

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section One: Reasoning and Inquiry Skills**30 Marks****Question 1****1 mark**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If penguins are fictional, then life is not worth living. Penguins are real. Therefore, life is worth living.

Denying the antecedent. (1 mark)

Question 2**2 marks**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

All octopi are evil. I know this because all the octopi I have met are on Dave's submarine and they are evil.

Hasty generalisation. (1 mark)

While the conclusion might be true, the sample contained in the premise is too small to prove such a large conclusion. (1 mark)

Question 3**2 marks**

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

The police officer said that I shouldn't lie to my friends about my test scores and so I've stopped lying to my friends.

Irrelevant authority. (1 mark)

While a police officer might be a moral person and ought to know the laws within his field, but that does not make him a moral authority and therefore is in no special position to decide upon the morality of an issue. (1 mark)

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 4

1 mark

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If you have jetpacks, you will have a great day. You are having a great day, therefore you have jetpacks.

Affirming the consequent. (1 mark)

Question 5

2 marks

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

You don't know that asylum seekers aren't terrorists. Therefore, we should treat them all like criminals as soon as they arrive in Australia.

Argument from ignorance. (1 mark)

The premise only shows a base level of ignorance regarding the possibility of asylum seekers being terrorists and not the implications of such a possibility. (1 mark)

Question 6

1 mark

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If you are tired, you will crash your car. You crashed your car, therefore you were tired.

Affirming the consequent. (1 mark)

Question 7

2 marks

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

Capitalism is destroying society as we know it. I know this because my philosophy teacher taught me about the critiques of capitalism.

Genetic fallacy. (1 mark)

Based upon the source of one's philosopher teacher and not for any other reason. (1 mark)

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 8

1 mark

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If I like to party, then I like to stay up late. I don't like to party, therefore I don't like to stay up late

Denying the antecedent. (1 mark)

Question 9

1 mark

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If Tom is taller than Nick, then Nick must be shorter than Pete. Tom is not taller than Nick. Therefore Nick isn't shorter than Pete.

Denying the antecedent. (1 mark)

Question 10

3 marks

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Penguins are really cute. Therefore we should not hurt them.

Weak. (1 mark)

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

Whether someone or something is cute should not be a condition for moral worth. (1 mark)

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 11

3 marks

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

All humans will turn orange and then pink. You are a human. Therefore you will turn orange and then pink.

Deductively valid. (1 mark)

Not Cogent. (1 mark)

This is modus ponens. (1 mark)

Question 12

2 marks

Explain why the following is a fallacious argument. In your explanation, name the fallacy.

Noisy children are a real headache. An aspirin will make a headache go away. Therefore, an aspirin will make noisy children go away.

Equivocation. (1 mark)

The first instance uses 'headache' as a way of describing a hard thing to handle, while the use of 'headache' the second time is used to mean an actual pain in the head. (1 mark)

Question 13

3 marks

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Eating cucumber sandwiches radically improves your mood because they satisfy your hunger and are very refreshing.

Weak. (1 mark)

Lacking cogency. (1 mark)

The premises provide weak support for the conclusion that eating cucumber sandwiches radically improves your mood. (1 mark)

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 14

3 marks

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

If you are a fan of Penguins of Madagascar then you can definitely be my friend. You are a fan of Penguins of Madagascar. Therefore you can be my friend.

Deductively valid. (1 mark)

Cogent. (1 mark)

This is modus ponens. (1 mark)

Question 15

3 marks

Evaluate the strength of the inference in the following argument. State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

If you want to get a good night's sleep before the exam, you should keep a consistent sleeping pattern and go to bed on time the night before. Tom has kept a consistent sleeping pattern and went to bed on time. Therefore he should sleep well before the exam.

Nil or no inference; Invalid inferential move. (1 mark)

Not Cogent. (1 mark)

The argument affirms the consequent. (1 mark)

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section Two: Philosophical analysis

40% (40 Marks)

Question 16

(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)

Dot point - Communities and Cultures: Self-expression and culture

Mollie: Oh, Tristan, I can't believe we're getting married – I am so excited! I am really looking forward to planning our wedding. I want it to be big, beautiful and princess themed! After all, I am like the princess who is marrying her wonderful prince and we are going to live happily ever after!

Mollie has an idea of how a wedding celebration should be and assumes that this is the only option. This idea is informed by the culture she lives in, including the fairy tale narrative.

Tristan: Wow, gee, Mollie, I am excited also but I sure am a little nervous. I don't like that many people looking at me, and I am super worried that if we have a big wedding I'm going to get all tongue-tied and be unable to recite my lines. Maybe we can elope to a beautiful tropical island somewhere and get married just the two of us in an exotic location?

Tristan offers a different point of view based on his personal or subjective feelings and fears. He suggests the opposite kind of wedding ceremony, that of elopement.

Mollie: Don't be silly, Tristy! I've looked forward to this day *my whole life!* It's just one day, I'm sure you can cope. And then we will have such lovely memories and photos that we can show our children and they will be able to see our whole extended family and all of our friends in the one place, helping us to celebrate our love for each other!

Mollie rejects Tristan's suggestion and commits the fallacy of ad hominem attack by calling Tristan 'silly'. She reiterates her perspective, adding further details about the life they will have together as husband and wife. Again these ideas are influenced by her cultural experience.

Tristan: Mollie, that sure sounds swell, but I think even if we had just a small wedding, we would still have lovely memories and beautiful photos. I'm not sure we should invite our extended family, after all, big weddings are very expensive! And Great Aunt Joan is going to be a source of embarrassment for everyone.

Tristan again is respectful of Mollie's argument and is willing to compromise. He alters his original position, suggesting a small wedding instead of an elopement. He offers pragmatic reasons for this, including financial and personal reasons (specific family dynamic), with a view to persuading Mollie to compromise as well.

Mollie: But Great Aunt Joan would be devastated if we don't invite her to our wedding! We can't be selfish, Tristan. We are expected, by our families, to follow tradition and have a big white wedding. Our culture is Christian and so we have to follow that traditional understanding of what a wedding should be.

Mollie is fixed on her original idea and refuses to compromise. She makes a claim that culture, tradition and societal as well as familial expectation play a role in determining what they should do as a couple.

Tristan: Do we have to follow such a conservative, out-dated tradition? Surely we can make our own rules! This day should be about you and me, baby. It is about our love for each other and how we wish to express that – not what everyone else wants or what is typical for our culture.

Tristan counters Mollie's claim by arguing that traditions are old-fashioned. He suggests that a wedding is about the couple, not the two families, which is a different perspective on the ritual. This argument identifies that self-expression can sometimes be in conflict with cultural norms and practices.

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Mollie: But it's what I want too! I love our culture and our traditions. If we were Indian and Hindu we would have a three day wedding celebration and the whole community would be invited!

Mollie claims that cultural norm and practices are important and explains that her ideas are consistent with those of her culture. She hints that if she belonged to a different culture, then she would follow those traditions.

Tristan: Maybe we can just discuss this a bit more before getting too carried away.

Tristan does not reply further but suggests they revisit this conversation at a later date. The debate is not resolved but we see that, overall, Mollie is unwilling to change her mind whereas Tristan has been willing to compromise and try and see Mollie's point of view.

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 17

(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

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)**Passage 1**

The concepts of imagination and interpretation are so strongly linked that when we lack an ability for one, we also lack an ability for the other. We use our imagination in order to interpret actions and events. Yet we do not always see things the same way. This difference is obvious when we consider children with autism. Children with autism are unable to understand the actions of others. They cannot always interpret what people mean or why people act the way they do. This inability to appropriately interpret actions and events seems to be linked to the lack of ability to imagine. The child who has autism is often unable to imagine the feelings of another, and therefore they struggle to understand why someone might react the way they do. Furthermore, children with autism may also fail to see how their actions can affect others as this involves considering reality from another's perspective. Using this example, we can clearly see that you cannot interpret the world around you unless you are able to use your imagination.

- imagination as a necessary element in interpretation
- the concept of interpretation

Passage 2

It is impossible to say that we have access to any objective truth. I might argue that I can use my senses in order to understand the world, but my senses are fallible and limited, too easily tricked or fooled. For example, the earth seems to be flat but actually is not. Even self-knowledge seems to be fallible. I feel as though I know myself, yet even here I could be deluded or deceived. For example, I don't think I have a great body, but my friends tell me that I am beautiful. So, even if things in the world have an objective reality, they exist apart from me and my understanding of them. I have to use my experience and my fallible senses in order to understand the world, when putting together my version of reality. Therefore I cannot know the objective truth about the things in the world.

- the ideas of truth, representation and reality and their interrelationship
- the question of objectivity and subjectivity

Passage 3

The fair governance of society is something that will always be an issue for citizens. In a fair society, rights should be equally held amongst all persons. But sometimes these rights are extended to individuals who do not deserve them. Individuals who do not have jobs and who do not pay taxation should be refused access to government subsidies and handouts. To give money to those who do not work encourages them and others to not bother finding employment. This places unfair pressure on persons who do work. Those who work hard should not have to support those who do not. Therefore, rights should not apply to all equally if society is truly to be fair.

- the concept of rights

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 18

A good artwork will have everyone interpret it in the same way.

Imagination and interpretation

- interpreting works of art e.g. painting, sculpture, music and/or film
- interpreting literature e.g. poetry, drama and novels and/or short stories
- criteria for good interpretations including coherence, consistency, comprehensiveness and concision
- imagination as a necessary element in interpretation.

Question 19

It is impossible to know the world without concepts, signs or symbols.

Conceptions of ultimate reality

- use of symbols and concepts to understand the way things are

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts

- use of symbols, signs and signification (semiosis) to understand the world

Question 20

Everyone who loves Classical Music has good aesthetic taste.

Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts

- various aesthetic concepts e.g. beauty, taste, judgement, appreciation, symmetry, form and harmony
- the concept of interpretation

Communities and cultures

- the artistic concept of culture

Question 21

It is always irrational to feel jealous.

Persons

- interrelationships between personhood, emotion and reason
- emotions and emotional responses e.g. how artwork, music, literature and film can help us to understand better.

Question 22

The less government surveillance, the better.

Governance

- the concept of rights
- freedom of expression
- the limits of privacy
- government interference and surveillance.