



**Examination paper – Marking Key**

# **PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS—UNIT 1**

## 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	50 minutes	9	9	30
Section Two: Philosophical analysis	80 minutes	2	2	40
Section Three: Extended argument	50 minutes	5	1	30
<b>Total</b>				100

**Section One: Reasoning and Inquiry Skills**

**30 Marks**

Attempt all questions in this section.

Allow approximately 50 minutes for this section.

---

**Part A)**

**4 Marks**

**Question 1**

**[4 marks]**

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

i) Foresight is useful for it is handier than hindsight.

Argument

ii) Time was up for Sophie, so she was free to do as she pleased from now on.

Narration

iii) It is true that all triangles have four sides.

Description

iv) Perth has received rainfall in the past because tiny lizards have done rain dances.

Explanation

**Part B)**

**11 Marks**

**Question 2**

**[6 marks]**

- a) Identify the premise(s) and conclusion(s) in the following arguments.

i) People would rather die than think, being that thinking is too difficult for people.

Premise: Thinking is too difficult for people

Conclusion: People would rather die than think

ii) Jack wanted to know if Jill was the author of a new book and since Jill was the author of the new book, Jack wanted to know if Jill was Jill.

Premise 1: Jack wanted to know if Jill was the author of a new book.

Premise 2: Jill was the author of the new book.

Conclusion: Jack wanted to know if Jill was Jill.

*\*note you only get 1 mark for both premises*

iii) The accused was at their desk 30 minutes before the crime and 15 minutes after the crime. The accused had more than enough time to commit the murder.

Premise: The accused was at their desk 30 minutes before the crime and 15 minutes after the crime.

Conclusion: The accused had more than enough time to commit the murder.

### Question 3

[5 marks]

a) Identify the inference indicators in the following arguments.

i) Gone are the times when one could speak freely about what breakfast food goes best with your shoes and **this is why** I'm moving to Greenland.

Also accepted: **is why** or **why**

ii) Numbers cannot exist like atoms do **because** I have never seen a number under a microscope or while walking in the bush. This is also **since** I hate bushwalking **as** I'm scared of Dropbears and Pokémon.

iii) Time waits for no man and I guess any other gender, **due to the fact that** Time realises it is 2019 and that kind of assumption is dated.

### Part C)

6 Marks

#### Question 4

[3 marks]

a) Number and bracket the separable statements.

(1 mark)

b) Circle the inference indicator(s).

(1 mark)

c) Underline the major conclusion.

(1 mark)

**1**[The uncaring bourgeoisie will tremble before the proletariat.] **Seeing that** **2**[all of history is a history of class struggle] and **furthermore**, **3**[in the modern period there are only two classes, the bourgeoisie and proletariat,] **it follows that** **4**[these two classes will struggle with one-another.] Also, **5**[we know that the proletariat drastically outnumber the bourgeoisie] and **6**[all they have to lose is their chains.]

**Question 5****[3 marks]**

- a) Number and bracket the separable statements. **(1 mark)**
- b) Circle the inference indicator(s). **(1 mark)**
- c) Underline the major conclusion. **(1 mark)**

1[There are many arguments for the notion that life is absurd.] This is because 2[life is absurd] and given that 3[life is absurd.] Further, it is also shown by the fact that 4[life is absurd.]

**Part D)****6 Marks****Question 6****[2 marks]**

- a) Is the following inference an example of inductive or deductive reasoning? **(1 mark)**
- b) Explain why. **(1 mark)**

All unmarried men are bachelors because all unmarried men are bachelors.

- a) Deductive.
- b) While the argument is an example of circular reasoning, if the premise is assumed true then the conclusion must be true because they are the same statement.

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

- a) Is the following inference an example of inductive or deductive reasoning? **(1 mark)**
- b) Explain why. **(1 mark)**

If Loki had lost his bet with Brok then he should have lost his head. Loki did lose his bet with Brok and therefore, Loki should have lost his head.

- a) Deductive.
- b) It is of the form Modus Ponens. The condition that guaranteed that Loki should lose his head was affirmed (that Loki lost the bet with Brok).

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

- a) Is the following inference an example of inductive or deductive reasoning? **(1 mark)**  
b) Explain why. **(1 mark)**

There must be a land where all misplaced and sadly forgotten socks and hair ties live together in harmony. This is because I have never seen the misplaced pair separated after losing them and there is a long-standing tradition of peace and love between socks and hair ties.

- a) Inductive.  
b) While the premises are nonsense, if true, they would imply, though not guarantee, the conclusion as harmony could be inferred from a long-standing tradition of peace and love.

**Part E)****3 Marks****Question 9****[3 marks]**

- a) Give the formal name for the following forms of reasoning.
- i) Critical Reasoning is hard if you overthink it. I overthink it, which is why I find it hard.  
**Modus Ponens**
- ii) If it is Modus Ponens, it is not Modus Tollens. This is Modus Ponens, so it is not Modus Tollens.  
**Modus Ponens**
- iii) If you do well in critical reasoning, you're going to do well in the exam. I am not going to do well in the exam so I won't have done well in critical reasoning.  
**Modus Tollens**

**End of Section One**

**Section Two: Philosophical Analysis****40 Marks**This section contains **two** questions. Answer both questions.

Suggested working time for this section is 80 minutes.

**Question 10 – Community of Inquiry****(20 marks)**

Description	Marks
<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>

Curriculum Dot Points:

- the concepts of action, intention, will, motives and reasons.
- the role of principled decision making in ethics

Jon – I hear that the Prime Minister is intending to meet the Paris Agreement target to cut Carbon Emissions in Australia by 2030 in order to tackle Climate Change. This shows that he is doing the right thing.

**Introduces the topic. Sets out his position – Intentions are of key importance in decision making.**

Andrew – That’s all very well – but intentions alone do not solve anything. To enable the target to be met, the Prime Minister needs to DO something. Action must be taken. For example, I could intend to help the poor and starving by donating some money, but unless I actually act on that intention, no poor or starving people are helped. This shows that by themselves, intentions are pointless.

**Responds by setting out an alternative position – Actions are more important than Intentions.**

**Provides an example to support his position that shows that a lack of action changes nothing.**

Jon – Intentions are what matters - especially in this instance. If you have the right intention, then you can act. The Prime Minister has the right intention about Climate Change, therefore he can act to do something about it.

**Continues to hold his original position, Supports his position with Modus Ponens Deductively Valid form of reasoning. Points out that intentions must come before actions.**

Andrew – That’s all very well – he should be commended for having such worthy intentions - but, without actions, any intentions are worthless. Even if the Prime Minister does do something – such as re-introduce a Carbon Tax for example - it does not matter what he intends as long as the action is good and the target is met.

**Asserts the view that without actions, intentions are not worth anything. He offers an example to support the view that it is actions that make a difference in changing a situation, not intentions. Good actions are all that matters as this is the aspect that makes a difference in moral decision making.**

Jon – I think intentions do matter. He could re-introduce the Carbon Tax simply to gain votes and popularity. It would be so much better if he acted for the intentions of wanting to help the environment rather than for selfish gain.

**Rebuts Scott’s position by pointing out that the intentions must be correct in order for the action to be good. Alludes to Kant’s Categorical Imperative (the Summum Bonum) that the highest Good is a Good action with a good intention.**



## Section Two: Philosophical Analysis (continued)

### Question 11 – 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>

## Passage One

In life we are faced with significant moral decisions where we are often unsure what to do. For example, suppose at the end of the month we have \$40 left over. Should we donate the money to charity or buy a desperately needed birthday present for our family member? Or do we try and do both? The best moral theory should consider the following factors. Firstly, when deciding what to do, there should be less of an emphasis on what to do in each situation and more focus on the kind of people we want to become. The emotional and social factors should also be taken into account. An ethical theory should be straightforward and easy to follow. Lastly, an ethical theory should become increasingly instinctive the longer you pursue it. It follows from this that virtue ethics is the best ethical theory.

### How should we live?

#### Self and others

- The nature of virtues and vices and their relationship to the development of character and ethical action

- (1) The best moral theory will focus on the kind of people we want to become
- (2) The best moral theory will take emotional and social factors into account
- (3) The best moral theory should be easy to follow
- (4) The best moral theory should become increasingly instinctive the longer you follow it.
- (5) Virtue Ethics is the best moral theory

1 2 3 4

↓ ↓ ↓ ↓

5

## Passage Two

When we perceive the world, our senses can be deceived and hence, we should be wary of basing what we know merely on our observations of the world. Illusions, hallucinations and other human-centered errors in perception are all examples of how our senses can be deceived. However, when we think modally – that is about possible worlds – we can sometimes see more clearly than with our limited senses. One way of thinking about how humans think modally or about possibility (possible worlds) is a thought-experiment. For instance, mere observation might imply that ‘we’ are currently in a biological body but we may in fact be a ‘brain in a vat’ which is fed stimulus from a computer. To this end, it is essential that we incorporate both observations and thought-experiments as means by which to obtain knowledge.

### How do we know?

#### Methods of inquiry

- observation and thought experiment

P1: When we perceive the world, our senses can be deceived.

*Therefore*

P2 (Minor-Conclusion): We should be wary of basing what we know merely on our observations of the world.

*And*

P3: When we think modally – that is about possible worlds – we can sometimes see more clearly than with our limited senses.

*Therefore*

Major-Conclusion (4): It is essential that we incorporate both observations and thought-experiments as means by which to obtain knowledge.

1 → 2 + 3 → 4

### **Passage Three**

Our human nature has two distinctive parts: reason and being social. Put simply, we must think but we need others to help us think. When our reason reflects on how we ought to be social, it determines that caring for the community is fundamental to the good life and our happiness. To expand on this point: no person is an island and no person can be a person without a flourishing community. However, our natural instinct to be social can lead us to value our own happiness above the community's happiness. For example, we could use our natural instinct to be social to collect friends both online and off, without much thought to what makes friendship worthwhile or why friendships might be important regarding the good life. This "gotta catch them all" approach to friendship is mere selfishness. It is for these reasons that we must use reason to guide our instincts.

### **What is real?**

#### **Scientific world view**

- different ideas of human nature

#### **Persons**

- the relationship between individuals and societies

P1: Our human nature has two distinctive parts: reason and being social.

*And*

P2: When our reason reflects on how we ought to be social, it determines that caring for the community is fundamental to the good life and our happiness.

*But*

P3: Our natural instinct to be social can lead us to value our own happiness above the community's happiness.

*Therefore*

Major-conclusion (4): We must use reason to guide our instincts.

1 + 2 + 3 → 4

**Section Three: Extended Argument****30 Marks**

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

Suggested working time for this section is 50 minutes.

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>

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

**(30 marks)**

**Question 12**

The mind is merely a function of the brain.

[Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts; the concepts of mind, body and personhood]

or

**Question 13**

Personal identity is determined by one's society.

[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]

or

**Question 14**

Freedom of will is an illusion.

[What is real: Conceptions of ultimate reality; conceptual difficulties with free-will, determinism and agency (human action), the idea of free will]

or

**Question 15**

Gender, race and class do not exist.

[Persons; the ideas of personal identity, gender, race, class and ethnicity]

[Communities and cultures; the ideas of justice, fairness and power relations, including race, gender and class]

or

**Question 16**

Only humans can be persons.

[Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts; the concepts of mind, body and personhood]