

3.1 Stimulus and philosophical analysis: supported rehearsal

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____

Total: 6 marks

Objective

Supported preparation: Identify an issue in a non-philosophical stimulus; Develop a focused 2000-word philosophical analysis with counterargument. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

A non-philosophical stimulus starts an issue; analysis must develop reasons, objections and judgement. Describing a film or image is not yet a philosophical argument.

Original source / task evidence

Task: an original image depicts a robot completing a conversation. Form an issue about mind and analyse one inference.

Separate what is stated from the interpretation.
Stimulus and philosophical analysis

Task: an original image depicts a robot completing a conversation. Form an issue about mind and analyse one inference.

Ask whether successful conversation is sufficient for consciousness. Behaviour supplies evidence of performance, while the inference to subjective experience requires an argument. An objection can question whether simulation establishes experience; a reply can ask what evidence is available for other minds.

2 Practice

2.1 For the worked case, identify the evidence and a conclusion it can support. Explain one material limit. [3]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 Is successful conversation a necessary or sufficient condition for consciousness in the proposed argument? Give a reasoned answer, evidence or method, and a relevant qualification. [3]

Solutions

2.1 Ask whether successful conversation is sufficient for consciousness. Behaviour supplies evidence of performance, while the inference to subjective experience requires an argument. An objection can question whether simulation establishes experience; a reply can ask what evidence is available for other minds. Authored points for identifying relevant evidence, explaining a supported inference and a material limit.

3.1 The original inference treats it as sufficient: successful conversation would establish consciousness. A necessary-condition claim would instead say consciousness requires that capacity. Neither implication follows automatically from the other; give relevant objections to the one actually proposed. Authored points for a relevant judgement, reason tied to the case and justified qualification or method. Accept a supported alternative.