

MARKING KEY

DRAFT

SECTION ONE—REASONING AND INQUIRY SKILLS

30 marks

Question 1

Classifying passages as description, explanation or argument

Description	Marks
a. argument	1
b. explanation	1
c. description	1

Question 2

Technical name for a form of reasoning

Description	Marks
Modus ponens	1

Question 3

Classifying the inference

Description	Marks
Inductive	1

Question 4

Classifying the inference

Description	Marks
Deductive	1

Question 5

Technical name for a fallacy

Description	Marks
Affirming the consequent	1

Question 6

Technical name for a form of reasoning

Description	Marks
Modus tollens	1

Question 7

Technical name for a fallacy

Description	Marks
Denying the antecedent	1

Question 8

Identifying and explaining the fallacy

Description	Marks
Explains that the conclusion does not follow from the premise because the lack of proof claimed in the premise does not count for the fullness of proof claimed by the conclusion.	1
Argument from ignorance (or <i>argumentum ad ignorantium</i>)	1

Question 9

Identifying the premise and the conclusion

Description	Marks
The premise is: Sundays are lazy days.	1
The conclusion is: I never change out of my pyjamas on Sundays.	1

Question 10

Identifying and explaining the fallacy

Description	Marks
Explains that the conclusion does not follow from the premise because "some wealthy soccer players" does not entail that all soccer players are or will be wealthy.	1
Hasty generalisation.	1

Question 11

Identifying the premise and the conclusion

Description	Marks
The premises are: The safety of students is of great concern in our school AND/OR Too many students are running down the corridors	1
The conclusion is: As of today, running is prohibited.	1

Question 12

Identifying the premises and the conclusion

Description	Marks
The premises are: My mother was busy with her university assignment AND/OR I was hungry	1
The conclusion is: I went out and bought a burger.	1

Question 13

Identifying and explaining the fallacy

Description	Marks
Explains that the conclusion does not follow from the premise because it rests on attacking the character of the person rather than the premise.	1
Ad hominem (or 'attacking the man').	1

Question 14

Evaluating the strength of the inference

Description	Marks
Correctly identifies the strength of the inference as being weak.	1
Justifies the answer by referring to key ideas in the premise and the conclusion, e.g. 'can educate themselves' and 'should be abolished'.	1
Justifies the answer by referring to some contextual factors which support the correct identification of the strength of the inference	1

Question 15

Evaluating the strength of the inference

Description	Marks
Correctly identifies the strength of the inference as being moderate.	1
Justifies the answer by referring to key ideas in the premise and the conclusion, e.g. 'easily seen' and 'reduce greatly your chances'.	1
Justifies the answer by referring to some contextual factors which support the correct identification of the strength of the inference	1

Question 16

Defining and discussing the thought-experiment

Description	Marks
Defines the concept of a thought experiment.	1
Provides an example of a thought-experiment e.g. brain in a vat, the twin earth, the Chinese room, the life boat, swamp man.	1
Discusses the use of a thought experiment in an argument.	1

SECTION TWO—PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS

PART A—Community of inquiry transcript

Question 17

Analysis and evaluation of community of inquiry passage (e.g. relevance, respect for persons and their ideas, clarity of thought and cogency of argument)

Description	Marks
Identifies with examples which participants engage respectfully and cogently with other persons and their ideas.	17–20
Judges with examples which participants have greater clarity of thought.	13–16
Evaluates the relevance of the argument of each participant.	9–12
Analyses with examples some of the concepts, issues and/or concerns of each of the participants.	6–8
Makes assertions only about the contribution of the participants.	2–5
Incoherent engagement with the passage.	0–1

Community of inquiry transcript

Typically, students may clarify and evaluate any of the following philosophical and/ethical perspectives of the participants:

- Abbie's egoism, her appeal to rights (without her really explaining how she or her family secured or received the right to plant what they like) and her scepticism about climate change generally.
- Dan's lack of respectful engagement with the ideas of his peers and so his lack of contribution to the community of inquiry.
- Edward's utilitarian and environmentalist perspectives, though not without their internal problems (e.g. people pursue pretty gardens because they need pretty gardens, challenging the idea that watering pretty gardens is unfair) contribute the most valid points to the inquiry.
- Ben's pragmatic and utilitarian perspective, especially his emphasis on economic costs, on users paying more for their water and his suggestion that water use should be monitored (though he is not clear as to who will do the monitoring).
- Clara's romantic claims, which generally jump from one perspective to another, often extreme, with the exception of her final point, which is reasonable (e.g. using existing resources more efficiently).

PART B—Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts

Question 18

Description	Marks
Produces using diverse examples a cogent analysis, clarification and evaluation of the core ideas, issues and concerns in the passage	17–20
Evaluates with examples the relevance of some of the core ideas, issues and concerns in the passage	13–16
Analyses some ideas, issues and/or concerns in the passage using limited examples	9–12
Makes assertions only about some ideas, issues and/or concerns in the passage using limited examples	6–8
Makes assertions only about some ideas, issues and/or concerns in the passage	2–5
Incoherent engagement with the passage	0–1

Text (i)—Just who is un-Australian?

Typically, students may clarify and evaluate the following ideas in the text:

- that Australians are not exempt from committing unfair acts e.g. drink driving, gambling, tax evasion, cheating employers, slander.
- that Australians exhibit unnecessary prejudicial attitudes to refugees, asylum seekers and indigenous people
- that Australians are xenophobic
- that Australians support the mandatory detention of refugees and asylum seekers because they are seen as illegal aliens
- that Australians are not morally better than other nationalities
- that Australians are human e.g. good, bad, noble, shameful, exemplary and slippery
- that Australians, like other nationalities, also act in a morally appropriate way e.g. donate to charity, help others, charge fair prices
- that it is impossible to define any un-national behaviour or attitude whatsoever
- that any attempt to expose and punish un-national behaviours or attitudes is socially dangerous e.g. the McCarthy trials
- that Australia is in danger of indulging in the dangers of the McCarthy era if the word un-Australian continues to be used.

Text (ii)—Proud to be un-Australian

Typically, students may clarify and evaluate the following ideas in the text:

- that being un-Australian is a very sensible and ordinary position to hold
- that nationalism is a movement based on fear and aggression, as well as drunk and disorderly behaviour
- that nationalism leads to violent clashes such as the events at Cronulla
- that nationalism is a mask for xenophobia e.g. Leb's out!
- that nationalism has historically prompted people to behave in very ugly ways e.g. National Socialism in Nazi Germany or the McCarthy era in the United States
- that people need to be very careful with defining Australian behaviour as explained in the Mackay text.

Text (iii)—Burnt Australian Flag

Typically, students may clarify and evaluate the following ideas in the text:

- that censorship should be opposed because people have freedom of expression e.g. flag burning is an expression of freedom
- that certain forms of expression may lead to detention and sedition e.g. flag burning is clearly un-Australian behaviour
- that the burning of the Australian flag is an artistic critique of a certain kind of nationalism e.g. the kind that leads to violence and riots such as Cronulla
- that the burnt Australian flag is an attack on xenophobia e.g. the public billboard on which it was hung seems to be in an area of cultural and ethnic diversity
- that cultural diversity has enriched the Australian nation and should not be exposed to fear, aggression and persecution from western European or Anglo-Celtic xenophobes.

SECTION THREE—EXTENDED ARGUMENT

Constructing an argument to an open-ended question. Students answer ONE only.

Description	Marks
Uses valid structures of reasoning to develop and/or evaluate cogency or soundness in an argument.	28–30
Reinterprets the criteria of concepts and/or categories to refine and/or address problems and/or issues.	25–27
Interprets unfamiliar and/or ambiguous concepts under their appropriate categories to build coherence and consistency in an argument.	22–24
Identifies and examines some examples and/or counter-examples to broaden the scope and relevance of an argument.	19–21
Compares and contrasts familiar concepts using acceptable examples to clarify a consistent and balanced perspective.	16–18
Uses familiar concepts to produce a reasoned account that justifies and explains a premise in response to a question.	13–15
Employs some definitions, evidence and reasons to make a simple case in response to a question.	10–12
Responds to a question with a series of general assertions and crudely connected ideas.	7–9
Rushed and incoherent written response.	1–6

Question 19

Can you be friends with someone who is not friends with you?

Typically, students may support or challenge the following concepts, concerns and/or issues:

- that friendship is a reciprocal concept that requires an other and so you cannot be a friend without having a friend (and/or)
- that you could be deceived into thinking and/or feeling that a person's friendship was genuine, so that your reciprocity to that person is genuine (and/or)
- that no person could commit themselves morally to deceiving a friend because to deceive a friend is to deceive one's self, and that is contrary to human nature (and/or)
- that friendship is nothing more than a social and cultural convention which people follow for the sake of civility
- that the concept of friendship depends on context because there are different friendships, such as professional or personal friendships, and it is possible to be one and not the other.

Question 20**Would people do wrong willingly if they thought they could get away with it?**

Typically, students may support or challenge the following concepts, concerns and/or issues:

- that no person could ever do wrong because an innate conscience in human nature would instruct them to the contrary (and/or)
- that no person would ever do wrong because people have been well-educated morally to know right from wrong in any given situation (and/or)
- that all people, given the opportunity, would commit a wrong act because human nature is driven by desire, especially greed (and/or)
- that the willingness to avoid doing wrong only applies when a person is observed doing an act that might be considered wrong (and/or)
- that there are degrees of doing wrong acts and some are seen as a lesser evil, e.g. cheating on your tax return as opposed to shoplifting.

Question 21**Is beauty the same as looking good?**

Typically, students may support or challenge the following concepts, concerns and/or issues:

- that beauty and looking good are culturally conventional concepts that cannot be separated (and/or)
- that beauty and looking good are quite distinct, with the former being a universal concept and the latter a cultural concept e.g. driven by fashion (and/or)
- that a person can look good yet be ugly and/or old, which is a clear distinction (and/or)
- that beauty is an internal quality of the person while looking good is an external quality acquired by a person (and/or)
- that beauty is an aspect of perfection, while looking good is matter of manufacture e.g. the beauty of a number as opposed to the beauty of an automobile.

Question 22**What would life be like without our emotions?**

Typically, students may support or challenge the following concepts, concerns and/or issues:

- that life would be less chaotic without emotions, since emotions cloud a person's thoughts about issues (and/or)
- that violence will cease to exist because prejudices will cease to exist, and emotions are at the core of a person's prejudices (and/or)
- that life would be radically different because human beings would no longer live life as fully as they once did, being merely logical beings or possibly automata or possibly drones in a colony (and/or)
- that a human being without emotions cannot know or perceive the world in any intelligent or sophisticated way, with the result that the species is reduced to an animal state of simple logic and crude sensory perception e.g. like a dog (and/or)
- that emotions are the most basic evolutionary advantage available to human beings and they would cease to exist as a species if the emotions were not a part of their nature.

Question 23**What is it for one thing to be the cause of another thing?**

Typically, students may support or challenge the following concepts, concerns and/or issues:

- that if one thing is the cause of another then the former is always the antecedent of the latter which is always the consequent (and/or)
- that a thing is the cause of another thing if it sets that thing into motion, e.g. one billiard ball striking another (and/or)
- that one thing can only be the cause of another thing if both things exist in a space where the movement of things is determined by certain properties or rules (and/or)
- that one thing can only be the cause of another thing if the thing had been moved initially, e.g. God (and/or)
- that one thing may be the cause of another thing when the causality between them is observed by a human being.

PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS EXAM/COURSE CONTENT MAP – SAMPLE STAGE 2, 2007

Cr – Critical reasoning

Swv – Scientific world view

G – Governance

Moi – Methods of inquiry

Cur – Conceptions of
ultimate reality

Cc – Communities and
cultures

li – Imagination and
interpretation

P - Persons

So – Self and others

Acec – Analysing, evaluating
and clarifying
concepts

Section/ question	How do we know?				What is real?			How should we live?		
	Cr	Moi	li	Acec	Swv	Cur	P	G	Cc	So
S1Q1	A									
S1Q2	B									
S1Q3		A								
S1Q4		A								
S1Q5	A									
S1Q6	B									
S1Q7	B									
S1Q8	B									
S1Q9	A									
S1Q10	B									
S1Q11	A									
S1Q12	A									
S1Q13	B									
S1Q14	B									
S1Q15	A									
S1Q16		A								
S2Q17	A/B	A/B								
S2Q18			B	B						
S3Q19								A		B
S3Q20								B	A	

PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS EXAM/COURSE CONTENT MAP – SAMPLE STAGE 2, 2007

Cr – Critical reasoning

Moi – Methods of inquiry

li – Imagination and interpretation

Acec – Analysing, evaluating and clarifying concepts

Swv – Scientific world view

Cur – Conceptions of ultimate reality

P - Persons

G – Governance

Cc – Communities and cultures

So – Self and others

Section/ question	How do we know?				What is real?			How should we live?		
	Cr	Moi	li	Acec	Swv	Cur	P	G	Cc	So
S3Q21				B	B				B	
S3Q22					A	B	B			
S3Q23				A		A				