The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section One: Critical reasoning   **30% (30 Marks)**

Question 1

What are the three parts of any argument?

Premise (or reason), inference and conclusion	1 mark

Question 2

Explain what is meant by the term "weasel word".

A weasel word is a word or phrase in a statement that is intentionally ambiguous (i.e. euphemism) and is intended to create support (favourable or unfavourable) for the conclusion even though it has no precise meaning. (Or some similar explanation.)	1 mark

Question 3

Name the fallacy committed in the following argument and explain why it is a fallacy.

> Arguments are either deductively valid or they are completely lacking any cogency. The argument in your essay is not deductively valid. Therefore it is completely lacking any cogency.

False dichotomy	1 mark
An argument can be strong without being deductively valid.	1 mark

Question 4

Name the fallacy committed in the following argument and explain why it is a fallacy.

> If people don't vote for the Super Logical Party in tomorrow's election, then the economy is doomed and the country will go to rack and ruin. This election is critical to all our future prospects. Thus, I urge you to vote for the SLP and save us from a terrible outcome.

Scare tactics	1 mark
The only reason being given us an appeal to fear. No evidence is given that the fear is reasonable.	1 mark

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 5

Name the fallacy committed in the following argument and explain why it is a fallacy.

> Consciousness is not part of the physical world, since consciousness is non-physical.

Begging the question, or circular argument	1 mark
The conclusion is the same as the premise.	1 mark

Question 6

Numbers and underlines the argument as follows: (1) Modern adults need to get more exercise. One reason for this is that (2) they would be healthier. This is because (3) exercise improves the body's capacity to resist disease and decline. Another reason why people should get more exercise is that (4) they would be happier as a result of it. This is because (5) exercise improves our mental well-being.	1 mark

Maps the argument as follows:
 	
    (3)   (5)
 	
    ↓   ↓
 	
    (2)   (4)
 	
    ↓   ↓
 	
      (1)
	1 mark for
	(4) → (2) → (1)
	1 mark for
	(5) → (3) → (1)
	1 mark for (1) as final conclusion

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 7

Numbers and underlines the argument as follows: (1) <u>It will rain heavily tomorrow</u>, since (2) <u>that is what the Bureau of Meteorology is forecasting</u>. Therefore (3) <u>there is no need to water the garden today</u>.	1 mark
Maps the argument as follows: (2) ↓ (1) ↓ (3)	1 mark for (2) → (1) 1 mark for (1) → (3)
Evaluates the inferences as follows: (2) → (1)　Moderate or strong (1) → (3)　Moderate or strong	2 marks

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 8

Numbers and underlines the argument as follows: (1) <u>Canberra is further south than Albany</u>, since (2) <u>Adelaide is further south than Albany</u>, and (3) <u>Canberra is further south than Adelaide.</u>	1 mark

Maps the argument as follows:
 	
                     <u>(2) + (3)</u>
 	
                      ↓
 	
                      (1)
	1 mark for (2)+(3)→ (1)
	
	1 mark for (1) as conclusion

Evaluates the inference: Deductively valid.	1 mark

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 9

Numbers and underlines as follows: (1) <u>Either the universe was created by God or it came into existence without a cause or it has existed forever.</u> (2) <u>But the universe contains much evil</u>, so (3) <u>it can't have been created by God.</u> (4) <u>Also nothing can come into existence without a cause.</u> Therefore, (5) <u>the universe has existed forever.</u>	1 mark
Maps the argument as follows: (2) ⬇ <u>(1) + (3) + (4)</u> ⬇ (5)	
Maps (2) as leading to (3)	1 mark
Maps (1) + (3) + (4) as linked and leading to (5)	1 mark
Maps (5) as the final conlusion	1 mark

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 10

Maps the argument as follows: <u>(1) + (3) + (4) + (5)</u> ↓ (2)	
Maps (2) as final conclusion.	1 mark
Maps (1) + (3) + (4) + (5) as linked and leading to (2).	1 mark

Question 11

Maps the argument as follows: (2) ↓ <u>(4) + (1)</u> ↓ (3)	
Maps (3) as final conclusion.	1 mark
Maps (2) → (4)	1 mark
Maps (1) + (4) as linked and leading to (3).	1 mark

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section Two: Philosophical analysis   **40% (40 Marks)**

Question 12   **(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**

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2014

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Dot point: Self and Others: obligations to the non-human world.

Desiree: I want a mouse for a pet! It will cheer me up and make me happy to look after and worry about and care for a lovely little animal. I'll name the mouse "Stevie", yeah, that's a great name! Stevie will be my new best friend.

Explanation of care towards a particular animal, i.e. a pet, as opposed to a general moral approach to animals. Reasons given are selfish.

Ivan: Are you sure that's a good idea? I mean, what about the poor mouse, stuck in a cage in your house? Will that make the mouse happy?

Points out that Desiree's reasons for caring about one particular mouse are selfish reasons and asks her to consider another perspective.

Desiree: You mean "Stevie". Yes, of course it'll make Stevie happy. Stevie will love the cage because it will be a lovely home for a mouse like him! Much better than being out there in the big old bad world where the cat can get him! I can't bear the thought of poor Stevie being harmed by that mean old cat next door.

Anthropomorphising by naming the imaginary (yet-to-be-obtained) pet. Pretends to consider the perspective offered by Ivan but continues to elaborate on this plan of caring for one particular animal.

Ivan: But you aren't responsible for protecting a mouse from harm. After all, what about all the mice you can't save and keep in cages? And what about mice that are used for animal experimentation in order to help humans? Many mice are harmed for either natural reasons or in order to benefit humans.

Points out that Desiree's reasons are inconsistent as she is worried about one animal, her pet, but not other similar animals. Ivan points out that some animals are harmed to help humans. Using utilitarian reasoning this is a "greater good" argument in favour of animal experimentation and using Deontological reasoning this is a "duty to humans" argument that grants higher moral consideration to more complex animals.

Desiree: Don't say such things! That's awful! No-one should harm any other living creatures, it's just not nice and there isn't any good reason for it. At least I can save one of them. And besides, Stevie isn't just any mouse, he'll be my pet.

Doesn't really reply to Ivan's argument but uses an emotional response to end the discussion by making a universal claim. Resorts to relativism and specifies that this case is different because it refers to a pet. Using virtue ethics or ethics of care this may refer to the relationship between this particular mouse and the owner, but this excludes other similar animals because they don't have the same relationship.

Ivan: But where do you draw the line? Why Stevie and not the others? And what about other animals? I think you're being illogical, after all, you aren't even a vegetarian!

Points out that Desiree's reasons are inconsistent as she is worried about one animal, her pet, but not other similar animals and certainly not other animals more generally. Claims that if Desiree cared about avoiding harm to animals, then she wouldn't eat meat. Doesn't give a reason or explanation for this claim, just assumes it is true.

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 13   **(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**

School Curriculum and Standards Authority 2014

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Life After Death

Surely there must be some sort of existence after death. Life after death is a concept that has received attention for centuries. Many people have found this idea not only interesting but also meaningful. For example, the religious argument for behaving morally relies on God's existence and the promise of life after death. If there is no life after death, then there is no reason to behave morally! Many people are religious, and if there is no existence after death, then they are all deluded! Surely that many people cannot be deluded and therefore <u>there must be some kind of life after death.</u>

What Is Real? Conceptions of ultimate reality
- humanism, secular society, religion and ultimate values.

Poverty and Moral Obligation

<u>As an individual we do not have a moral obligation to help anyone that is suffering from poverty in foreign countries</u>. Investing money into developing countries does not help them and instead only creates further need and dependency. Only local people know what will be best for local people, and at no time has a group of foreigners succeeded in stabilizing a country other than their own. It is simply more efficient for us to take care of our own people, as we do have a moral obligation to look after the welfare of those in our own communities. If wealthy businesses and individuals invest their money back into their own society in order to create jobs, then this will result in a secure society for us to live in, which is more beneficial than donating to foreign aid.

How Should We Live? Self and others
- obligations to those in my society and to those outside my society

On Liberty

Those who believe in a liberal democracy believe that individuals should be free to say and believe in whatever they want, provided they do not cause harm to others. Liberals tell others that freedom of choice is of the utmost importance. As they believe freedom of choice is moral, they claim that society should be set up in such a way as to allow for maximum liberty. However, in making this claim, liberals fail to accept any other ways a society may run. For example, societies that do not value freedom as one of the highest values are seen as morally inferior. Governments that dictate and legislate on matters of religion, rights, speech and personal expression are deemed immoral. What this means then is that liberals do not tolerate these other forms of social governance or, if they do, then they tolerate something that they believe to be morally incorrect. Surely this means that <u>liberals aren't really all that tolerant.</u>

How should we live? Governance
- the concept of liberal democracy and its forms

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 14

Science is as subjective as any other form of inquiry

How Do We Know? Methods of inquiry
- the scientific method including falsification, the role of thought-experiment, deduction, induction and the problem of induction
- the method of sceptical doubt in philosophical inquiry

What is real? Scientific world view

- various relationships between science and society e.g. the assumption the scientific method is the dominant paradigm for reality
- the applicability of scientific studies for understanding human beings and their societies.

Question 15

Utopia is impossible.

How Do We Know? Imagination and interpretation
- the idea of a good society
- the concepts of utopia and dystopia in works of imagination.

Question 16

Tolerance is not a virtue.

How Do We Know? Analysing, clarifying and evaluating concepts
- the concepts of justice, fairness, liberty, equality, rights and tolerance

Question 17

Conformity is necessary to make social life possible.

What Is Real? Persons
- idea of social identity and social membership
- social conformity and the idea of individualism
- the concept of marginalisation.

Question 18

There are some values that are shared by all, regardless of their culture.

How Should We Live? Communities and cultures
- moral concepts in different cultures e.g. guilt, shame, saving face, respect, cooperation and honour.