APIS
ASSOCIATION FOR PHILOSOPHY IN SCHOOLS (WA)

Examination paper

PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS—UNIT 1

Student Name: _____

Student number: _____

Teacher: _____

Time allowed for this paper

Reading/planning time before commencing work: ten minutes
Working time for paper: two and a half hours

Material required/recommended for this paper

To be provided by the supervisor

This Question/Answer Booklet

To be provided by the candidate

Standard materials: Pens, pencil, eraser or correction fluid, highlighter and ruler.

Special materials: Nil

Important note to candidates

No other materials may be taken into the examination room. It is **your** responsibility to ensure that you do not have any unauthorised notes or other material of a non-personal nature in the examination room. If you have any unauthorised material with you, hand it to the supervisor **before** reading any further.

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Structure of this paper

Section	Suggested working time	Number of items available	Number of items to be attempted	Marks available
Section One: Reasoning and inquiry skills	40 minutes	14	14	30
Section Two: Philosophical analysis	60 minutes	2	2	40
Section Three: Extended argument	50 minutes	5	1	30
			Total	100

Instructions to candidates

1. Write your answers for section 1 in the spaces provided in this paper. Use a blue or black pen only.

2. You must confine your responses to the items and to follow all instructions specific to each item.

3. Spare answer pages may be found at the end of this booklet if you need more space to answer. Please indicate in the original answer space where the answer is continued.

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Section One: Reasoning and Inquiry Skills **30 Marks**

Attempt all questions in this section.

Allow approximately 40 minutes for this section.

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.

_____

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

_____

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

_____

d. The perfect description is impossible.

_____

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.

Arguments for the reasonableness of faith fail for two reasons. The first reason is that if faith means anything it all it must mean belief without justification as saying you have justification for a belief would just make it a justified belief, not faith. Also because 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.

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

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.

Berkley is probably right that there is nothing but immaterial mind stuff in the universe because 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 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:
The conclusion is:

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

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:
The conclusion is:

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:
The conclusion is:

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.

_____

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.

_____

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

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.

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.

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).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

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.

End of Section One

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Section Two: Philosophical Analysis **40 Marks**

This section contains **two** questions. Answer both questions.

Suggested working time for this section is 60 minutes.

Question 15 – Community of Inquiry **(20 marks)**

In the following dialogue, you are required to:

You are required to
- summarise (2 marks)
- clarify (6 marks)
- and critically evaluate (12 marks)

the contributions of each participant

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?

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.

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.

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 their passions and emotions, not their reason. Reason is a slave to the passions.

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.

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?

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Section Two: Philosophical Analysis (continued)

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Question 16 – Passage Analysis **(20 marks)**

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

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

the topic in the passage

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.

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.

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

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.

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Section Three: Extended Argument **30 Marks**

This section contains **five** questions. Answer **one** question only. Write your answer in the spaces provided.

Suggested working time for this section is 50 minutes.

Choose **one** of the following five questions. Argue for or against the statement in the question, giving clear definitions, examples and reasons.

(30 marks)

Question 17

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

or

Question 18

Justice is a matter of treating people equally.

or

Question 19

It can never be proven that a caused b.

or

Question 20

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

or

Question 21

You cannot have reason without imagination.

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).

Copyright © 2018 Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc).