PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

ATAR course examination 2016

Marking Key

Marking keys are an explicit statement about what the examining panel expect of candidates when they respond to particular examination items. They help ensure a consistent interpretation of the criteria that guide the awarding of marks.

Section One: Critical reasoning 30% (30 Marks)

Question 1 (2 marks)

If the British people vote to exit the European Union (EU), the effect of the exit on British agricultural export markets will be utterly devastating. British farmers will never be able to compete with countries in which labour is much cheaper, and the whole industry is likely to collapse. <u>The British people should not vote to exit the EU</u>.

For the above argument:

(a) Underline the conclusion. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The conclusion is underlined (see above)	1
Total	1

(b) Name the fallacy. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Appeal to adverse consequences such as scare tactics	1
Total	1

Question 2 (2 marks)

Marriage is nothing more than a legal commitment between two people who love each other, so there shouldn't even be a debate about whether gay marriage should be legal in our country.

For the above argument:

(a) Circle the inference indicator. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The inference indicator 'so' is circled. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

(b) Name the fallacy. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Definist fallacy	1
Total	1

Question 3   **(3 marks)**

(1) (I know a little boy who was perfectly normal and healthy before he got his four-year-old Measles-Mumps-Rubella (MMR) vaccinations), but (2) (he was diagnosed with autism a month later.) (3) (<u>If he hadn't had that MMR vaccination, he would never have developed autism.</u>)

For the above argument:

(a)   Underline the conclusion   (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The conclusion is underlined (see above)	1
Total	1

(b)   Bracket and number the separable statements.   (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The separable statements are bracketed and numbered exactly as shown above	1
Total	1

(c)   Name the fallacy.   (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Post hoc ergo propter hoc or post hoc fallacy	1
Total	1

Question 4 **(2 marks)**

Are the following statements analytic or synthetic?

(a)   Male polar bears eat their young.   (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Synthetic	1
Total	1

(b)   Psychology is the scientific study of the human mind and behaviour.   (1 mark)

Description	Marks
Analytic	1
Total	1

Question 5 **(2 marks)**

We should reframe the way we define staff reductions, so it isn't simply viewed as a foregrounding of cost saving, but instead takes account of a much more complex interplay of influences and drivers that facilitate opportunities for enhancing the ways in which we manage the movement of our workforce.

Give **two** concise reasons for why the sentence above is an example of 'weasel' words.

Description	Marks
The sentence is almost entirely jargon/weasel words **or** The sentence is intentionally meaningless **or** The sentence is intentionally unclear	1
The sentence puts forward a euphemism (an attempt to make something bad sound less so) for staff reductions (sackings)	1
Total	2

Question 6 **(2 marks)**

(a)   Red wine contains a powerful antioxidant, but too much red wine is bad for your health.

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence.   (1 mark)

(i)   <u>Red wine contains a powerful antioxidant and too much red wine is bad for your health.</u>

(ii)   Either too much red wine is bad for your health or red wine contains a powerful antioxidant.

Description	Marks
Sentence (i) is underlined as shown above	1
Total	1

(b)   You cannot join Mensa unless you have an IQ of more than 150 points.

Underline the sentence that means the same as the above sentence.   (1 mark)

(i)   <u>If you can join Mensa, then you have an IQ of more than 150 points.</u>

(ii)   If you have an IQ of more than 150 points, then you can join Mensa.

Description	Marks
Sentence (i) is underlined as shown above	1
Total	1

Question 7 **(4 marks)**

Construct a deductively-valid argument that uses **all** and **only** the following statements once.
Use a diagram to represent the argument you construct.

(1)   I am essentially a thinking thing.
(2)   I cannot doubt that I am thinking.
(3)   If I cannot doubt that I am thinking but I can doubt the existence of my body, I must be essentially a thinking thing.
(4)   I can doubt the existence of my body.
(5)   If I am doubting, then I am thinking.

Description	Marks
Diagram showing (5) as a premise supporting (2)	1
Diagram showing (2) (3) and (4) linked	1
Diagram showing (2) (3) and (4) supporting (1)	1
Diagram showing (1) as the main conclusion	1

(5)

↓

(2)   +   (4)   +   (3)

↓

(1)

	Total	4

Note: The conventions that need to be formally observed and applied correctly are:
• the arrow to represent a relationship of inference
• the placement of the arrow exactly between the premise (or linked premises) and the conclusion that are in the inferential relationship.

Question 8 **(6 marks)**

(1) (The environments that people live or work in should be free from all forms of discrimination.) This is because, firstly, (2) (living and working in environments that are free from discrimination promotes equality and human dignity), and, secondly, (3) (discrimination in all its forms whether racial, sexual, religious, etc. does not belong in our workplaces or in our society, more broadly.)

For the above argument:

(a) Bracket and number the separable statements. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The separable statements are bracketed and numbered exactly as shown above	1
Total	1

(b) Using the numbers you have given each proposition, draw a diagram of the argument. (2 marks)

Description	Marks
Diagram showing premise (2) giving convergent support to conclusion(1)	1
Diagram showing premise (3) giving convergent support to conclusion(1)	1
Candidates may use a different numbering system. They should receive the marks if their diagram is relevantly similar to the one above.	
Total	2

Note: The conventions that need to be formally observed and applied correctly are:
- the arrow to represent a relationship of inference
- the placement of the arrow exactly between the premise (or linked premises) and the conclusion that are in the inferential relationship.

(c) Evaluate the cogency of the argument. Circle the correct answer. (1 mark)

Cogent (Not cogent)

Description	Marks
The word 'not cogent' is circled	1
Total	1

Question 8 (continued)

(d) Give **two** reasons that could justify your evaluation of the cogency of the argument.

(2 marks)

Description	Marks
The argument is not cogent because it is circular **or** begs the question **or** the conclusion is a restatement of the premise labelled (3) above	1
The argument is not cogent because: The acceptability of the premise labelled (2) above is questionable because there might be circumstances where discrimination of certain kinds contributes promotes equality and human dignity (i.e. affirmative action, positive discrimination etc.) **or** The acceptability of the premise labelled (3) above is questionable because there might be certain kinds of discrimination that are an important part of our society or workplace	1
Total	**2**

Question 9   **(7 marks)**

(1) (If we had allowed the Federal Government to pass their new labour legislation, then ordinary Australians would have lost their rights at work and our living standards would have dramatically declined.) But (2) (we didn't allow it to pass,) so (3) (we won't lose our rights at work or suffer a dramatic decline in living standards.)

For the above argument:

(a)   Bracket and number the separable statements.   (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The separable statements are bracketed and numbered exactly as shown above	1
Total	**1**

(b)   Write in full and number the separable statements in the order in which they occur.
                                                                                         (3 marks)

Description	Marks
(1)If we had allowed the Federal Government to pass their new labour legislation, then ordinary Australians would have lost their rights at work and our living standards would have dramatically declined	1
(2) We didn't allow [the new labour legislation] to pass **or** (2) We didn't allow [the Federal Government's new labour legislation] to pass	1
(3) We won't lose our rights at work or suffer a dramatic decline in living standards **or** (3) We [ordinary Australians] won't lose our rights at work or suffer a dramatic decline in living standards	1
Total	**3**

(c)   Using the numbers you have given each proposition, draw a diagram of the argument.
                                                                                         (1 mark)

Description	Marks
(1) + (2) ↓ (3)	1
Total	**1**
Note: The conventions that need to be formally observed and applied correctly are: • the arrow to represent a relationship of inference • the placement of the arrow exactly between the premise (or linked premises) and the conclusion that are in the inferential relationship.	

Question 9 (continued)

(d)   Circle the word that best describes the strength of the inference.   (1 mark)

       (Weak)   Moderate   Strong

Description	Marks
The word 'weak' is circled	1
Total	**1**

(e)   Give **one** reason that justifies your evaluation of the inferential strength of the argument.
(1 mark)

Description	Marks
The argument is a logical non sequitur **or** The argument is a fallacy because it denies the antecedent **or** The conclusion does not follow from the premises, as the premise labelled (1) above does not tell us anything about what would happen if we didn't allow the new legislation to pass	1
Total	**1**

Section Two: Philosophical analysis and evaluation 40% (40 Marks)

Question 10 (20 marks)

The following dialogue is an excerpt from a community of inquiry.
You are required to:
- summarise the contributions of each participant (2 marks)
- clarify these contributions (6 marks)
- critically evaluate them. (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	
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	
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	2
Makes an assertion about cogency	1
Total	**0–2**
Overall total	**20**

Question 11 **(20 marks)**

Choose **one (1)** of the following texts and

- summarise the text (2 marks)
- clarify its meaning (8 marks)
- 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**

Section Three: Construction of argument 30% (30 Marks)

Use the marking key below for **Questions 12–16**.

Marks will be awarded for demonstration of
- philosophical understandings (10 marks)
- philosophical argument (15 marks)
- clarity and structure. (5 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 arguments	
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**