



## MARKING KEY

# PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS—UNIT 1

**Section One: Reasoning and Inquiry Skills****30 Marks****Question 1****[4 marks]**

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

- a. There are two types of people in the world, leaders and followers. You don't want to be a follower so, you should be a leader.

\_\_\_\_\_ARG\_\_\_\_\_

- b. The internet is not connecting at home right now because we upgraded to the NBN.

\_\_\_\_\_EXP\_\_\_\_\_

- c. The cat swiped at the fly then ran outside to chase the fleeing fly.

\_\_\_\_\_NAR\_\_\_\_\_

- d. The perfect description is impossible.

\_\_\_\_\_DESC\_\_\_\_\_

**Question 2****[3 marks]**

- 1) Number and bracket the separable statements in the below argument.
- 2) Circle the inference indicator(s).
- 3) Underline the major conclusion.

**1**(Arguments for the reasonableness of faith fail for two reasons). **The first reason is that** **2**(if faith means anything it all it must mean belief without justification) **as** **3**(saying you have justification for a belief would just make it a justified belief, not faith). Also **because** **4**(my church says that faith is more to do with living your life in accordance with God's way rather than with holding any single belief).

**Question 3****[3 marks]**

- 1) Number and bracket the separable statements in the below argument.
- 2) Circle the inference indicator(s).
- 3) Underline the major conclusion.

**1**(Berkley is probably right that there is nothing but immaterial mind stuff in the universe) **because** **2**(it does seem like the only thing we can know is our emotions, beliefs and desires which are all parts of the mind). I guess **it follows that** **3**(science is the study of causal connections between mental phenomena).

**Question 4****[2 marks]**

Identify the inference indicators in the following argument.

**Due to** the exhausting nature of social media, I am going to be taking a break from it. It won't be for too long though, **so** make sure you're still tagging me in all the spiciest memes so that I can catch-up when I'm back.

The inference indicators are:

---



---

**Question 5****[2 marks]**

Identify the inference indicators in the following argument.

Issues with the NBN are **reason enough** to move back to ADSL internet services. This is **because** the NBN service has many issues with slow speeds and drop-out connections.

The inference indicators are:

---



---

**Question 6****[2 marks]**

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

The reason why Modus Ponens is a deductively valid form of argumentation is that affirming the antecedent of a hypothetical statement entails the conclusion (i.e. the consequent) within a syllogism. For instance, "If trees are red then ants are green, and trees are red, therefore, ants are green."

The premise is:

Affirming the antecedent of a hypothetical statement entails the conclusion (i.e. the consequent) within a syllogism.

The conclusion is:

Modus Ponens is a deductively valid form of argumentation.

**Question 7****[2 marks]**

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

There are problems with congestion on the roads and hence, we should increase funding to public transport and other transport infrastructure.

The premise is:

There are problems with congestion on the roads.

The conclusion is:

We should increase funding to public transport and other transport infrastructure.

**Question 8****[2 marks]**

Identify the premise and the conclusion in the following argument.

Precisely because it is going to rain heavily over the next few days you have good reason to stay in bed all day long watching re-runs of your favourite show.

The premise is:

It is going to rain heavily over the next few days.

The conclusion is:

You should stay in bed all day long watching re-runs of your favourite show.

**Question 9****[1 mark]**

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

If all turnips did the Harlem Shake, then David would be an outstanding business man. But David is not an outstanding business man and therefore, not all turnips have done the Harlem Shake.

Modus Tollens

---

**Question 10****[1 mark]**

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

When there is low taxation then public services suffer. There is currently low taxation and so public services are suffering.

Modus Ponens

---

**Question 11****[2 mark]**

- 1) What is the technical name for the following form of reasoning?
- 2) What makes the argument deductive?

If what makes something art is merely common opinion then what is art becomes open to the tyranny of the masses. Art is defined merely by what people commonly believe and so, what is art is at the mercy of majority rule.

Modus Ponens. **(1)**

The argument is deductive because it attempts to provide premises that entail or necessitate the conclusion.

And / or **(1)**

It is syllogistic reasoning in which the premises entail the conclusion. Such that if you accept that art being defined merely by common opinion guarantees that art's definition is open to the tyranny of the masses and further suppose that art is defined merely by what people commonly believe then the conclusion is necessitated.

---



---



---

**Question 12****[2 mark]**

- 1) What is the technical name for the following form of reasoning?
- 2) What makes the argument not inductive?

Without free will there would be no social contract. Given that there is a social contract it follows that there is free will.

Modus Ponens. **(1)**

The argument is deductive because it attempts to provide premises that entail the conclusion.

And / or **(1)**

It provides premises that entail the conclusion via a hypothetical syllogism. Such that if you accept that all x's being y's and all y's being z's guarantees that x's are z's and further suppose that all x's are not z's then the conclusion is necessitated.

---



---



---

**Question 13****[2 marks]**

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

There are times when the right thing to do is all dependent on the situation. This is because sometimes going by the rules is the right thing to do (e.g. don't continue through STOP signs) but sometimes rules need to be broken to bring about good outcomes (e.g. continuing through a STOP sign because there's a large truck rapidly approaching your rear).

Deductive. **(1)**

It is deductive because the premises necessitate or entail the conclusion. It does this by giving two cases where the situation changes the "right thing to do" and hence, making the "right thing to do" situationally dependent. **(1)**

---



---



---

**Question 14****[2 marks]**

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

The most important feature of consciousness is the "what it's like" aspect of experience (i.e. qualia). Scientists cannot study qualia and so scientists are not investigating the most important feature of consciousness.

Deductive. **(1)**

It is deductive because the premises necessitate or entail the conclusion. It does this by stating that qualia are the most important features of consciousness and that scientists cannot study qualia and hence that scientists do not study the most important features of consciousness. **(1)**

---



---



---



---

**End of Section One**

**Section Two: Philosophical Analysis****40 Marks****Question 15 – Community of Inquiry****(20 marks)**

<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
<b>Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)</b>	
Identifies the main position of the first participant	1
Identifies the main position of the second participant	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Criterion 2: Clarification (6 marks)</b>	
<b>Concepts</b>	
States clearly and engages critically with philosophical concepts in the dialogue	2
Refers to some philosophical concepts in the dialogue	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–2</b>
<b>Arguments</b>	
For each participant:	
Explains the arguments (e.g. by using relevant examples)	2
Describes the arguments	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Criterion 3: Evaluation (12 marks)</b>	
<b>Examples</b>	
Explains and engages critically with examples/counter examples in the dialogue	2
Refers to examples/counter examples in the dialogue	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–2</b>
<b>Premises</b>	
For each participant:	
Provides relevant reasons to justify their stated acceptability of the premises	2
States the acceptability of the premises	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Inferences</b>	
For each participant:	
Provides relevant reasons to justify their stated strength of the inferential moves	2
States the strength of the inferential moves	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Cogency</b>	
Provides a detailed and accurate assessment of the cogency of the arguments pointing out any fallacies	2
Makes assertions about cogency	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–2</b>
<b>Overall total</b>	<b>20</b>

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2016

**MARKING GUIDE:****Scientific world view**

- different ideas of human nature

**Persons**

- the relationship between individuals and societies

Daniel – The recent ball tampering issue in Australian cricket has got me thinking about the nature of human beings. What is it that influences people’s actions?

*Sets the scene and poses the question for the inquiry – What is the nature of human beings and what influences their actions? He uses the example of the ball tampering incident to frame the discussion.*

Cam – I think that the ball tampering example shows that humans are controlled by their emotions. The people involved wanted to win so badly that they let their passions drive their actions.

*Sets out a position that Humans are controlled by their emotions and that passions drive actions. He builds on the example of the ball tampering to show that sometimes people want something so badly that the emotion of wanting that thing takes over and rational thought is lost.*

Daniel – I’m not sure that is true. If actions were based on impulse and emotion, there would not be evidence of any pre-planning when people act. However, in the cricket example, there was clear evidence of pre-planning as one of the players had sandpaper in his pocket to tamper with the ball. This shows humans are led by reason.

*Sets out the opposing position that Humans are controlled by reason. This is supported with the explanation that actions are preceded with intentions and planning, as shown in the example of the Cricket ball-tampering issue. One of the players involved used sandpaper to tamper with the ball – sandpaper has no purpose on the cricket pitch, which supports his view that this was pre-planned. He uses Modus Tollens method of reasoning to support this position.*

Cam – People are unable to prevent emotion from controlling their choices. No-one would rationally choose the bad consequences that bad choices bring. The fact that people frequently make poor choices shows that people are controlled by our passions and our emotions, not our reason. Reason is a slave to the passions.

*Supports his position by using the example of how actions sometimes bring bad consequences. He reinforces this position by stating that people do not intentionally choose bad consequences, so reason cannot have any part to play. He believes that if they had thought about the actions they would have seen the bad consequences that would result, and so they would not act in this way. He argues that because they acted in such an obviously bad manner, they could not have used reason. He believes that if they are not controlled by reason, then they must therefore be controlled by their passions and emotions and are unable to prevent it. He uses David Hume’s quotation to support this position.*

Daniel – Rational choices are not always good choices. The Captain of the Australian Cricket team achieves his position through his ability to make rational decisions. As this situation was a decision



made by the Captain, we must conclude that it was a rational choice – albeit a bad one. From this, we can conclude that all humans must be driven by reason.

*Refutes Cam's position by pointing out that it is possible for people to use their reason and result in bad consequences. People do not always use their reason well and can often make poor judgements and bad decisions. He uses the example of the fact that Cricket Captains have to make rational decisions as a vital part of their role. But in so doing he neglects to take into account that the Australian cricket Captain is human and not a machine - just because he can use his reason does not mean that he always will use his reason.*

Cam – The players involved had families and were role models for young people. The fact that these roles were forgotten shows that humans are selfish and are driven and controlled by selfish emotions. What else would cause humans to act in such irrational ways?

*Cam further develops his position by pointing out some of the resulting consequences of the decision. He maintains that a rational person would never make a rational decision that affected so many others in such a negative manner. He infers that to do so means that humans are selfish. In so doing, he neglects to consider the fact that there could have been a good intention for others in his actions eg he may have won the game which would have brought glory for his country.*

## Section Two: Philosophical Analysis (continued)

## Question 16 – Passage Analysis

(20 marks)

Description	Marks
<b>Criterion 1: Summary (2 marks)</b>	
Identifies the topic	1
Identifies the main conclusions	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Criterion 2: Clarification (8 marks)</b>	
<b>Concepts</b>	
Explains and critically engages with core concepts	3
Describes core concepts	2
States core concepts	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–3</b>
<b>Arguments</b>	
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–5</b>
<b>Criterion 3: Evaluation (10 marks)</b>	
<b>Premises</b>	
Identifies the major premises and accurately critically evaluates their acceptability, giving relevant reasons	4
Identifies the major premises and evaluates their acceptability	3
Identifies the major premises and states their acceptability	2
Identifies some of the major premises	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Inferences</b>	
Identifies the inferential moves and accurately critically evaluates inferential strength, giving relevant reasons	4
Identifies the inferential moves and evaluates inferential strength	3
Identifies some inferential moves and makes some assertions about inferential strength	2
Identifies some inferential moves	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–4</b>
<b>Cogency</b>	
Assesses the cogency of the argument based on their evaluation of premise acceptability and inferential strength	2
Makes assertions about cogency	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>0–2</b>
<b>Overall total</b>	<b>20</b>

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2016

### Passage One

The view that the rightness or wrongness of action is determined by its consequences is a more attractive ethical view than the one that claims an action is right or wrong in and of itself. This is because the latter view can lead to some counter intuitive decisions. Take for example a situation where a murderer comes to your front door and asks where your family is. You know that they are currently sleeping upstairs, but you also know it is wrong to lie. If lying is wrong in and of itself, it would be immoral to lie to the murderer and tell them your family are away on vacation. To tell the murderer that your family are happily sleeping upstairs would lead to their brutal death. According to the view that claims the morality of an action is determined by its consequences, one can justify telling a lie, to spare your family from such a terrible fate. This seems the intuitive thing to do in this situation and is why it is a more attractive approach to how you should live than the other view in question.

### **MARKING GUIDE:**

#### **Self and others**

- the role of principled decisions in ethics, including:
  - the greatest happiness principle
  - the categorical imperative

#### **Summarise:**

Ethics, Consequentialism (/Utilitarianism - although not explicit, it is a form of consequentialist ethics) & Deontology - Kant

#### **Clarify:**

Hidden premise: ethical theories that avoid unpalatable scenarios are more attractive.

P1: Deontological view of ethics can lead to unpalatable scenario's.

P2: Consequentialist theories avoid these scenario's.

C: Consequentialism is a more attractive approach to ethics.

1 + 2

↓

C

## Passage Two

If you were to be asked ‘Who are you?’, would you be able to identify the essential properties of your identity? Philosophy has struggled with this question for centuries. To find an answer we need to look at the world in which we live. In the Western world, we are often identified and labelled by our gender, our race and our class. Paying women less than men enforces gender inequality by providing one gender with a higher status over another. In a similar way, indigenous groups experiencing higher levels of incarceration and lower life expectancy causes attitudes of resentment. In addition, higher university fees preclude the lower classes from applying, which limits their ambition. These social conventions shape a person’s identity. So it is society which defines who we are.

### MARKING GUIDE:

#### Persons

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

If you were to be asked ‘Who are you?’, would you be able to identify the essential properties of your identity? Philosophy has struggled with this question for centuries. To find an answer we need to look at the world in which we live. In the Western world, we are often identified and labelled by our gender, our race and our class. **1**(Paying women less than men enforces gender inequality by providing one gender with a higher status over another). In a similar way, **2**(indigenous groups experiencing higher levels of incarceration and lower life expectancy causes attitudes of resentment). In addition, **3**(higher university fees precludes the lower classes from applying, which limits their ambition). It is clear that these **4**(social conventions shape a person’s identity). So it is **5**(society who defines who we are.)

#### Summarise:

Personal identity, society and the individual, authenticity

#### Clarify:

P1: The gender pay gap maintains the status quo for gender power differences.

P2: Indigenous group inequalities bring about resentment.

P3: Lower classes have reduced access to education which limits ambition.

mc: Social power structures produce a person’s identity.

C: Society defines who we are.

$$\underline{1 + 2 + 3}$$

↓

4

↓

5

**Passage Three**

To date, scientists have been unable to identify where consciousness comes from. Traditionally there are two arguments for how consciousness exists. Substance dualists argue that there is the brain, which is made of physical stuff and the soul, which is made of non-physical stuff. Therefore, as the soul is where consciousness occurs, consciousness is made of non-physical stuff. The second traditional argument is that as there is only material things in the universe (materialism) our minds or consciousness has no non-material parts; it is fully material. There is, however, a third argument. Perhaps consciousness is a property of the physical stuff in the universe in the same way electro-magnetism is (property dualism). Therefore, we don't 'see' consciousness in any physical way, much the same as we don't see gravity, we only encounter its effects.

**MARKING GUIDE:****Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts**

- the concepts of mind, body and personhood

**Summarise:**

Metaphysics, Philosophy of Mind and Consciousness

**Clarify:**

P1: Consciousness occurs in the soul.

P2: The soul is made of non-physical stuff.

Therefore,

C: Consciousness is made of non-physical stuff.

1 + 2

↓

C

P1: There are only material things in the universe.

P2: Consciousness exists.

Therefore,

C: Consciousness is material.

1 + 2

↓

C

P1: Consciousness is a property of physical substance.

Therefore,

C: We only encounter consciousness' effects and do not perceive consciousness directly.

1

↓

C

**Section Three: Extended argument (30 Marks)**

Description	Marks
<b>Criterion 1: Philosophical understandings</b>	
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Criterion 2: Philosophical argument</b>	
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Criterion 3: Clarity and structure</b>	
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
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Overall total</b>	<b>30</b>

*School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2016*

**Question 17**

The golden rule should be revised to read: do unto others as *they* would *want* you to do.

**Self and others**

- the role of principled decisions in ethics, including:
  - the Golden Rule

**Question 18**

Justice is a matter of treating people equally.

**Communities and cultures**

- the ideas of justice, fairness and power relations, including race, gender and class

**Question 19**

It can never be proven that a caused b.

**Conceptions of ultimate reality**

- the concepts of change and causation

**Question 20**

Empirical evidence is a better source of knowledge than rational proof.

**Methods of inquiry**

- the distinction between empirical evidence and rational proof

**Question 21**

You cannot have reason without imagination.

**Imagination and interpretation**

- the relationship between reason and imagination