

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section One: Critical reasoning

30% (30 Marks)

Question 1

What are the three components in any argument?

Reason(s) or premise(s); Inference(s); and conclusion	1 mark
---	--------

Question 2

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

People who advocate the teaching of philosophy in schools really just want to indoctrinate students with their own ideas.

Straw man	1 mark
It attacks a position for advocating something that it doesn't actually advocate.	1 mark

Question 3

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

You have to choose: either become an atheist or a theist. Studying the issues will help you make a wise choice. Therefore, you should study the issues between theism and atheism.

False dichotomy	1 mark
There is a third alternative, agnosticism, so the first premise is false.	1 mark

Question 4

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

Driving dangerously is illegal, because it is prohibited by the law.

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

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 5

Explain what is meant by the term “weasel word”.

<p>A weasel word is a word or phrase in a statement that is intentionally misleading and is intended to create support (favourable or unfavourable) for the conclusion even though it has no precise meaning. (Or some similar explanation.)</p>	<p>1 mark</p>
---	---------------

Question 6

<p>Numbers the argument as follows: (1) World peace will never be achieved. We know this from the fact that (2) no matter how far back we look into the past we find wars taking place somewhere. We also know it from the fact that (3) human nature is inherently competitive.</p>	<p>1 mark</p>
<p>Maps the argument as follows:</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-left: 200px;"> <p>(2) (3)</p> <p>↓ ↓</p> <p>(1)</p> </div>	<p>1 mark for (2) → (1) 1 mark for (3) → (1)</p>

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 7

<p>Number the statements, bracket the premises and underline the conclusion in the following argument and evaluate the inferences.</p> <p>(1) The price of platinum is bound to rise, since (2) platinum reserves are in decline and (3) demand for platinum will remain strong. Therefore (4) platinum shareholders will see the value of their stocks go up.</p>	<p>1 mark</p>
<p>Maps the argument as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(2) + (3) ↓ (1) ↓ (4)</p>	<p>1 mark for (2) + (3) → (1) 1 mark for (1) → (4)</p>
<p>Evaluates the inferences as follows:</p> <p>(2)+ (3) → (1) Moderate or strong (1) → (4) Moderate or strong</p>	<p>1 mark for each</p>

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 8

<p>Number the statements, bracket the premises and underline the conclusion in the argument:</p> <p>(1) {Bulgaria has a common border with Turkey}, and also (2) {a common border with Serbia}. It follows that (3) <u>Turkey has a common border with Serbia.</u></p>	<p>1 mark</p>
<p>Maps the argument as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">(1) + (2) ↓ (3)</p>	<p>1 mark for (1)+(2)→ (3)</p>
<p>Evaluates the inference: Deductively invalid. Nil or weak validity.</p>	<p>1 mark</p>

Question 9

<p>Numbers statements and underlines conclusions as follows:</p> <p>(1) The government will not lose the election unless it makes a major blunder. But (2) some of its ministers are very risk-prone. However, (3) they may not have time to cause a problem. Given this, (4) <u>it seems likely the government will not lose.</u></p>	<p>1 mark</p>
<p>Maps the argument as follows:</p> <p>(1) + (2) + (3) ↓ (4)</p>	<p>1 mark</p>

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 10

<p>Numbers statements and underlines conclusions as follows:</p> <p>(1) <u>Some forms of violence are morally justified</u>. (2) One obvious form of justified violence is violence in self-defence. Also (3) accidental violence is not morally wrong.</p>	1 mark
<p>Maps the argument as follows:</p> <p>(2) (3)</p> <p> ↓ ↓</p> <p> (1)</p>	
Maps (2) → (1)	1 mark
Maps (3) → (1)	1 mark

Question 11

<p>Diagram the following statements so that they form the strongest possible argument.</p> <p>(1) Glycogen is a form of sugar (2) Glycogen does not contain phosphorus (3) All sugars are forms of carbohydrate (4) Carbohydrates are made up of carbon, hydrogen and oxygen molecules only</p>	
<p>Diagrams the argument as follows:</p> <p>(1) + (3) + (4)</p> <p> ↓</p> <p> (2)</p>	
Maps (1) + (3) + (4) as linked and leading to (2)	2 marks
Maps (2) as the final conclusion	1 mark

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 12

<p>Diagram the following statements so that they form the strongest possible argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Spanish is the main language in at least 10 countries (2) Spanish is the main language in Spain, Argentina, Mexico and central America (3) There are seven countries in central America 	
<p>Diagrams the argument as follows:</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-left: 200px;"> <p>(3) + (2)</p> <p>↓</p> <p>(1)</p> </div>	
<p>Maps (2) + (3) as linked and leading to (1)</p>	<p>2 marks</p>
<p>Maps (1) as the final conclusion</p>	<p>1 mark</p>

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Section Two: Philosophical analysis

40% (40 Marks)

Question 12

(20 marks)

In the following dialogue, 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)

Dialogue Topic

- Methods of Inquiry: scientific method and phenomenology

Rachel's arguments in propositional form

1. Others have experienced and tested the world before me.
2. Those others who have tested it see the world in much the same way that I do.
3. Therefore, the world is as it seems to me.

1. Women and men have been socialised differently.
2. Women and men essentially live a human life and have human sensations.
3. Therefore, women and men are essentially the same: rational beings.

Phil's arguments in propositional form

1. Males and females are distinct.
2. Therefore, males and females experience the world differently.
3. It can be shown that men sometimes do not understand what it is like to be a woman.
4. Either we don't only define ourselves in terms of rationality or we miss out understanding and experiencing embodied and emotional experiences.
5. Therefore, we should not restrict or limit women's choices.

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

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

On justice and survival

The rule of nature, the instinct to survive, is absolute. Try as one might, nature’s pervasiveness creeps into everything. In the same way that we have seen the ancient cities of the Mayans and the Babylonians consumed by jungle or desert, nature takes over all of humanity’s effort to be anything other than what nature dictates. Society is where we see this power of nature at work. Despite our best efforts to ensure justice for people, the force at work within people endlessly undermines it. We see this acted out daily from courts of law where innocent people suffer, through to commercial interests destroying the environment. Justice conflicts with the rule of nature. Therefore, we seek justice for others and ourselves yet, the battle within that drives us to survive will always undermine our best intentions.

P1: The rule of nature, the instinct to survive, is absolute.

P2: Nature takes over all of humanity’s effort to be anything other than what nature dictates.

P4: Justice conflicts with the rule of nature.

MC: We seek justice for others and ourselves however, the battle within that drives us to survive will always undermine our best intentions to seek justice.

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

- The concepts of justice, fairness, liberty, equality, rights and tolerance

On utopia

The concept of a utopia as a perfectly functioning society only exists as a picture in the human imagination. This is because such societies would inevitably run into problems due to the nature of human behaviour and the fact that we are inherently flawed. Also, since societies are made up of people, there will always be issues, problems and conflicts that cause unrest. Furthermore, what is perfect for one person could be imperfect for another. As such utopias can only ever be imagined and never actualized.

P1: Human behavior and humans themselves are by their nature flawed.

P2(mc): Utopian societies would inevitably run into problems.

P3: What is perfect for one person could be imperfect for another.

P4(implicit): Utopias are imaginations of perfections.

C: Utopias can only ever be imagined and never actualized.

$$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ \downarrow \\ 2 \quad \underline{3+4} \\ \downarrow \quad \downarrow \\ 5 \end{array}$$

- the idea of a good society
- the concepts of utopia and dystopia in works of imagination

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

On utilitarianism

Utilitarianism is based on the principle of Utility – it states that an action is good or right if it brings the greatest happiness to the greatest number. For example, the Brazilian government is proposing the construction of a hydro-dam. They say that the dam will improve the living conditions for the majority by reducing Brazil's carbon footprint, which will bring benefit to future generations. However, this serves to demonstrate that Utilitarianism is an immoral theory. Utilitarianism fails to consider the welfare of those in the minority. This is shown by the fact that the construction of the dam will lead to some riverside dwellers losing their fishing livelihood. In addition, it may wipe out some aspects of the small indigenous population altogether and could extinguish many species of flora and fauna.

P1: The construction of the dam will lead to some riverside dwellers losing their fishing livelihood.

P2: The construction of the dam may wipe out some aspects of the small indigenous population altogether.

P3: The construction of the dam could extinguish many species of flora and fauna.

P4(mc): Utilitarianism fails to consider the welfare of those in the minority.

MC: Utilitarianism is an immoral theory.

$$\underline{1 + 2 + 3}$$

↓

4

↓

5

- moral theories in ethical decision making, including utilitarianism and deontology

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 2015

The Association for Philosophy in Schools (Inc)

Question 14

A democratic society is intrinsically good.

- The idea of a good society

or

Question 15

We have no moral obligation to a future society.

- Obligations to those in my society and to those outside my society

or

Question 16

Too much liberty leads to the loss of freedom.

- The concepts of socialism, liberalism and libertarianism

or

Question 17

If we doubt everything we can never trust anything.

- The method of skeptical doubt in philosophical inquiry

or

Question 18

A good society is based on public goods.

- The concepts of social policy, social planning, and public goods