hours
Unit 5: The Good Life	NA	30 hours

Course Content

UNIT 1

AN INTRODUCTION TO EPISTEMOLOGY (Approximately 30 hours)

This introductory Unit will provide a foundation for learners to engage with questions concerned with knowledge, what we can know and how we can know it. Since the 17th Century Epistemology has been a primary focus of Western Philosophy. Epistemology is a branch of philosophy concerned with the nature and sources of our knowledge. Epistemological questions include:

- What is the foundation of knowledge and how does it differ from belief?
- How is knowledge acquired and is the process distinct to the acquisition of beliefs?
- What methods of reasoning can bring us closest to the 'truth'?
- And can we really ever know anything?

Learners will engage in research and discussion about traditional definitions of knowledge, including Plato's *tripartite account of knowledge (Justified True Belief)*. In considering the theoretical limitations of our knowledge, learners will examine Cartesian and Humean Scepticism.

In an introduction to sound philosophical reasoning, learners will be able to identify and consider the strengths and/or validity of inductive and deductive arguments.

Learners will also examine two distinct schools of thought on sources of knowledge; *Empiricism and Rationalism*. Learners will investigate these schools of thought and will analyse and evaluate arguments put forward by philosophers to support each approach.

Studies will include investigations in how alternative arguments attempt to refute the tripartite account. The skills in epistemology (the study of knowledge) will be relevant to, and may be applied to, all other units throughout this course. This introductory Unit will give students the tools and capabilities to analyse and evaluate philosophical arguments and differing perspectives. By understanding the foundations of knowledge students will be able to approach challenging philosophical questions with an understanding or how to arrive at a logical position based on sound reasoning.

Content **will** include:

- What is the difference between belief and knowledge?
    - *Tripartite Theory of Knowledge* – knowledge is 'true justified belief'; this account holds that three conditions must be satisfied in order for one to possess knowledge i.e. if you believe something, with justification, and it is true, then it can be classed as knowledge.
    - Gettier; cases show that some justified true beliefs do not constitute knowledge
    - An alternative to the tripartite theory: knowledge is true belief formed through a reliable method (cf. Robert Nozick)
- What is the structure of knowledge:
    - *Foundationalism* asserts that knowledge is structured like a building. This requires that some beliefs are self-justifying. These self-justifying beliefs form a foundation upon which other claims can be known. The regress argument in favour of Foundationalism.
    - *Coherentism* claims that knowledge has a web-like structure. Beliefs are justified by virtue of their coherence with other beliefs. The strongest argument for Coherentism is the failure of Foundationalism as an alternative.
    - Foundationalism is a theory of knowledge resting upon justified belief (and correspondence).
- explanation and evaluation of Empiricism (Hume) and Rationalism (Descartes)
    - *Empiricism* – the theory that all knowledge is based on experience derived from the senses. Emphasises evidence, especially that derived from experiments
    - *Rationalism* –theory that reason rather than experience is the foundation of certainty in knowledge there is wide agreement that knowledge, however it is accounted for, includes:
        - data (especially that provided by the senses)
        - 'thinking' about data (or reasoning)
    - Philosophers have disagreed about which is the more fundamental of these two components. Descartes argues that sense data is unreliable and therefore reason must be the fundamental foundation of knowledge.
- *Scepticism*: can we know anything? Sceptical arguments include Descartes method of doubt and Humean scepticism; specifically, Hume's Problem of Induction.
- *Inductive and Deductive* Reasoning
    - *Inductive*: a logical process in which multiple ideas or premises, all believed true (or found true most of the time), provide strong evidence for a conclusion; the truth of inductive reasoning is probable, not certain; arrives at a specific conclusion. Inductive reasoning is often used in applications that involve prediction, forecasting, or behaviour
    - *Deductive*: a logical process in which one or more statements are used to reach a conclusion; based on the concordance of multiple premises that are generally assumed to be true i.e. deductive reasoning links premises with conclusions in which the conclusion is certain.

Investigations may include:

- investigating the foundations of knowledge statements and differentiate between knowledge statements and beliefs
- investigating Descartes '*method of doubt*' and Hume's 'problem of induction' as a means of illustrating philosophical scepticism
- examining the differences between the arguments for Empiricism (Hume, Locke or others) and Rationalism (Descartes, Plato)
- evaluating the effectiveness of inductive and deductive reasoning.

Learners **may** use epistemological questions to support analysis of philosophical theories and the nature of knowledge in subsequent Units 2-5. Refer to APPENDIX A for examples.

Learners **will** gain key knowledge and understanding of:

- the difference between belief and knowledge
- how to identify statements as belief or knowledge
- *scepticism* and its role in Epistemology
- the use of inductive and deductive reasoning in philosophy
- the major differences between *Empiricism and Rationalism*.

Learners **will**:

- analyse and evaluate **one** argument from at least one Empiricist
    - empiricists may include Hume, Locke.
- analyse and evaluate **one** argument from at least one Rationalist
    - rationalists may include Descartes, Plato.

Key concepts include:

- *Epistemology*
- *Rationalism and Empiricism*
- *inductive reasoning*
- *deductive reasoning*
- *justification*
- *Scepticism.*

UNIT 2

MIND/BODY PROBLEM (Approximately 30 hours)

This Unit investigates the mind/body problem. The question looks at the nature of the relationship between the mind, or consciousness, and the physical world, asking a number of questions. Are they separate? What is the relationship between them?
What is consciousness and how does it exist in matter? The mind/body problem has been addressed since the time of Plato and is evident in the works of philosophers since that time.

Historically, religion has been a significant force in shaping answers to metaphysical questions. However, in more recent times, mainstream philosophical opinion has turned more towards materialistic or property dualistic explanations in the development of answers to metaphysical questions. Therefore, study in this topic will focus on these more recent schools of thought, but will not neglect classical philosophers, for example Descartes.

There are a number of responses that have been proposed to the mind/body debate although none are fully accepted universally. Content will include investigations into philosophical theories on mind/body:

- Dualist and Monist philosophical positions on the mind/body problem =
- the relative strengths and weaknesses of philosophical positions on the mind/body problem
- analysis of thought experiments on qualia and their relevance
- Cartesian Dualism and other forms that try to avoid the *problem of interaction* (Leibniz, Malebranche, Property Dualists). Physicalist evaluation of the *problem of interaction* and 'ghosts in the machine' (Ryle et. al)
- forms of *Physicalism*
- Thought Experiments and issues of *Qualia* (Jackson, Chalmers, Nagel); critique of *Thought Experiments* and *Qualia* (Dennett).

Investigations **will** include:

- at least one (1) one example of *Dualism* in detail
- at least one (1) example of *Monism* in detail
- at least one philosopher representing each view looking at their contribution to philosophy and the key understandings of their theories; includes analysis of their philosophical ideas and the relative strengths and weaknesses of their argument
- at least one (1) thought experiment and the relevance of that experiment to the mind/body problem
- at least one issue of qualia (properties of experience.)

Table 2: Key Theories/Concepts and Recommended Thinkers on Mind/Body

Key Theories/Concepts	Key Question(s)	Recommended Thinkers Include
General Position 1: Dualism		
Dualism *1/ Substance dualism* • Cartesian dualism *2/ Property dualism* *May include discussions on qualia and consciousness	• Does the mind exist separately from the body? • What are the strengths and weaknesses of deductive reasoning? • Is the mind a property of the body rather than a separate substance?	Rene Descartes Thomas Nagel David Chalmers
The Problem of Interaction	• If the mind and body are separate entities, how do they interact?	Rene Descartes (Pineal gland) Gottfried Leibniz (Pre-established harmony) Nicolas Malebranche (*Occasionalism*) Other 'property dualists'
General Position 2: Monism		
Physicalism	• Can science provide a purely physical explanation of the mind? • What are the strengths and weaknesses of empirical scientific evidence? • What are the implications of physicalism for personal identity and life after death?	Daniel Dennett Patricia & Paul Churchland J.J.C Smart Hilary Putnam

		Gilbert Ryle John Searle (Biological Naturalism)Evaluation of interaction and 'ghosts in the machine' (Ryle et. al)
Identity Theory (Also known as *Reductionism*)	• Can psychology be reduced to biology, chemistry and, ultimately, physics? • Is anything lost in this process?	J.J.C. Smart Saul Kripke
Eliminative Materialism	• Can 'mind' be reduced to the physical? Or is 'mind' such a problematic concept that it should be eliminated altogether?	Patricia & Paul Churchland
Other considerations		
Functionalism	• Are mental states identified by what they do rather than what they are made of? • What are the implications of a functionalist conception of mind for artificial intelligence?	Hilary Putnam Gilbert Ryle Alan Turing (Turing Test) John Searle (Chinese Room)
Relates to both *Dualism* and *Monism*: *Qualia* *Consciousness*	• Do materialist theories account for the qualitative aspects of mind? Are there mental events that cannot be explained in physical terms? • What is the nature of consciousness? • Can consciousness be explained in purely physical terms?	Frank Jackson Thomas Nagel Chalmers Dennett Both Dualist and Monist thinkers

Philosophical theories/concepts that address Mind/Body:

- ***Dualism***, the position that the mind is essentially not physical, and exists separately from the body. Dualism exists in various forms. Studies may include:
    - *Property dualism* – this theory claims that we have mental states like thoughts and beliefs, and that these mental states are properties. Mental properties are viewed as different to physical properties.
    - *Substance dualism* – the view that mental properties belong to the mind, and physical properties belong to the body. The mind and body are different substances
    - *Cartesian dualism* is the substance dualism formulated by Rene Descartes. All Cartesian dualists are also substance dualists
    - *Problem of Interaction*
        - *Interactionism* - states that the mind and body have causal interaction
        - *Occasionalism* - states the apparently causal links between mind and body are actually divine intervention
        - *Parallelism*, which states that the apparent causal link between mind and body is an illusion, and that mind and body run parallel to one another.
- ***Monism***, the position that the mind and body are not fundamentally separate. There are several types of mind-body monism:
    - *Physicalism*, including most commonly-held positions today, which asserts that the mind may be reduced to the physical processes of the brain:
        - *Functionalism*, which states that mental states are caused by behaviours, senses and other mental states
        - *Type physicalism*, which argues that mental states are equivalent to brain states
        - *Behaviourism*, which holds that discussions about mental states can be reduced to discussions about behaviours.
    - *Idealism*, which claims that the mind is all that exists
        - Phenomenalism, which reduces the physical world to perceptions which exist within the mind alone.
    - Materialism, which claims that everything is either made only of matter or is ultimately dependent upon matter for its existence and nature. Materialism tends to reject the idea of spirit or anything non-physical although some may refer to spirit.

- ***Thought experiments***
    - Investigations will include analysis of thought experiments and their relevance. Epistemological approaches may be applied in this study.

      Learners will analyse at **least one (1)** thought experiment, investigating and assessing its strengths and flaws, referring to the reasoning philosophers have used and any arguments that refute them.

    - *thought* experiments are devices of the imagination used to investigate our world; for example, The Chinese Room and The Black and White Room; Philosophical Zombies.
    - learners will investigate the reasoning behind the thought experiments.

In completing Unit 2, learners will gain key knowledge and understanding of:

- how the mind/body issue centres around the notions of mind (mental) and body (physical)
- whether we are made of the physical as in our body and/or the mental as in our mind?
- Dualism (a view that there is both mind/mental and body/physical) of which there are a number of theories including:
    - *Property dualism*
    - *Substance dualism*
        - Cartesian dualism.
    - *the Problem of Interaction*.

- *Monism* (a view that there is only one of these, just mental or just physical), of which there are a number of theories

    - *Physicalism*
    - *Materialism*
        - *Functionalism*
        - *Behaviourism*
        - *Identity theory*
    - *Idealism*

- the strengths and weaknesses of Mind/Body theories
- Mental events, for example, thoughts; dreams; ideas; hopes; emotions: love, fear
- Physical events: states and functions of the body, for example, walking; falling; heart-beat; brain states
- *Qualia* – the qualitative nature of experience. What is it like, over and above the experiences themselves?
- analysis of thought experiments on qualia and their relevance, for example, *The Chinese Room (Searle), Mary and the black and white Room (Jackson); Philosophical Zombies (Chalmers)*
- philosophical views on the soul.

UNIT 3

FREE WILL (Approximately 30 hours)

This Unit will consider the question of free will; what is meant by free will and whether human beings ever have the ability to choose freely. Is the power of acting freely determined by necessity or fate or do human beings have the ability to act at their own discretion?

Learners will define free will and become familiar with, and will investigate and analyse, different answers to the question of free will and the arguments that have been presented by philosophers and varying theses to support those answers. Studies will include investigations into determinism, free will versus determinism and how these perspectives are evidenced in daily lives.

The issue of punishment and moral responsibility will provide a context for learners to understand why the question of free will is important in today's society and the effectiveness of determinism as a legal defence.

Studies **will** include investigations into **three key questions** on 'free will':

- what is free will and do humans possess it?
- is free will compatible with Determinism?
- what is punishment for and what are the implications of different views on free will?

What is free will and do humans possess it?

- examining contested definitions of Free Will - that people have choice in the way they act; that people are self-determined
- ***Libertarianism*** – argues that human beings are free to choose amongst alternatives available and not controlled by others or outside forces
    - this view suggests that as humans have free will to choose their actions, they are morally bound to be responsible for them
    - philosophers may include Descartes and Peter van Inwagen in evaluation of the Libertarian view (at least **one (1)** philosopher must be studied.)
- ***Determinism*** – the belief that everything humans do is pre-determined and that therefore they are not responsible for their actions; this is also an incompatibilist view. Determinism argues that the notion of 'free will' is an illusion.
    - types of determinism may include: divine, causal, genetic, environmental, logical, physical, material, mechanical
    - causality – determinism argues causality, that all events are determined by preceding events
    - philosophers for the study of determinism may include la Place, Baron d'Holbach, Patricia Churchland, Schopenhauer or Galen Strawson (at least one (1) philosopher must be studied.)
- both ***Libertarianism*** and ***Determinism*** are incompatibilist views.
- ***Incompatibilism*** – denies the compatibility of free will and determinism. Some incompatibilists argue the belief that at least some persons have free will and therefore determinism must be false; that all or a part of the actions of people are not influenced by causation.

Is Free Will compatible with Determinism?

- ***Compatibilism*** provides a response to the disputed incompatibility of free will and determinism; an uneasy compromise of *Libertarianism* and *Determinism*. It proposes that free will is compatible with determinism; also expressed as a concept that argues compatibility between determinism and moral responsibility (i.e., that people can make free choices, for which they can be held morally responsible, even if determinism is true)
    - Philosophers for the study of *compatibilism* may include Daniel Dennett; Hume (at least one (1) philosopher must be studied.)
- ***Hard Determinism*** (*incompatibilist* determinism) and **Soft Determinism** (*compatibilist* determinism). Both agree that determinism is true but disagree that free will is possible given that determinism is true. Does science now suggest that determinism is probably false?
- ***Indeterminism*** - there are events, particularly some human actions or decisions, which have no cause. This can be connected with the idea of uncertainty and indeterminacy (e.g. Werner Heisenberg's quantum mechanics.)

Table 3: Is Free Will Compatible with Determinism?

POSSIBILITIES: exclusive & exhaustive	**Determinism EXCLUDES free will**	**Determinism DOES NOT EXCLUDE free will**
Determinism is true. (All human actions arise from antecedent causes that necessitate their result.)	Hard determinism	Soft determinism
Determinism is false	Libertarianism	

What is punishment for and what are the implications of different views on free will?

Some hard determinists (e.g. Clarence Darrow in the Leopold and Loeb case, 1924) have argued that our current practices of punishing the guilty cannot be justified if hard determinism is true. But this depends on what purpose punishment serves. Does it exist to exact retribution and give criminals their just deserts (the retributivist view)? Does it exist to promote good outcomes such as deterring potential offenders, keeping the public safe from danger, or rehabilitating offenders (the consequentialist view)? The relevance of different views on free will to punishment depends in part on the function punishment is supposed to serve.

Examples of investigations may include:

- if people have 'free will' should they be responsible for their actions? How does this impact on the law?
- are 'free will' and *determinism* incompatible? Discuss in relation to the position of at least two philosophers
- apply the themes of 'free will' to a range of everyday situations
- define and explain *hard determinism* and *soft determinism*. Discuss in relation to creating arguments in standard form or different epistemic approaches
- define and explain the position of *Libertarianism*
- examine the implications of different views on free will if the primary purpose of punishment is retribution. What if the primary purpose is deterrence or rehabilitation?

In completing Unit 3, learners will gain knowledge and understanding of:

- the contested definitions of 'free will'
- the responses of philosophers and thinkers to the question of 'free will'
- the argument that determinism is compatible with free will and impacted by causality
- the nature of Indeterminism, Hard Determinism and Soft Determinism
- the main philosophical positions including the compatibilism and *incompatibilism* theses
- the issue of punishment/moral responsibility and the effectiveness of determinism as a legal defence
- the contribution of philosophical debate to contemporary issues of law
- explanation and evaluation of philosophers' positions for *Libertarianism*, *Determinism*, and *Compatibilism*.

Unit 4:

ELECTIVE STUDIES: ETHICS or SCIENCE AND FAITH (Approximately 30 hours)

Table 4: Elective topics

COMPULSORY	ELECTIVE TOPICS (select one only)
Unit 4 One topic of:	4.1: Contemporary Conflicts in Moral Theory OR 4.2: Life the Universe and Everything

EITHER:

Elective 4.1

CONTEMPORARY CONFLICTS IN MORAL THEORY (Approximately 30 hours)

This Unit elective investigates questions relating to contemporary morality. What does it mean to think, act, and exist morally? Is it relative to context, both circumstantial and cultural? Have humans made meaningful moral progress throughout history? Is there an objective, universal morality to which humanity is given access, or are we condemned to be free and create our own codes? How are we to exist as moral agents in a contemporary context?

This study of moral theory explores ideas about what it means to think, act and reason ethically, with an emphasis upon applying modern philosophical schools of thought, and specific skills to contemporary issues.

The aim of this Unit of study is to educate and engage students in a study of moral theory that will assist them in becoming empowered ethical thinkers and accountable young adults.

Studying moral theory in the context of a broad range of contemporary issues offers learners the ability to undertake a study of applied ethics, utilising the skills of previous units to formulate, refine, challenge and make accountable, their own ethical perspectives of the world.

This study develops an understanding of moral theories, thinkers and themes, whilst encouraging learners to make meaningful choices in an empowered and informed sense.

Learners will investigate both moral theories and contemporary ethical issues. Learners will undertake investigations of at least two moral theories and at least one contemporary ethical issue. Of the two moral theories investigated, one will be from the 'core' moral theories listed below. These investigations will include the application of the chosen theories to the chosen issue(s).

Core moral theories include:

- Moral Relativism – argues there are no objective or universal moral standards. Moral claims are only ever true for – never simply true. (may include: cultural relativism, Ruth Benedict, David Hume's 'you cannot derive an 'ought' from an 'is')
- Moral Nihilism – argues that all moral claims, whether absolute or relative, are simply false. There is no such thing as rightness or goodness. (may include J. L. Mackie or Hume's 'no ought from is' principle)
- Deontology – argues there are universal moral laws (may include: Immanuel Kant's categorical imperative or Rawls' original position and principles of justice)
- Consequentialism – argues only the consequences of actions are morally significant (may include: Jeremy Bentham's classical utilitarianism and hedonic calculus, John Stuart Mill, Judith Jarvis Thompson's trolley experiment.

Other moral theories that may be considered include:

- Preference Utilitarianism – is the satisfaction of preferences a better measure of utility than happiness? (for example: Peter Singer)

- the capabilities approach – is providing opportunities for individuals to flourish by utilising human capabilities the greatest ethical consideration? (for example: Martha Nussbaum)
- virtue ethics – is the building of good character more important than rules or consequences? (for example, Aristotle)
- existentialist ethics – If God is dead, is everything permitted? Are we 'condemned to be free' and to act as if all acted in accordance with us? (for example, Jean Paul Sartre, Friedrich Nietzsche.)
- Feminist ethics – is there a distinctively feminine 'ethic of care' that should supplement masculinist moral reasoning that places emphasis on impartiality and principles?

Moral theories applied to contemporary ethical issues may include:

Environmental Ethics: What are our ethical obligations to the environment?

- human interaction within and interference with the natural world
- the rights of animals
- conservation
- sustainability
- climate change and its consequences (displaced peoples and disappearing species)

Political Ethics: What are our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the state and in the world?

- the basis, justification, and constraints upon our individual rights
- liberties in an age of terror (terrorism, torture, privacy, surveillance, whistleblowers)
- responsibility to less economically developed nations and to domestic minorities (decolonisation and the legacies of Empire, rights of First Nation peoples, wealth inequalities, altruism and charity, economic exploitation, overconsumption, rights of corporations, and consumer ethics in capitalism, moral imperialism)
- international military intervention; the theory of the Just War invoked by Jimmy Carter in his article in NY Times prior to the Iraq war 9 March 2003.

Feminist Ethics: What is our role and ethical imperative in identifying and deconstructing gender inequalities and patriarchal privilege?

- the fundamental principles of feminism and the right to equality
- sexism: social expectations, objectification, and access to power or wealth
- 'women's work': division of domestic and paid labour in society
- perception of women in power, affirmative action and quotas
- contemporary manifestations of inequality between the sexes (online harassment, social media, gamergate).

In completing Unit elective 1, learners will gain key knowledge and understanding of:

- the nature of morality, moral theory and specific schools of thought
- how to identify, articulate and analyse ethical questions
- the contemporary context of ethical issues in a globalised world
- how to explore ethical ideas, responding to foundational ethical questions, viewpoints and arguments with clearly expressed logical analysis and evaluation
- how to apply moral theories to a range of contemporary issues, under a number of broad strands
- how to utilise key terms and approaches of moral theory
- how to evaluate the strengths and limitations of moral theories
- the ways in which moral conflicts and their solutions reflect values and ideological positions.

OR

Elective 4.2

Life, the Universe and Everything (Approximately 30 hours)

This unit elective explores competing views to the universal questions around the origin of the universe and life on earth. The two main explanations studied are scientific explanations and theist explanations.

Learners **will** investigate key theories and understandings including:

1. Science and Faith as ways of knowing (including paradigms)
2. Theories for the origin of the universe and proponents of these theories
3. Theories about the origin of human life and proponents of these theories

Table 5: Content: Life the Universe and Everything

Theories/Concepts	Philosophers/Thinkers may include
Science and Faith as Ways of Knowing	
Learners study both topics. Including how faith based institutions have responded to scientific developments. Science *as a way of knowing* using the basic Scientific Method • the Problem of Induction • Verificationism & Falsifiability • Paradigms & Incommensurability	Hume, Nelson Goodman Popper, Ayer Kuhn Paul Davis George Coyne

Faith as a Way of Knowing • Faith answers questions science can't adequately answer; faith answers 'why?' • Pragmatic Arguments for God's existence • Fideism and irrationality	Blaise Pascal Soren Kierkegaard, Bertrand Russell (critic)
Theories for the Origin of the Universe	

Learners study both *Big Bang Theory* and at least one example of the Cosmological argument; including how traditional cosmological arguments have been challenged by the Big Bang theory
 	
• Big Bang Theory
• Cosmological
  ○ Modal (Contingency Argument)
  ○ Temporal (Kalam Argument)
	Alpher (1948)
	Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson (1965)
	
	Aquinas, Leibniz, Hume, Plantinga, William Lane Craig, Swinburne

Theories about the Origin of Human Life	
Learners will investigate theories about the origins of human life including how design arguments have been challenged by the theory of evolution. *Evolution* Learners study **at least one** evolutionary argument in detail. • *adaptation and speciation* • *Natural Selection* and *Common Descent* • new evolutionary theories	Darwin Richard Dawkins
Learners will study **at least one** Teleological argument in detail The *Teleological (design) argument* • *the Anthropic argument*	Thomas Aquinas, Behe, Hume, Paley, Schlesinger Swinburne and Tennant

Science and Faith as Ways of Knowing

Investigations into 'Science as a way of knowing' may include but are not limited to:

- **The Scientific Method**
  - the most common means of distinguishing scientific knowledge claims from non-scientific or pseudo-scientific claims is the method used to arrive at claims. The scientific method consists of: empirically observing patterns in the natural world, forming hypotheses to explain empirical observations, using hypotheses to make predictions, testing predictions through experimentation, and finally, amending hypotheses or devising further predictions depending on results of experiment
  - there exist problems with the scientific method, including the problem of observation (fallibility of senses & quantum observer effect) and the problem of induction. To what extent do these problems undermine the status of science?
  - falsifiability is a further means of distinguishing science from non-science. Proposed by Karl Popper, this theory aims to eliminate the problem of verificationism by insisting that science must aim to disprove and to eliminate false beliefs
  - Thomas Kuhn challenges Popper's theory of scientific falsificationism by suggesting that the development of a science is not uniform but has alternating 'normal' and 'revolutionary' phases. Normal science resembles the standard cumulative picture of scientific progress. paradigm shifts (examples are the shift from geocentrism to heliocentrism and Newtonian to Einsteinian mechanics)
  - **paradigms**: knowledge claims can only be evaluated from within a paradigm. There is no common measure for claims outside of a paradigm. Therefore, we have no means of determining the value of theories in an objective way. This is Kuhn's incommensurability thesis. To what extent does incommensurability make assessing scientific theories problematic? Does incommensurability mean that there is no way to determine whether religious or scientific paradigms better explain life and the universe?

- Investigations into faith may include but are not limited to:
  - faith can answer questions that science cannot, i.e. why is there something rather than nothing?
  - faith can answer the 'why' questions where science is limited to 'how'
  - criticisms of faith as a way of knowing, including faith does not revise beliefs as new evidence comes to light
  - faith provides the answer then looks for evidence to support the answer rather than the other way around.

The Big Bang Theory

- Learners will investigate key understandings in the Big Bang Theory and the Cosmological Argument. Content may include but is not limited to:
  - the leading and most widely accepted scientific theory about how the universe began; the principle proposes that the universe began with a small 'singularity', transforming over the next 13.8 billion years to the cosmos of today
  - many of the understandings of the big bang theory stem from mathematical theory and models; astronomers support the theory through a phenomenon called the 'cosmic microwave background', an 'echo' of the expansion
  - it is open to change and refinement in the future
  - does not explain the origin of the 'singularity'; as such questions are raised regarding whether it is a theory of the origins of the universe, or a theory regarding the transformation of the universe

    - questions also grapple with the notion of the Big Bang theory being described as scientific (as the laws of physics could not apply in the 'beginning'). Does it rely upon a 'leap of faith' to accept the Big Bang theory?
    - the emergence of light or Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB); early theorists such as Alpher (1948).

- ***The Cosmological Argument*** - an argument 'type' using a pattern of argumentation; it utilises certain alleged facts about the world (the cosmos) making inferences to the existence of an external agent or being. First Cause – argues that if the universe exists, there must have been something that first caused it to come into being. Otherwise there would be an infinite regress of causes with no beginning

- Investigations into the *cosmological* argument may include 'modal' and 'temporal':
    - Modal (associated with possibility):
        - *Contingency argument:* contingency distinguishes those things that must exist, or could not have failed to exist, and those that exist contingently (caused by something, not a necessary existence.)
    - Temporal (associated with time) cosmological argument or *Kalam Argument*
        - distinguished from other cosmological arguments, that there is a point in time in which the universe began to exist. If the universe began to exist it must have had a cause. As no scientific account can accurately explain its cause, it must therefore have been caused by an agent or being; God.

Theories about the origin of human life and our place in the universe

Learners **will** investigate key theories for the origin of human life including:

- Evolution
- The Teleological argument (design)

Evolution – Darwinism; explanation of the process in which living organisms have developed from earlier forms; evolving in response to their environments and by improving survival and continuancee as a species; seen as an evidence-based explanation for the process of the history of life on Earth and the variety and diversity of life. Scientists use evidence to demonstrate that the evolutionary process explains the existence of human life as one part of life on Earth over millions of years. Learners will investigate evolutionary evidence and arguments.

Investigations will include at least one evolutionary argument and the evidence that underpins it in detail:

- Adaptation – adaptation provides an improved function that impacts on the success of a species; provided by natural selection
- Speciation – where a species evolves into two or more separate species; involves genetic change
- Natural Selection - the process in which organisms better adapt to their environment to survive and produce more offspring; explaining evolution (Charles Darwin) Common Descent – explains evolutionary biology and how a group of organisms may share common ancestors; that all living things on earth descended from a common ancestor. The notion of common descent is supported from DNA evidence
- Extended Evolutionary Synthesis: the concept that has dominated evolutionary thinking focuses on genetic inheritance and, given new evidence, theorists propose more nuanced evolutionary explanations. The theory of EES (Extended Evolutionary Synthesis) argues drivers of evolution, that organisms are constructed in relation to their environment as well as through more direct genetic expression. EES does not replace traditional thinking but argues that there is more to evolution than just genes with a single expression and that there are multiple routes to adaptation between organism and environment.

Teleological (design) Argument: argues that the Cosmic Order and its complexity are the result of intelligent design - the work of an external being. A key question in the Teleological argument poses is 'Does the designer continue to have input into the design?'

Learners will investigate at least one Teleological argument in detail.

Investigations may include:

- Intelligent design – the reinterpretation of scientific knowledge in accord with belief in the literal truth of the Bible, especially regarding the origin of matter, life, and humankind; attempts to find scientific support for creationism
- creationist Michael Behe (1996) advocates the theory of 'intelligent design'; that certain biochemical processes are 'irreducibly complex' in which he argues that species could not have evolved from natural selection as the removal of any one element (proteins) would destroy the viability of the organism. He argues therefore that organisms could not have evolved but must have been a product of intelligent design; the 'mousetrap design'
- Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225–1274): proposes the cycle of the existence of God; Creation; Man; Man's Purpose; Christ; the Sacraments; back to God
- the Teleological argument; for example: William Paley and his 'watchmaker'
- the Anthropic argument is a Law of Human Existence; human existence depends on a range of cosmological constants. If any of these parameters or constants changed, so would the existence of the universe as we know it
  o the Fine Tuned Universe and argument from Suspicious Improbabilities are modern versions of Teleological Arguments that criticise the 'randomness' of evolution;
  o both the Fine Tuned Universe and Suspicious Improbabilities have been subjected to fallacies of assumption arguing their vulnerabilities as theories.

In completing Unit 4 elective 2, learners will gain key knowledge and understanding of:

- competing theories for the origin of the universe (Big bang theory and the cosmological argument)
    - explanations and evidence for the Big Bang theory
    - explanations for the cosmology argument.
- theories about the origins of human life and our place in the universe:
    - arguments for evolution
    - arguments for Teleological or 'design' theories
    - discuss and analyse the views of proponents and opponents of each view (evolution and 'design.')
- strengths and weaknesses of theories
- how the scientific method differs from faith based belief systems
- how deductive, and inference to the best explanation methods of reasoning are applied.

UNIT 5:

Philosophers and the Good Life (Approximately 30 hours)

Humankind has long sought answers to the questions around the issue of how we live a good life. Modern Philosophers have drawn certain conclusions around what is needed for us to fulfil a good life. This unit examines the views of some of those philosophers.

There are opposing views on what the good life is. Some philosophical positions argue that life is a preparation for death and what people do in life will reverberate in the afterlife; this necessitates that life is approached aspiring knowledge, discipline and justice. Certain religious views may argue that the good life is submitting to the Divine Will; some argue that living the good life requires fulfilling natural function; still others argue that we should live in the now, while we can, as death awaits us all. Philosophical views on the good life vary greatly and are influenced by social, cultural and religious views.

Key questions are central to this study; these are linked to a particular philosopher and it is the views of that philosopher which will be studied to understand and address the questions.

This unit investigates **four (4)** key questions and the theories/concepts associated with the philosophers identified for this study. Learners will undertake an overview of all four questions (and associated philosophers) and investigate **one (1)** question and philosopher **in detail**:

- What roles do our bodies and our reasoning play in helping us achieve the good life? (Montaigne)
- What roles do biology, gender and freedom play in living a good life? (de Beauvoir)
- What is the role of life's difficulties in the formation of character? (Nietzsche)
- What is the role of the natural world in achieving the good life? (Thoreau)

What roles do our bodies and our reasoning play in helping us achieve the good life?

Michel de Montaigne (1553-1592) closely studies the minutiae of his own lived experience and his own 'attempt' at a good life in order to illuminate some general characteristics of good lives. His intimate Essays explore the roles of reason, judgement, culture, bodies, sex, pleasure, aging and death in living a good life. In exploring these subjects, he studies what human lives actually involve - the daily realities of being human that are often overlooked in philosophy. He preaches sober thinking so that we may adopt more reasonable perceptions and expectations of human life and, in doing so, he brings the classical conception of humans as essentially rational 'down to earth' in his focus on embodied experience.

Learners who choose this inquiry will gain knowledge and understanding of:

- Montaigne's sceptical account of the role of reason in a good life.
- The role of judgement in thinking about the body and culture.
- His philosophical method of examining his own life as one 'attempt' at the good life.

Evaluative questions relating to this inquiry include but are not limited to:

- Is Montaigne's esteem for reason too low?
- Is a plural notion of good lives or a singular/universal conception of good life more appropriate?
- Does Montaigne's suggested practical modesty inhibit human greatness?
- Does his method fail to offer a robust philosophy that provides real/concrete answers to the questions concerning the good life?
- Learners may, but are not required to, consider the arguments of different philosophers in evaluating Montaigne's arguments.

What roles do biology, gender and freedom play in living a good life?

Existentialist feminist, Simone de Beauvoir (1908 - 1986), argues that many women are prevented from living good lives. Her critical project, developed in The Second Sex, examines the way that patriarchal societies constrain women and establish them as inferior 'others' who are considered less fully human than men. She analyses the roles of biology, culture, sexuality, love, marriage, raising children and work in producing women as 'other'. Her emancipatory project is to empower women to realise that their constrained state is not natural or inevitable – there is no female 'essence' that determines the way women live. Women's liberation involves creating oneself through authentically free action. Although primarily focusing on the lives of women, her existentialist philosophy also applies to men, who ought to reject the notion of a masculine essence in order to live authentically.

Learners who choose this inquiry will gain knowledge and understanding of:

- The ways women are cast as 'other' by society and the way this inhibits one's ability to live a good life (focus on marriage and children).
- The rejection of essentialism in favour of existentialism.
- Freedom and transcendence as central to authentic lives.

Evaluative questions relating to this inquiry include but are not limited to:

- Is the rejection of essentialism justified? Do fundamental natural differences between women and men exist? To what extent?
- Does Beauvoir's anti-essentialist individualism marginalise important feminine virtues such as caring? Are difference feminists and maternal feminists right to argue that Beauvoir only offers women 'the freedom to be men'?
- In critiquing marriage and gender roles, does Beauvoir undermine the harmonious functioning of society?
- Learners may, but are not required to, consider the arguments of different philosophers in evaluating Beauvoir's arguments.

What is the role of life's difficulties in the formation of character?

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844 – 1900) rejects the notion of objective truth and argues that all claims to truth are, at base, expressions of power. This means that answers to the question of the good life are expressions of power by those who utter them. Greatness, for Nietzsche, involves the rejection of traditional morality, especially the 'slave morality' of Christianity and democracy. The great individual is a free spirit who creates their own values and freely expresses what Nietzsche calls the 'will to power'. They are life affirming, strong, optimistic and passionate to the point where gesture toward a new being: the ubermensch. These arguments are developed throughout Nietzsche's vast body of work, but are most clearly addressed in Beyond Good and Evil and The Genealogy of Morals. Nietzsche's unashamedly elitist philosophy proposes that 'pinnacles of humanity' are the greatest concern in life and he sheds no tears for the 'herd' who are unwilling or unable to forge greatness in the crucible of suffering.

Learners who choose this inquiry will gain knowledge and understanding of

- The will to power as the metaphysical foundation of Nietzhsce's argument concerning greatness.
- Master and slave morality, the transvaluation of values & overcoming hardship/suffering.
- Eternal recurrence and embracing all of life's difficulties as the measure of greatness.

Evaluative questions relating to this inquiry include but are not limited to:

- Is Nietzsche's rejection of slave morality justified? Is there value in humility, obedience, compassion, and self-sacrifice?
- Is Nietzsche's elitist individualism problematic? Should society and community play some role in the good life?
- Should alleviating the suffering of the destitute be a greater focus than the cultural elite in human life?
- Learners may, but are not required to, consider the arguments of different philosophers in evaluating Nietzsche's arguments.

What is the role of the natural world in achieving the good life?

Henry David Thoreau (1817 - 1862) proposed a worldview that contradicted the dominant views of his time in arguing that people are a part of nature as opposed to being masters of nature. He endows nature with spiritual significance and argues that by observing nature, we can apprehend truth – especially moral truths. In his major work, Walden, Thoreau advocates a simple and self-sufficient life lived in a natural environment and argues that material possessions are inhibit living 'deliberately' and well. His essay, 'On Civil Disobedience,' argues that when one believes the laws of one's nation to unjust, they ought to non-violently resist. In other words, one ought to act morally rather than conform to a government's laws.

Learners who choose this inquiry will gain knowledge and understanding of:

- Thoreau's arguments concerning nature, truth and the ethics of perception.
- His arguments about simplicity, economy and self-sufficiency.
- His political/moral philosophy and civil disobedience.

Evaluative questions relating to this inquiry include but are not limited to:

- Is Thoreau's romantic conception of nature relevant and/or justified in the Anthropocene era?
- Is Thoreau's emphasis on independence problematic? Should there be a greater focus on community, family and interdependence?
- Is it reasonable to expect people with dependents (e.g. families and children) to go to jail for their beliefs? Or is civil disobedience only a reasonable expectation of independent people?
- Learners may, but are not required to, consider the arguments of different philosophers in evaluating Thoreau's arguments.

In completing Unit 5, learners will gain key knowledge and understanding of:

- philosophers' responses to key philosophical questions in relation to the 'good life'
- analysis of philosophical arguments on the 'good life'
- the strengths and weaknesses of philosophical responses to living the 'good life'
- how philosophers' responses apply to modern life
- analysis of how philosophical responses to the 'good life' may address problems of modern life
- epistemic basis for beliefs on the good life.

Work Requirements

Table 6: Minimum Work Requirements for *Philosophy*

UNIT	TITLE & FOCUS	REQUIREMENTS	RECOMMENDED WORD COUNT
UNIT 1	***Introduction to Epistemology*** This unit will focus on investigating Epistemology. The skills and understandings developed in this unit will be applied to all other units.	A minimum of **two** responses. Responses may include, for example: analytical essay; research essay; response to stimulus; oral response supported by written research and documentation; multi-modal presentation; posters or other visual form of communication.	Recommended total word limit: 1000 words.
UNIT 2	***Mind/Body*** This unit will focus on the debate concerning the nature of the mind and its relationship to the body. A range of classic and contemporary positions will be investigated and current debates concerning neuroscience, consciousness and artificial intelligence will be considered.	A minimum of **two** responses. At least one research essay of 1000 - 1500 words. Other responses may include, for example: analytical essay; response to stimulus; oral response supported by written research and documentation.	Recommended total word limit: 2000 - 2500 words.
UNIT 3	***Free Will*** This unit will focus on responses to the question: are we free? Libertarian, determinist and compatibilist positions will be considered. Implications for morality,responsibility and punishment will also be considered.	A minimum of **two** responses. At least one research essay of 1000 - 1500 words. Other responses may include, for example: analytical essay; response to stimulus; oral response supported by written research and documentation.	Recommended total word limit: 2000 - 2500 words.
UNIT 4 (Select **ONE** topic only)	**EITHER** ***4.1 Contemporary Conflicts in Moral Theory*** This unit investigates moral theory and what it means to think, act and reason ethically, with an emphasis upon applying modern philosophical schools of thought, and specific skills to contemporary issues.	A minimum of **two** responses. At least one research essay of 1000 - 1500 words. Other responses may include, for example: analytical essay; response to stimulus; oral response supported by written research and documentation.	Recommended total word limit: 2000 - 2500 words.
	OR ***4.2 Life the Universe and Everything*** This unit explores competing views to the universal questions around the origin of the universe and life on earth. The two main explanations studied are scientific explanations and theist explanations.	**OR** A minimum of **two** responses. At least one research essay of 1000 - 1500 words.Other responses may include, for example: analytical essay; response to stimulus; oral response supported by written research and documentation.	Recommended total word limit: 2000 - 2500 words.
UNIT 5	***The Good Life*** This unit investigates questions around the issue of how to live a happy life. The unit examines the views of philosophers on what is needed to live a 'good life'.	A minimum of **two** responses. At least one research essay of 1000 – 1500 words. Other responses may include, for example: analytical essay; response to stimulus; oral response supported by written research and documentation.	Recommended total word limit: 2000 - 2500 words.

Assessment

Criterion-based assessment is a form of outcomes assessment that identifies the extent of learner achievement at an appropriate end-point of study. Although assessment – as part of the learning program – is continuous, much of it is formative, and is done to help learners identify what they need to do to attain the maximum benefit from their study of the course. Therefore, assessment for summative reporting to TASC will focus on what both teacher and learner understand to reflect end-point achievement.

The standard of achievement each learner attains on each criterion is recorded as a rating 'A', 'B', or 'C', according to the outcomes specified in the standards section of the course.

A 't' notation must be used where a learner demonstrates any achievement against a criterion less than the standard specified for the 'C' rating.

A 'z' notation is to be used where a learner provides no evidence of achievement at all.

Providers offering this course must participate in quality assurance processes specified by TASC to ensure provider validity and comparability of standards across all awards. To learn more, see TASC's quality assurance processes and assessment information.

Internal assessment of all criteria will be made by the provider. Providers will report the learner's rating for each criterion to TASC.

TASC will supervise the external assessment of designated criteria which will be indicated by an asterisk (*). The ratings obtained from the external assessments will be used in addition to internal ratings from the provider to determine the final award.

Quality Assurance Process

The following processes will be facilitated by TASC to ensure there is:

- a match between the standards of achievement specified in the course and the skills and knowledge demonstrated by learners
- community confidence in the integrity and meaning of the qualification.

TASC gives course providers feedback about any systematic differences in the relationship of their internal and external assessments and, where appropriate, seeks further evidence through audit and requires corrective action in the future.

External Assessment Requirements

The external assessment for this course will comprise:

- a three hour written exam assessing criteria: 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5

For further information see the current external assessment specifications and guidelines for this course available in the Supporting Documents below.

Criteria

The assessment for *Philosophy* Level 3 will be based on the degree to which the learner can:

1. communicate philosophical ideas and concepts*
2. use philosophical ideas and concepts in discussing philosophical arguments*
3. describe and explain philosophical arguments*
4. use evidence to support philosophical arguments*
5. apply philosophical ideas and concepts to contemporary issues*
6. undertake research about philosophical issues
7. use resources and organisational strategies

* = denotes criteria that are both internally and externally assessed

Standards

Criterion 1: communicate philosophical ideas and concepts

This criterion is both internally and externally assessed.

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
structures ideas to effectively compose coherent and cohesive arguments in analytical responses	structures ideas to compose coherent arguments in analytical responses	structures main ideas to compose basic arguments in analytical responses
coherently* and accurately communicates a wide range of ideas, arguments and points of view of own and others in written responses	communicates a range of ideas, arguments and points of view of own and others in written responses	communicates a limited range of basic ideas, arguments and points of view of own and others in written responses
presents clear, logical and detailed analytical interpretations and philosophical arguments	presents clear, logical, coherent and evidence-based interpretations and philosophical arguments	presents clear and logical interpretations and philosophical arguments
accurately uses complex grammatical conventions, and spelling and punctuation in written responses	accurately uses grammatical conventions, spelling and punctuation in written responses	uses grammatical conventions, spelling and punctuation to achieve clarity in written responses
uses a wide range of appropriate sources to develop and communicate detailed, analytical interpretations and arguments	uses a range of appropriate sources to develop and communicate own interpretations and arguments	uses a limited range of appropriate sources to support and communicate own interpretations and arguments
clearly differentiates the information, images, ideas and words of others from the learner's own	clearly differentiates the information, images, ideas and words of others from the learner's own	differentiates the sources of information, images, ideas and words of others from the learner's own
referencing conventions and methodologies are followed with a high degree of accuracy	referencing conventions and methodologies are followed correctly	referencing conventions and methodologies are generally followed correctly
creates appropriate, well structured reference lists/bibliographies.	creates appropriate, structured reference lists/bibliographies.	creates appropriate reference lists/bibliographies.

Criterion 2: use philosophical ideas and concepts in discussing philosophical arguments

This criterion is both internally and externally assessed.

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
selects and uses a wide range of philosophical ideas and concepts in response to philosophical arguments	selects and uses a range of philosophical ideas and concepts in response to philosophical arguments	selects and uses a limited range of philosophical ideas and concepts in response to philosophical arguments
uses a wide range of terminology and specialist terms to clarify meaning to support philosophical discussion	uses relevant terminology and employs correct usage of a range of specialist terms to support philosophical discussion	uses a limited range of relevant specialist terms to support philosophical discussion
describes and analyses philosophers' philosophical ideas and concepts	describes philosophers' philosophical ideas and concepts	identifies philosophers' philosophical ideas and concepts
uses a wide range of comprehensive and detailed explanations of ideas and concepts to support own philosophical discussions	uses a range of detailed explanations of ideas and concepts to support own philosophical discussions	uses a limited range of explanations of ideas and concepts in discussing philosophical concepts
critically analyses relationships between differing philosophical ideas and concepts.	analyses relationships between differing philosophical ideas and concepts.	explains relationships between differing philosophical ideas and concepts.

Criterion 3: describe and explain philosophical arguments

This criterion is both internally and externally assessed.

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
analyses and evaluates* differing interpretations of philosophical arguments	describes and evaluates* differing interpretations of philosophical arguments	identifies and provides basic evaluation* of differing interpretations of philosophical arguments

describes and analyses philosophical arguments used by philosophers in differing philosophical explanations	describes philosophical arguments used by philosophers in differing philosophical explanations	identifies main philosophical arguments used by philosophers in differing philosophical explanations
analyses and evaluates* philosophical arguments (in oral and written form) to clarify meaning of own philosophical discussions	describes and evaluates* philosophical arguments (in oral and written form) to clarify meaning of own philosophical discussions	identifies and provides basic evaluation* of philosophical arguments (in oral and written form) to clarify meaning of own philosophical discussions
analyses and evaluates* relative strengths and weaknesses of alternative viewpoints coherently and succinctly	describes and evaluates* relative strengths and weaknesses of alternative viewpoints	outlines and evaluates* basic strengths and weaknesses of alternative viewpoints
synthesises philosophical arguments into clear and succinct premises and conclusions to accurately convey reasoning	describes and explains arguments for the premise and conclusion of philosophical arguments as separate propositions	outlines and describes arguments for the premise and conclusion of philosophical arguments as separate propositions
selects and appropriately applies philosophical analysis to propositions.	selects and applies philosophical analysis to propositions.	identifies key propositions in an argument using basic philosophical analysis.

*Refer to glossary for definitions of 'basic evaluation' and 'evaluation'.

Criterion 4: use evidence to support philosophical arguments

This criterion is both internally and externally assessed.

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
uses a wide range of evidence to critically analyse the philosophical ideas and theories of others	uses a range of evidence to analyse the relative strengths and weaknesses of the philosophical ideas and theories of others	uses a limited range of evidence to assess the basic strengths and weaknesses of philosophical ideas and theories of others
uses a wide range of philosophical evidence to develop own detailed, analytical interpretations of philosophical arguments	uses a range of philosophical evidence to develop own interpretations of philosophical arguments	uses a limited range of philosophical evidence to support own interpretations of philosophical arguments
synthesises a wide range of evidence from philosophers' arguments to develop detailed, analytical interpretations	uses a range of appropriate evidence from philosophers' arguments to develop analytical interpretations	uses a limited range of evidence from philosophers' arguments to develop basic analytical interpretations
analyses and interprets evidence from a wide range of sources to develop and sustain philosophical argument	describes and analyses evidence from a wide range of sources to develop and sustain philosophical argument	provides some relevant explanation and assessment of the evidence used by others to support own philosophical argument
uses a wide range of evidence to synthesise an analytical, coherent position on philosophical issues.	uses a range of evidence to describe and explain an analytical position on philosophical issues.	uses a limited range of evidence to outline a position on philosophical issues.

Criterion 5: apply philosophical ideas and concepts to contemporary issues

This criterion is both internally and externally assessed.

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
critically evaluates implications and consequences of ideas and viewpoints on contemporary issues	analyses implications and consequences of ideas and viewpoints on contemporary issues	describes some implications of ideas and viewpoints on contemporary issues
critically analyses and explain a wide range of contemporary issues	analyse and explain a range of contemporary issues	discuss and explain a limited range of contemporary issues

applies philosophical thinking* to clarify and explain relevant contemporary issues	applies philosophical thinking* to clarify and offer judgements on contemporary issues	applies philosophical thinking* to engage with contemporary issues
synthesises an extensive analytical and coherent philosophical position on relevant contemporary issues	describes and explains an analytical philosophical position on relevant contemporary issues	outlines and describes a sound philosophical position on relevant contemporary issues
analyses and evaluates the manner in which adopting a philosophical position can influence how one lives one's life.	discusses and explains the manner in which adopting a philosophical position can influence how one lives one's life.	outlines and describes the manner in which adopting a philosophical position can influence how one lives one's life.

* ('If I believe x how does this affect my position on contemporary issue y?')

Criterion 6: undertake research about philosophical issues

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
formulates a wide range of philosophical questions	formulates a range of philosophical questions	formulates a limited range of philosophical questions
locates a wide range of primary and secondary sources relevant to philosophical ideas and concepts	locates a range of primary and secondary sources relevant to philosophical ideas and concepts	locates a limited range of primary and secondary sources related to philosophical ideas and concepts
identifies and records a wide range of relevant ideas, information and images for use in a range of own responses	identifies and records a range of ideas, information and images for use in own responses	identifies and records a limited range of ideas, information and images for use in own responses
effectively uses a range of appropriate tools and strategies to collect and organise information	uses a range of tools and strategies to collect and organise information	uses a limited range of tools and strategies* to collect and organise information
analyses and evaluates relevance and relative significance of information to philosophical issues	analyses relevance and relative significance of information to philosophical issues	assesses relevance and relative significance of information to philosophical issues
analyses and evaluates reliability, validity and accuracy of selected information.	analyses reliability, validity and accuracy of selected information.	assesses reliability, validity and accuracy of selected information.

*Tools and strategies used to collect and organise information include, but are not limited to: graphic organisers; note taking; and the use of categories to organise information.

Criterion 7: use resources and organisational strategies

The learner:

Rating A	Rating B	Rating C
effectively manages time, resources and equipment needed to undertake a wide range of philosophical inquiries	manages time, resources and equipment needed to undertake a range of philosophical inquiries	identifies time, resources and equipment needed to undertake a limited range of philosophical inquiries
develops and employs highly effective and coherent research plans	develops and uses effective research plans	uses appropriate research plans
proposes and negotiates complex, measurable, achievable and realistic goals	proposes and negotiates measurable, achievable and realistic goals	proposes and negotiates with support measurable, achievable and realistic goals
critically evaluates progress using oral and written communication, and assesses impact on goals and plans	reflects on progress using oral and written communication and assesses impact on goals and plans	reflects on progress towards meeting goals using oral and written communication, and uses prescribed strategies to meet goals
plans future actions, effectively adjusting goals and plans where necessary	plans future actions, adjusting goals and plans where necessary	uses prescribed strategies to adjust goals and plans where necessary
uses technology and a range of critical thinking strategies to find innovative solutions to questions and problems.	uses technology and critical thinking strategies to find solutions to questions and problems	uses technology and prescribed strategies to find solutions to questions and problems
effectively manages and completes a range of inquiries and responses within proposed timelines.	effectively manages and completes inquiries and responses within proposed timelines.	manages and completes inquiries and responses within proposed timelines.

Qualifications Available

Philosophy Level 3 (with the award of):

EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

HIGH ACHIEVEMENT

COMMENDABLE ACHIEVEMENT

SATISFACTORY ACHIEVEMENT

PRELIMINARY ACHIEVEMENT

Award Requirements

The final award will be determined by the Office of Tasmanian Assessment, Standards and Certification from 12 ratings (7) from the internal assessment, 5 from external assessment).

The minimum requirements for an award in Philosophy Level 3 are as follows:

EXCEPTIONAL ACHIEVEMENT (EA)
10 'A', 2 'B' ratings (4 'A's, 1 'B' from external assessment)

HIGH ACHIEVEMENT (HA)
5 'A', 5 'B', 2 'C' ratings (2 'A', 2 'B's, 1 'C' from external assessment)

COMMENDABLE ACHIEVEMENT (CA)
6 'B', 4 'C' ratings (2 'B's, 2 'C's from external assessment)

SATISFACTORY ACHIEVEMENT (SA)
10 'C' ratings (3 'C's from external assessment).

PRELIMINARY ACHIEVEMENT (PA)
6 'C' ratings.

A learner who otherwise achieves the ratings for a CA (Commendable Achievement) or SA (Satisfactory Achievement) award but who fails to show any evidence of achievement in one or more criteria ('z' notation) will be issued with a PA (Preliminary Achievement) award.

Course Evaluation

The Department of Education's Curriculum Services will develop and regularly revise the curriculum. This evaluation will be informed by the experience of the course's implementation, delivery and assessment. In addition, stakeholders may request Curriculum Services to review a particular aspect of an accredited course.

Requests for amendments to an accredited course will be forwarded by Curriculum Services to the Office of TASC for formal consideration.

Such requests for amendment will be considered in terms of the likely improvements to the outcomes for learners, possible consequences for delivery and assessment of the course, and alignment with Australian Curriculum materials.

A course is formally analysed prior to the expiry of its accreditation as part of the process to develop specifications to guide the development of any replacement course.

Course Developer

The Department of Education acknowledges the significant leadership of Dr Hottes and the significant contribution of Lachlan Hine, Mary Garland, John Williamson, Ben Felstead, Carl Hinde, Patrick Berechree and Professor Dirk Baltzly (UTas) in the development of this course.

Expectations Defined By National Standards

There are no content statements developed by ACARA that are relevant to this course.

Accreditation

The accreditation period for this course has been renewed from 24 January 2019 until 31 December 2021.

During the accreditation period required amendments can be considered via established processes.

Should outcomes of the Years 9-12 Review process find this course unsuitable for inclusion in the Tasmanian senior secondary curriculum, its accreditation may be cancelled. Any such cancellation would not occur during an academic year.

Version History

Version 1 – Accredited on 19 May 2017 for use from 1 January 2018. This course replaces Philosophy (PHL315113) that expired on 31 December 2017.

Version 1.a - Clarification of terminology made 9 March 2018.

Accreditation renewed on 22 November 2018 for the period 1 January 2019 until 31 December 2021.

Version 2 - Amendments 4 February 2019. Changes to Criterion (C) 2 standard element (E) 3, C3 E2, C3 E5 & C4 E1. Major modifications to course content in: Unit 2 (Mind/Body Problem); Unit 3 Free Will; Unit 4 (Life, the Universe and Everything); Unit 5 (Philosophers and the Good Life).

Version 2.a - Amendments 1st April 2019. Rewording of Unit 5 investigative question for de Beauvior.

Appendix 1

TABLE: APPLYING EPISTEMOLOGY TO UNITS 2-5

Concept/Theory	Questions
Epistemology	UNIT 2: How can we know whether there is a mind distinct from the body? How can we know that our sense data is reliable? How can we know that other people have minds? UNIT 3: How can we know if we have 'free will'? Would things appear any differently to us if we didn't? UNIT 4.1: What is the difference between moral knowledge and mere belief? Does this contrast make sense in the case of morality? UNIT 4.2: How is faith related to knowledge? Do articles of faith fit better with foundationalist or coherentist views about the structure of knowledge? Are science and faith, as ways of knowing, in completion or complementary to one another? UNIT 5: Is it possible to be deceived about whether you are having a happy life?
Rationalism	UNIT 2: How do arguments supporting rationalist positions (property dualism, substance dualism etc.) support and/or criticise theories of mind distinct from the body?How do we know we have a body? UNIT 3: Are our concepts and knowledge gained independently of sense experience? Is reason the source of concepts or knowledge? UNIT 4.1: Is the principle of utility shown to be true (if it is true) on the basis of rational insight or sense perception? UNIT 4.2: Which premises in the argument from Contingency are the product of rational insight? Which ones are based on sense perception? Can we know the origins of life and the universe without empirical evidence? UNIT 5: Is the place of love in the good life revealed by rational insight or by sense experience? Where does rationalism lie when considering a good life? Is it forward looking, reflective on the past, or is it in the moment?
Empiricism	UNIT 2: How do arguments supporting empirical positions support and/or criticise theories of mind distinct from the body/ the existence of free will? UNIT 3: How do empirical positions support and/or criticise the existence of 'free will'? Is the sense experience the ultimate source of all our concepts and knowledge? UNIT 4.1: What empirical evidence could there be for moral relativism? Is the observed fact that different people have different moral beliefs relevant to the question of whether moral truths are only ever 'true for' some group? UNIT 4.2: Which premises in the Teleological argument are derived from sense experience? Can we understand the origins of life and the universe purely using empirical evidence? UNIT 5: How would an empiricist approach the question 'What is a good life?' Can a good life be observed or measured?
Inductive Reasoning	UNIT 2: Which hypotheses/positions/concepts (e.g. Cartesian Dualism, Mental States, Qualia etc.) rely upon inductive reasoning? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments? UNIT 4.2: Where do science and faith based knowledge rely upon inductive reasoning? UNIT 5: To what extent can we articulate the premises to guarantee a good life?
Deductive Reasoning	UNIT 2: Which hypotheses/positions rely upon deductive reasoning? What are the strengths and weaknesses of these arguments? UNIT 3: Can a deductive argument about the cause of our actions only follow after assuming the existence, or otherwise, of free will? UNIT 4.2: Where do science and faith based knowledge rely upon deductive reasoning? UNIT 5: Can we argue whether or not someone has had a good life?
Justification	UNIT 2: What justification is presented for each argument? With what justification can we be said to know that there is a mind distinct from the body? With what justification can we be said to know that the mind is a physical entity? UNIT 3: What justification is presented for each argument in relation to 'free will'? UNIT 4.2: Can science and/or faith based knowledge ever be truly justified?

	UNIT 5: What justification is presented for each argument in relation to the 'good life'?
Scepticism	UNIT 2: Can you reasonably doubt that you have a mind? Can you reasonably doubt that you have a body? What does this show about the mind–body problem? What rational argument can we produce to say that we have no reason to believe we can have knowledge of a mind as distinct from the body? What empirical evidence can we produce to support the idea that we have no reason to believe we can have knowledge of the mind as distinct from the body?How do we know we are not living in a matrix?How do we know we are not a brain in a vat? UNIT 3: Can we reasonably doubt that there are times when we act freely? If freedom is an illusion, could it be a perfect illusion? Are perfect illusions illusions at all?Is it possible to know whether or not everything we do is determined? UNIT 4.1: Moral scepticism is the view that, while there might be objective moral truths, we are not able to know them. Can we live as moral sceptics? UNIT 4.2: Can we reasonably doubt that there must be an explanation for the existence of the universe or for life in the universe? What attitude would a sceptic urge toward both the Big Bang and the hypothesis that God created the universe? Does a sceptical perspective lead more naturally to faith or science based knowledge? UNIT 5: Would it be reasonable or foolish to simply suspend judgement about the nature of the good life and just live? Give reasons for your answer.Can we ever know whether what we do or think will contribute to a good life?

Appendix 2

GLOSSARY

TERMS USED IN LEARNING OUTCOMES AND STANDARDS

Term	Definition
Accurately	completed precisely and correctly according to the guidelines of the investigation (the criteria); free from errors resulting from care and diligence; accuracy of data by comparing several measurements from the same or different sources
Analyse	to examine, scrutinise, explore, review, consider in detail for the purpose of finding meaning or relationships, and identifying patterns, similarities and differences
Appropriate	information and ideas that are specific and relevant to the study or investigation (for example, sources) that respond to and support (or refute) a specific idea, hypothesis, concept or premise
Argument	an argument is a set of propositions including a premise (reasons for accepting the truth of a conclusion) and a conclusion; a statement or series of statements typically used to persuade someone of something or to present reasons for accepting an idea, concept, theory of conclusion
Assess	to make a judgement about; to rate; to weigh up; to form an opinion
Clarify	to render less confusing and more comprehensible using explanation
Coherent	a logical and consistent argument that responds to a theory or hypothesis forming a unified response
Cohesive	well integrated range of ideas and concepts to communicate a response to a philosophical question or investigation
Contemporary issues	in the context of this syllabus, refers to events and issues of significance in the study of philosophy in the world today
Critically analyse	to closely examine, analyse in detail, focus on essence, examine component parts of an issue or information (for example identifying the premise of an argument or ideology, and its plausibility, illogical reasoning or faulty conclusions)
Describe	to recount, tell of/about, chronicle, comment on; give an account of characteristics or features Epistemic: belonging to epistemology; relating to knowledge and the degree of its validity
Evaluate	to appraise, measure, judge, provide a detailed examination and substantiated judgement concerning the merit, significance or value of something; provides a structured interpretation; also concerned with the relative strengths and weaknesses of philosophical arguments
Evaluate (Basic)	to assess, appraise and provide a basic judgement concerning merit or value of something (philosophical theory, in the context of this syllabus); in relation to differing interpretations of philosophical theory; the arguments used by philosophers; and the strengths and weaknesses; may refer to effectiveness or relevance with limited supporting evidence
Evidence	in the study of this syllabus, evidence is the information obtained from sources that is valuable for a particular inquiry. Evidence can be used to help support a hypothesis or to prove or disprove a conclusion; evidence may also refer to the ideas, premises and conclusions of thinkers or philosophers.
Explain	to make plain, clear, intelligible, to describe in detail, revealing relevant facts. Factual historical information includes, but is not limited to: uncontested dates; uncontested events; and names of historical figures, places and events
Extensive	in this context, a wide range of ideas, information, data or concepts that interpret philosophical arguments
Ideas and Concepts	a concept (in the study of philosophy) refers to any general notion or idea that is used to develop an understanding of philosophy, such as concepts or philosophical theories. Explains the premise of the concept/theory and how it is to be understood; uses terminology associated with the field of study of philosophy; extends to an explanation of the ideas and concepts using correct terminology
Implications and Consequences	the conclusion that can be drawn to something although not explicitly stated; in response to ideas, information, data, concepts and theories; consequences include the result or effect of a particular circumstance or set of information and conditions
Identify	to point out, name, list, distinguish, recognise, establish or indicate who or what someone or something is
Impact	the marked effect or influence of a context, understanding or set of circumstances on another e.g. How does 'free will' impact on the law?
Interpretation	an interpretation is an explanation of information or data, for example, about a specific person, event, development, experiment, theory, concept or research. There may be more than one interpretation of a particular aspect of philosophical idea, concepts and theories which may have used different sources, asked different questions and held different points of view about the topic
Justify	show or prove to be right or reasonable; provide rationale for why an idea or premise is right or reasonable
Perspective	a particular point of view; the position from which a person of group understand research, events or phenomena. Critics and authors may also have perspectives and this can influence their interpretation of philosophical ideas and concepts
Philosophical	the process of investigation undertaken in order to understand the ideas, concepts and

inquiry	theories of philosophers and thinkers in the domain of philosophy. Steps in the inquiry process include posing questions, locating and analysing sources and using evidence from sources to develop an informed explanation
Primary sources	in the study of philosophy, primary sources are documents created or written during the time being investigated, for example during an event or very soon after. Examples of primary sources include official documents? personal documents such as books, diaries and letters. These original, firsthand accounts or documents that have not been subjected to analysis at the time of their writing. They are original works
Proposition	a statement that expresses whether an idea is true or false; the primary statement or bearer of truth-value; what is believed or doubted and the attitude and context of the belief
Range of (primary and secondary sources)	has dimensions of number (how many sources) and scope of types (books, academic articles, internet, film/video etc.)
Reasoned	based on logic and good sense, supported by relevant evidence
Referencing Conventions	the style of correctly identifying sources and referencing sources in text and in bibliographical detail (for example, Harvard); format consistent for a particular form of writing
Relative significance	having meaning or significance only in relation to something else; the significance of ideas and information in relation to another set of ideas and information; impacts on relevance of information
Relevance	having significance and value in a particular set of circumstances, for example, in response to a philosophical argument or question
Reliability and validity	refers to the source information and the evaluation of whether it is relevant based on whether it can be trusted and is likely to be correct; considers also the distinction between facts and 'truth'
Representation	a picture or image that illustrates a perspective on a theory, idea or concept
Secondary sources	are accounts about philosophical ideas and concepts in documents, books and other source material that were created after the time being investigated and which often use or refer to primary sources and present a particular interpretation. Examples of secondary sources include writings of critics, authors responding to philosophical theories, encyclopaedia, documentaries, textbooks and websites
Selective	in the context of this syllabus, relating to the selection of the most suitable or appropriate sources, information, ideas, data to support a philosophical argument in written and oral responses
Significance	the importance that is assigned to particular aspect an inquiry, e.g. events, research, articles, theories, concepts. Significance includes an examination of the principles behind the selection of what should be investigated for the inquiry
Source	any written or non-written materials that can be used to investigate philosophical ideas and concepts, theorists and thinkers; for example books, online articles and journals, websites, newspaper articles, photos, and journal entries. A source becomes 'evidence' if it is of value to a particular inquiry
Structures	the way in which information is organised in a logical, coherent format to communicate ideas and information in a written response
Synthesises	to format and structure an argument to respond to a question or proposition; uses evidence to systematically support an argument
Task	characteristics may include, but are not limited to: word limits; format of response; mode of response; and presentation requirements
Terminology/Terms	the body of words or language for a particular domain of study (philosophy); phraseology, nomenclature, vocabulary
Tools/organisational strategies	the methods in which information is collected and organised. Includes, but is not limited to: • graphic organisers • note taking • use of categories to organise information

Line Of Sight

Learning Outcomes	Criteria	Criteria and Elements	Content
• describe and explain philosophical ideas, issues and positions	C2 - * use philosophical ideas and concepts; C3, C4, C5	C2 - ALL; C3 - ALL; C4 - ALL; C5 - ALL	ALL Units
• describe and explain primary texts and access relevant information from a variety of sources	C4 - *Use evidence to support philosophical arguments; C6. * Undertake research about philosophical issues C1 *Communicate philosophical ideas and concepts	C4 - E3/E4; C6 - E2; C1 - all standards	ALL units
• identify strengths and weaknesses of philosophical arguments	C3 *describe and explain philosophical arguments	C3 - E4 (particularly)/ E5/E6	ALL units
• formulate and provide evidence to support philosophical questions	C6 - undertake research about philosophical issues; C4	C6 ALL standards; C4 all standards	ALL units
• develop informed opinions on various philosophical issues	C5 *Apply philosophical ideas and concepts to contemporary issues; C6 - Undertake research	C5 - all standards; C6 - E1	ALL units
• utilise organisational and time management skills	C7 - Use resources and organisational strategies	C7 - all standards	ALL units
• have communicated ideas clearly and effectively in verbal and written forms	C1 *Communicate philosophical ideas and concepts	C1 - all standards	ALL units
• explain the significance of philosophical positions to contemporary issues.	C5 *Apply philosophical ideas and concepts to contemporary issues	C1 - E1, E2, E3; C5 - all standards	Unit 5 particularly (all units)

Supporting documents including external assessment material

- PHL315113 Assessment Report 2016.pdf (2018-02-07 01:44pm AEDT)
- PHL315113 Exam Paper 2016.pdf (2018-02-07 01:44pm AEDT)
- PHL315113 Exam Paper 2017.pdf (2018-02-07 01:45pm AEDT)
- PHL315113 Assessment Report 2017.pdf (2018-02-28 03:57pm AEDT)
- PHL315118_V1.a_Amendments_March_2018.pdf (2018-04-10 12:53pm AEST)
- PHL315118 Philosophy TASC Exam Paper 2018.pdf (2018-12-09 09:48am AEDT)
- PHL315113 - Assessment Panel Report 2018.pdf (2019-02-07 01:42pm AEDT)
- PHL315118 Philosophy TASC Exam Paper 2019.pdf (2019-11-21 10:42am AEDT)
- PHL315118 Assessment Report 2019.pdf (2020-02-05 01:25pm AEDT)
- PHL315118 Philosophy TASC Exam Paper 2020.pdf (2020-11-13 09:30pm AEDT)
- PHL315118 Assessment Report 2020.pdf (2021-01-13 10:40am AEDT)
- PHL315118 External Assessment Specifications.pdf (2021-03-04 09:48am AEDT)
- PHL315118 Philosophy TASC Exam Paper 2021.pdf (2021-11-18 03:40pm AEDT)

Tasmanian Government

© 2024 TASC. All rights reserved.