



MARKING KEY

PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS—UNIT 2

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	16	16	30
Section Two: Philosophical analysis	80 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.

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****[1 mark]**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

If Skee-Lo were a little bit taller then Leoshi will pay attention to him. But unfortunately, Skee-Lo is not a little bit taller and therefore, Leoshi will not pay attention to him.

Denying the Antecedent (1 mark)

Question 2**[1 mark]**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy?

Whenever something is sentient then that thing should be considered a person. Orangutans are considered persons and so, they are sentient creatures.

Affirming the Consequent (1 mark)

Question 3**[2 marks]**

What is the technical name for the following formal fallacy? Justify your answer.

Without a timely departure the train will not make it to the destination on schedule. The train did not make it to the destination on schedule. So, the train did not depart on time.

Denying the Antecedent (1 mark)

The argument can be understood as follows:

Without p then not q. Which means that 'p' is necessary for 'q' but does not guarantee 'q'.

Therefore, it is of the form:

If q then p

Not q

Therefore, not p (1 mark)

Part B)**8 Marks****Question 4****[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the following argument? Justify your answer.

The policy at this workplace is those wearing blue to work will be sent home. And Peter, even though you claim your shirt is cyan and hence not truly blue, I'm afraid cyan is a shade of blue. So Peter, you have to go home now.

Deductively valid (1 mark)

Because it is of the form Modus Ponens: "If you wear blue then you will be sent home. You are wearing blue and so, you will be sent home". (1 mark)

Question 5**[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the following argument? Justify your answer.

If the clothes are dry on the outside line then it means that it didn't rain. But the clothes are not dry on the outside line and therefore, it did rain.

Deductively invalid **or** Inductively moderate or strong (1 mark)

Because, while it is a formal fallacy (i.e. denying the antecedent and hence, the conclusion is not necessitated (deductively invalid)) there is a moderate to strong possibility that given P1 and P2, the conclusion follows (inductively moderate or strong). (1 mark)

Question 6**[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the following argument? Justify your answer.

For the last year, every time the school bell has rung I start to drool, knowing that in a few short moments I will be reunited with my favourite after-school snack at home: melted vegemite on ice cream. I can see the clock ticking down and I know the bell is about to ring and so, I know I'm about to start drooling.

Inductively strong (1 mark)

Because, given all of the evidence for a causal connection between the bell and drooling it is highly likely that the bell will once again lead to drooling. (1 mark)

Question 7**[2 marks]**

What is the inferential strength of the following argument? Justify your answer

On previous occasions the government has started monitoring individuals due to their involvement in certain radical groups. These groups have turned out to be planning violent actions against other citizens of the country. It follows that the government ought to monitor everyone.

Inductively weak (1 mark)

Because, it uses a relatively small subset of the population (certain radical groups) to argue for the same application to the entire population. (1 mark)

Part C)**8 Marks****Question 8****[2 marks]**

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

My dad said that there are issues with Sudanese gangs in Victoria and so, the Victorian Police should be on the lookout for Sudanese people engaged in criminal activity.

Irrelevant Authority (1 mark)

Because, while your dad might be knowledgeable about many things it is likely that he is an irrelevant authority on criminal activities in Victoria. (1 mark)

Question 9**[2 marks]**

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

My parents went away for the long weekend and asked to make sure the back porch was illuminated well, so that our pet dog, Lil' Pebbles, was comfortable. So, I am going to throw a lit party on the back porch to make sure Lil' P is feeling at home.

Equivocation (1 mark)

The words 'illuminated' (to have ample light) and 'lit' (fantastic) are being used with two different meanings within the argument. (1 mark)

Question 10**[2 marks]**

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

I met this person who said there's a material called vibranium which allows you to build amazing things and source energy incredibly efficiently but what would they know? They are from Wakanda, that poor country in Africa and so there is no way I am believing them.

Genetic (1 mark)

Because, the conclusion (don't believe those from Wakanda) is drawn from an attack on the origin or source of the argument (that they are from Wakanda). (1 mark)

Question 11**[2 marks]**

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

When reviewing the research on the nature of chimpanzees there is a surprising lack of evidence to support the notion that they are fundamentally aggressive. Given that we have not found evidence of these natural tendencies it follows that human beings, a close evolutionary relative of the chimpanzee, are not fundamentally aggressive as well.

Argument from Ignorance (1 mark)

Because, merely finding no evidence of these natural aggressive tendencies in human beings does not support the notion that we are not fundamentally aggressive. (1 mark)

Part D)**10 Marks****Question 12****[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Democracy should foster equal voting rights for all citizens. Making all people totally equal is impossible. Therefore, democracy is impossible.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is rationally acceptable.

P2 is rationally acceptable. While equality is possible in many areas, it seems impossible to make people "totally equal"; for instance, physically (e.g. same size feet).

The inference is weak. Whether we can make people equal in many respects (e.g., shoe size) seems irrelevant to the issue of whether we can have democracy with equal voting rights.

(1 mark)

Question 13**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

We know that animals suffer around the world due to our use of them. In ourselves and those close to us we recognise the centrality of suffering in deciding upon what we ought to do. For instance, we don't put our hand into an open flame. So, we should stop using animals if they are suffering.

Cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is rationally acceptable.

P2 is rationally acceptable. While there are different metaethical and moral theories, and people believe different things about ethics, suffering is something that any serious metaethical/moral theory or person considers.

The inference is strong. (1 mark)

Question 14**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

We must understand the world around us to understand ourselves. This is because, if our identity is constructed by the world around us then to understand ourselves we must understand the world around us. Also, our identity is, at least in part, constructed by the world around us.

Cogent. (1 mark)

P1 and P2 are rationally acceptable and the inference is Deductively Valid. (1 mark)

Question 15**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Right now, looking out the window, I get a strong sense that "I" am the one who is looking. The problem with this feeling is that science has never found a spot in the brain where "I" exist. It follows that "I" don't exist.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 and P2 are rationally acceptable.

The argument is fallacious as it is an argument from ignorance. Merely because science hasn't found a physical part of the brain which functions to give us the "what it's like" feeling of being an individual self – an "I" – does not mean that the individual self does not exist. (1 mark)

Question 16**[2 marks]**

State the cogency of the argument. Justify your answer.

Schools are unjust institutions. This is due to a few reasons. First, anything that Karl Marx wrote is obviously correct. Secondly, Marx states that having a society structured around class is not just. Lastly, these points connect with the fact that schools are structured around classes.

Not cogent. (1 mark)

P1 is not rationally acceptable.

P2 is rationally acceptable.

P3 is rationally acceptable.

Equivocation is occurring with the use of "class" in P2 (as in class hierarchy) and P3 (as in a room/year group you learn with). (1 mark)

End of Section One

Section Two: Philosophical Analysis

40 Marks

Question 17 – Community of Inquiry

(20 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 clearly and engages critically with philosophical concepts in the dialogue	2
Refers to some philosophical concepts in the dialogue	1
Total	0–2
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 and engages critically with examples/counter examples in the dialogue	2
Refers to examples/counter examples in the dialogue	1
Total	0–2
Premises	
For each participant:	
Provides relevant 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 relevant reasons to justify their stated strength of the inferential moves	2
States the strength of the inferential moves	1
Total	0–4
Cogency	
Provides a detailed and accurate assessment of the cogency of the arguments pointing out any fallacies	2
Makes assertions about cogency	1
Total	0–2
Overall total	20

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2016

MARKING GUIDE:

- Types of Inquiry: Hermeneutics
- The concept of interpretation

Dani – I've just been watching the news. A lot of the problems that we are facing in our world today are caused by problems of interpretation. It is clear that people are not able to understand each other. For example, the tensions between countries are caused by their leaders getting confused about meaning. This could be avoided if we could all accept one objective truth.

Sets the scene – a problem of interpretation. Presents the position of objectivity or Universalism. Forms the argument that objective truths would avoid any problems of mis-interpretation and subsequent conflict

Martin – But isn't that just a natural state of affairs? To be human is to interpret. All things in our world such as language, literature and art – are open to our own interpretation. My Mum says that the more we understand one aspect of life, the easier it is to understand others. She's right. This will mean we are able to integrate our ideas into a meaningful, unifying 'whole'. For example, I could interpret Alice in Wonderland as an allegory of my own life, which would then bring me understanding about my worries of growing up.

Takes a pro- hermeneutical stance – that the world should be interpreted by the individual. Uses the fallacy of Irrelevant Authority. (Martin's Mum is not an authority on hermeneutics).

Dani – But that's what I mean! That's exactly the problem - everyone has a different interpretation. What if I had a different understanding? Would I be wrong? If everyone could agree on a universal meaning there would be no problem of interpretation. But there are problems of interpretation, so people clearly can't agree. I think we should aim for a 'naked truth' a truth striped away from analogy that shows how things are- one Universal interpretation of everything.

Continues to advocate for an objective stance of the world. Uses modus tollens form of reasoning to support her position. Is such a position of 'naked truth' possible? Even basic words can be seen as signs or signifiers for concepts. How does one agree 'how things are'?

Martin – It is an impossible dream to expect everyone to be able to interpret things in the same way. It would also be extremely boring. The beauty of art and literature is that everyone can interpret them in their own way. For example, I can choose to understand Hamlet as a story of betrayal, while my Mum sees it as a story of false love. To me, that's what gives them power, as they are meaningful in a person's own life context.

Refutes Dani's position– gives a counter example from Hamlet to show how things can be interpreted in different ways

Dani – That position is all very well in art and literature – but it is potentially very dangerous if we apply it to Science or Morality. It means that 'anything goes' and it could lead to all sorts of trouble. The only way to make sense of this cluttered and disjointed world of ours is to search for meaning or interpretations that we can all agree on.

Disagrees with Martin and highlights the problems of using a hermeneutical approach in the field of Science and Morality. Reinforces her original position.

Section Two: Philosophical Analysis (continued)

Question 18 – Passage Analysis

(20 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 and critically engages with core concepts	3
Describes core concepts	2
States core concepts	1
Total	0–3
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	0–5
Criterion 3: Evaluation (10 marks)	
Premises	
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
Total	0–4
Inferences	
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
Total	0–4
Cogency	
Assesses the cogency of the argument based on their evaluation of premise acceptability and inferential strength	2
Makes assertions about cogency	1
Total	0–2
Overall total	20

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2016

Passage One

As the concepts of ‘fake news’ and ‘alternative facts’ gather momentum, it is probably time to question the role that the notion of truth has to play in reflecting the nature of reality. It has been argued that ‘the truth shall set you free’ but in a ‘post-truth’ world, who knows what true is? Why set such an impossible benchmark? The unification and functionality of a community is far more important than the quest for truth. For example, most people who ‘believe’ in Christianity don’t necessarily claim their beliefs to be true. They just say that it makes them a good person and it helps them in their daily life. If truth was more accessible to the wider society then it would be of high importance, but accessing the truth is near on impossible due to the subjective nature of human experience.

MARKING GUIDE:

Area: Epistemology, pragmatic theory of truth

- The ideas of truth, representation and reality and their interrelationship

Argument structure:

P1 (MC): the unification and functionality of a community is far more important than the quest for truth.

P2: If truth was more accessible to the wider society then it would be of high importance

P3: accessing the truth is near on impossible

P4: human experience [is subjective]

$$\begin{array}{c} 4 \\ \downarrow \\ \underline{2 + 3} \\ \downarrow \\ 1 \end{array}$$

Passage Two

Australians should be free to express themselves in any way they wish. There are a number of reasons why this is the case. If the government silences views that the majority disagree with, we could silence ideas that might be true. Also, even if this particular view is in error, there may be an aspect of truth in it. Individuals also need to develop the art of defending their beliefs. If views are silenced, there is no chance for individuals to defend them. The other danger of silencing certain views that we simply disagree with, but don't necessarily cause harm to others is that a lack of open discussion on certain issues will encourage intellectual laziness on behalf of our society.

MARKING GUIDE:

Area: Privacy and its limits

Argument structure:

1. If we silence views that the majority disagree with, we might silence truth (based on the acceptable assumption that the majority is not always right)
and
2. If the view is in error, there might be an aspect of truth in it.
and
3. Individuals need to develop the art of defending their beliefs.
and
4. Shutting down ideas we disagree with encourages intellectual laziness.
therefore
5. Australians should be free to express themselves in any way they wish.

Premise (1), (2), (3) and (4) offer individual convergent support to (5)

Passage Three

The degree to which works of art and literature give us an understanding into human nature and identity has been debated in philosophy. In William Golding's (1954) *Lord of the Flies*, the characters are not true representations of what humans are really like because they are just Goldings' unconscious wish-fulfillments as his deep subconscious thoughts are worked out onto the page. Secondly, Golding didn't copy characteristics from real life individuals to create his protagonists Ralph, Piggy and Jack but created them. So how can we expect them to reflect human nature? This is not just true of *Lord of the Flies*, but of all art and literature throughout time. This shows that characters in a work of literature are not true representations of what humans are really like.

MARKING GUIDE:

Area: How works of art and literature help the understanding of human nature and identity

Argument structure:

1. Characters in literature are reflections of the author's subconscious
so
2. Characters in literature cannot be true representations of human nature (Minor Conclusion 1)
and
3. Authors create characters, not copy them from real life
therefore
4. We should not expect them to reflect human nature (Minor Conclusion 2)
therefore
5. Characters in a work of literature are not true representations of what human are really like. (from 2 & 4)



Section Three: Extended argument**(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 2016

Question 19

No government should be given the right to spy on its citizens.

- **Privacy and its limits**

Question 20

Your culture is your identity.

- **The concept of culture, including shared values and social roles**

Question 21

Interpretations are relative to individual context.

- **Criteria for good interpretations, including coherence, consistency, comprehensive and consilience**

Question 22

Human Rights have no basis.

- **The concepts of rights**

Question 23

Meta-narratives represent reality.

- **Disputes about realism and the limits of interpretation, including modernism and postmodernism**