

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section One: Reasoning and Inquiry Skills

30 Marks

Question 1

[10 marks]

Classify each of the following passages as description, explanation or argument.

[10 marks, one mark for each] 3exp, 4 des, 3arg

a. The heat in Perth is very humid.

_____DESC_____

b. The piano is known as a percussion instrument because pianos use small 'hammers' to hit the instrument's strings.

_____EXP_____

c. Whoever is stronger should lead the world. Ants are stronger than humans, therefore ants should lead the world.

_____ARG_____

d. Water is composed of two parts hydrogen and one part oxygen. .

_____DESC_____

e. Red food colouring is often made up from crushed insects.

_____DESC_____

f. You can never walk into the same river twice because you are not the same person at each moment in time.

_____ARG_____

g. The Norse god Freyja is often mentioned as the god of fertility and farming.

_____DESC_____

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

h. James eats jam two donuts every day and these contain loads of sugar, so he will be at risk of getting diabetes.

_____ ARG _____

i. Daylight hours are longer in some areas of the world due to the tilt in the Earth's axis of rotation.

_____ EXP _____

j. Coral reefs around the world are dying because the oceans are warming.

_____ EXP _____

Question 2

[2 marks]

Identify the inference indicators in the following argument.

An apple a day keeps the doctor away, so you should eat an apple a day because you only see doctors when you are sick.

The inference indicators are:

So [1 mark]

Because [1 mark]

Question 3

[2 marks]

Identify the inference indicators in the following argument.

Violent video games are bad for children because they normalise violent actions. Therefore, parents should be careful to monitor the types of video games their children play.

The inference indicators are:

Because [1 mark]

Therefore [1 mark]

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 4

[2 marks]

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

Science is our only means of knowing anything about the world. This is because science is our only objective method of interrogating the world.

The premise is:

science is our only objective method of interrogating the world.

The conclusion is:

Science is our only means of knowing anything about the world

Question 5

[2 marks]

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

Coal seam gas mining pollutes aquifers, therefore we should not permit that form of mining in Australia.

The premise is:

Coal seam gas mining pollutes aquifers

The conclusion is:

we should not permit that form of mining in Australia

Question 6

[2 marks]

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

Penguins are ethical animals because they are monogamous.

The premise is:

they are monogamous

The conclusion is:

Penguins are ethical animals

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 7

[2 marks]

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

Having coffee just before bed may prevent you from sleeping well that night, therefore you should not drink coffee just before bed.

The premise is:

Having coffee just before bed may prevent you from sleeping well that night

The conclusion is:

you should not drink coffee just before bed

Question 8

[1 mark]

What is the technical name for the following form of reasoning?

If a sandwich has mayonnaise in it, it will be tasty. The sandwich is not tasty, therefore there is no mayonnaise in the sandwich.

Modus tollens

Question 9

[1 mark]

What is the technical name for the following form of reasoning?

Horses are happy when they gallop. This horse is galloping, so it must be happy.

Modus ponens

Question 10

[1 mark]

What is the technical name for the following form of reasoning?

If the sun is out, the ground will be hot. The ground is not hot, so the sun must not be out.

Modus tollens

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 11

[1 mark]

What is the technical name for the following form of reasoning?

Guitars are very loud if they are plugged into amplifiers. This guitar is plugged into an amplifier, so it will be very loud.

Modus ponens

Question 12

[2 marks]

Is the following inference an example of inductive or deductive reasoning? Explain why.

All ducks make the sound 'oink' when they are hungry, except green ducks. There is a group of brown ducks that are hungry, so they will make an 'oink' sound.

Deductive; if the premises are accepted then the conclusion must necessarily follow.

Question 13

[2 marks]

Is the following inference an example of inductive or deductive reasoning? Explain why.

Whenever I have worn a white shirt to work, I get a stain on it. Today I'm wearing a white shirt to work, so I'm sure I'll get a stain on it.

Inductive; the premises do not necessarily infer the conclusion.

Question 14

[4 marks]

In the following argument:

(a) number and bracket each statement in order of appearance. [½ mark each]

(b) circle the inference indicators.

1<When determining if an action is right or wrong we should choose the action that maximises pleasure and minimises pain>. 2<Most animal industries that make animal food products produce more pain than pleasure>, therefore 3 <it would be morally wrong to consume products that come from these industries.> Consequently 4<we ought to adopt a broadly vegetarian diet.>

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section Two: Philosophical analysis

40% (40 Marks)

Question 15

(20 marks)

The following dialogue is an excerpt from a classroom community of

inquiry. You are required to

- summarise (2 marks)
- clarify (6 marks)
- and critically evaluate the contributions of each participant. (12 marks)

DESCRIPTION	MARKS
Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)	
Identifies the main position of the first participant.	1
Identifies the main position of the second participant.	1
Total	2
Criterion 2: Clarification (6 marks)	
Concepts	
States philosophical concepts that frame the argument of the first participant.	1
States philosophical concepts that frame the argument of the second participant.	1
Total	2
Arguments	
For each participant:	
Explains the arguments (e.g. by using relevant examples)	2
Describes the arguments.	1
Total	0–4
Criterion 3: Evaluation (12 marks)	
Examples	
Explains the relevance of examples/counter examples of the first participant.	1
Explains the relevance of examples/counter examples of the second participant.	1
Total	2
Premises	
For each participant:	
Provides reasons to justify their stated acceptability of the premises.	2
States the acceptability of the premises.	1
Total	0–4
Inferences	
For each participant:	
Provides reasons to justify their stated strength of the inferential moves.	2
States the strength of the inferential moves.	1
Total	0–4
Cogency	
Assesses the cogency of the argument of the first participant.	1
Assesses the cogency of the argument of the second participant.	1
Total	2
Overall Total	20

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

What Is Real? Conceptions of ultimate reality: concepts of change and causation.

George: The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again but hoping for a different outcome.

Uses a famous quote to link to the idea of determinism. If the causes and the causal chain is the same, the outcome should be consistent.

Harry: But, who can say what the outcome will be each time as, even if you think you're doing the exact same thing, there are so many factors that may be different, even if only slightly different. These factors can change the causal chain and may produce a different outcome.

Challenges the idea that we can predict the outcome or that the outcome will always be the same, but doesn't actually challenge determinism. Points out that other determining factors could affect the causal chain and change the outcome.

George: I don't think miniscule changes like whether it is raining or sunny will have any affect on the outcome. If you act, it's still the same you acting as you did previously. This is why people get stuck in ruts.

Seems to miss Harry's point and reiterates the idea of the agent acting being the determining factor in the causal chain. Uses a bad analogy to link to a psychological idea of feeling 'stuck' or as if things are 'always the same' simply because we remain the same person.

Harry: Even if you're the same you, the future you is different to the past you. You have grown and altered, even at a cellular level! And I'm sure environmental factors, even if they seem insignificant, can have an effect on a causal chain and lead to different outcomes that simply can't be predicted!

Points out the weakness in George's analogy. Identifies that even though we remain the same person, we change also. Reiterates that other determining factors, biological or environmental (nature / nurture) could affect the causal chain and change the outcome.

George: We are creatures of habit. Things simply don't change.

Blanket, universal statement. Vague. Doesn't offer an argument or a justification. Even if we are creatures of habit (which ever habits they may be...) it doesn't necessarily follow that 'things' (which things?) don't change.

Harry: All we can ever be sure of is change. It may not seem like things are changing and even when it does, the changes that occur may not always seem for the "better", but the only thing we can rely on is that "this too shall pass".

Doesn't reply to George's statement, but offers the opposite universal claim. Again, doesn't actually defend this claim by providing reasons, but offers a description of changes that may occur. Doesn't defend a utopian stance of telos/teleology or goal-directed improvement either.

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 16

(20 marks)

Choose **one (1)** of the following passages and

- summarise (2 marks)
- clarify (8 marks)
- and critically evaluate it. (10 marks)

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)	
Identifies the topic.	1
Identifies the main conclusions.	1
Total	2
Criterion 2: Clarification (8 marks)	
Concepts	
Explains core concepts using illustrative examples.	3
Describes core concepts.	2
States core concepts.	1
Total	3
Arguments	
Identifies the arguments in the texts and clarifies the premises and inferences.	5
Identifies the arguments in the texts and clarifies some of the premises and inferences.	4
Identifies the arguments in the texts and refers to some of the premises and inferences.	3
Identifies the arguments in the texts.	2
Identifies an argument or some arguments in the texts.	1
Total	5
Criterion 3: Evaluation (10 marks)	
Premises	
Identifies the major premises and evaluates their acceptability using illustrative examples.	4
Identifies the major premises and evaluates their acceptability.	3
Identifies the major premises and states their acceptability.	2
Identifies some of the major premises.	1
Total	4
Inferences	
Identifies the inferential moves and evaluates inferential strength using illustrative examples.	4
Identifies the inferential moves and evaluates inferential strength.	3
Identifies the inferential moves and makes some assertions about inferential strength.	2
Identifies some inferential moves.	1
Total	4
Cogency	
Assesses the cogency of the argument based on their evaluation of premise acceptability and inferential strength.	2
Makes assertions about cogency.	1
Total	2
Overall total	20

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2014

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)**Capital Punishment**

Society's laws should reflect the culture they govern. If a culture supports the notion of 'an eye for an eye', then that society should be allowed to enforce Capital Punishment. Laws are a system of rules, implemented through social institutions in order to govern behaviour. Globally, laws differ greatly. In some places the enforcement of Capital Punishment for the worst of offenders is just. If the law of the land states that a crime is punishable by Capital Punishment then people who commit these crimes should be fully aware they will be held accountable in such a way that they may, if found guilty, lose their life. By living in a particular place, you agree to follow the social contracts by which that society is bound. If you don't like it, then don't live there.

How should we live? Governance

- the distinction between contractual and non-contractual relationships.

Genetic Engineering

Parents have the right to select the best genetic material for their children. Genetic engineering can modify mutations from human cells and eradicate illness and disease. If parents make use of genetic engineering, they can prevent the next generation from suffering unnecessarily and may also prolong their lives. Genetic engineering also permits parents to choose the hair colour, eye colour, or facial features of their future children. Although such features may not prolong the life of the human race, they enable parents to design children who will be happy and valued by the society in which they live. Making children biologically immune to some diseases is a good thing and ensures future generations inherit these same genes.

What is real? Scientific world view

- science as a way of classifying the world and constructing our understanding of what is real in human nature
- different ideas of human nature.

Socratic Dialectic

Why would Socrates think that dialectic is a good way of inquiring into any topic? A dialogue is simply a conversation. A conversation never just tells you what is correct or what is incorrect. A conversation becomes confusing because there is always more than one point of view. In a conversation, people often disagree. One person says something and then the other person counters what was said. Basically, the second person rebuts the argument of the first person, who seeks again to defend what they initially said and on it goes. This is never-ending! How can we ever get to the truth of the matter when there are always new arguments and justifications for so many different perspectives? If only someone could just be the voice of authority and tell us the Truth, we'd all be able to agree and finally put an end to the incessant debate. We don't need dialectic, what we need is certainty.

How Do We Know? Methods of inquiry

- types of inquiry: dialectic.

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section Three: Extended argument

30% (30 Marks)

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Philosophical understandings	
Demonstrates a critical understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses sophisticated philosophical language and concepts.	9–10
Demonstrates understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses appropriate language and concepts.	7–8
Demonstrates an understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question and uses some appropriate philosophical language and concepts.	5–6
Demonstrates some understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question.	3–4
Demonstrates a limited understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question.	1–2
Fails to demonstrate an understanding of philosophical topics relevant to the question.	0
Total	10
Criterion 2: Philosophical argument	
Constructs a relevant, cogent argument, which demonstrates originality, and a deep understanding of philosophical method (e.g. relies on plausible assumptions, demonstrates logical insight, effectively uses examples and counter-examples where appropriate).	14–15
Constructs a relevant, cogent argument, which demonstrates a sound understanding of philosophical method.	12–13
Constructs a relevant, moderately cogent argument, which demonstrates some understanding of philosophical method.	10–11
Constructs a relevant, moderately cogent argument (e.g. may contain some errors in reasoning or fails to consider possible objections where appropriate).	8–9
Constructs a relevant, weak argument (e.g. may make controversial assumptions, beg the question and/or commit some other serious errors of reasoning such as informal or formal fallacies)	6–7
Constructs a weak argument that makes few relevant claims (e.g. commits several serious errors of reasoning, has tenuous/occasional links with the question).	4–5
Makes some claims relevant to the question but fails to construct any argument (e.g. merely makes assertions, merely discusses the thoughts of others).	2–3
No relevant argument (e.g. fails to address the question).	0–1
Total	15
Criterion 3: Clarity and structure	
Writes with structure and clarity (e.g. clarifies key terms, sign-post key steps of the argument, logical ordering of topics).	4–5
Writes with some structure and some clarity.	2–3
Writing is poorly structured and lacks clarity (e.g. fails to clarify key terms, unclear argument structure).	0–1
Total	5
Overall total	30

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2014

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 17

Imagination can never be a good guide to what is real.

How Do We Know? Imagination and interpretation

- the relationship between reason and imagination
- distinction between perception, rational reflection and various sources of imagination.

Question 18

I am my mind.

How Do We Know? Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts

- concepts of mind, body and personhood

Question 19

Personal identity is dictated by the society in which you live.

What Is Real? Persons

- the concept of being 'an individual'
- relationship between individuals and societies
- the social element in individual identity
- personal identity, gender, race, class and ethnicity.

Question 20

What is just is determined by those who are powerful.

How Should We Live? Communities and cultures

- justice, fairness and power relations including race, gender and class.

Question 21

Love is irrational.

How Should We Live? Self and others

- the nature of virtues and vices and their relationship to the development of character and ethical action
- the concept of care e.g. care for, care about and taking care
- the role of principled decisions in ethics
e.g. the Golden Rule, greatest happiness principle and categorical imperative.