



PHILOSOPHY AND ETHICS

ATAR course examination 2023

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)

Are the following statements analytic or synthetic?

- (a) The name 'Dave' is short for 'David'. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
synthetic	1
Total	1

- (b) To be water-soluble is to have the capacity to dissolve in water. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
analytic	1
Total	1

Question 2

(3 marks)

- (a) Express the following sentence as a conditional (If X then Y) statement. (1 mark)

Either you climb the mountain or you take a nap.

Description	Marks
If you don't climb the mountain then you take a nap. or If you don't take a nap then you climb the mountain.	1
Total	1

- (b) Unless you are fit, you cannot climb Arunachala. (2 marks)

Underline the **two** sentences that mean the same as the above sentence.

- (i) If you can climb Arunachala, then you are fit.
 (ii) If you are fit, then you can climb Arunachala.
 (iii) Either you cannot climb Arunachala or you are fit.
 (iv) You cannot be fit unless you can climb Arunachala.

Description	Marks
Sentence (i) is underlined (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way)	1
Sentence (iii) is underlined (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way)	1
Total	2

Question 3

(3 marks)

(1) {I do not know that I am awake.} **For** (2) {if I know anything, then I know it with certainty,} and (3) {I am not certain that I am awake.}

For the above argument:

- (a) Circle any inference indicators. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The word 'For' is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as shown above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

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

Description	Marks
Brackets and numbers are placed in the locations as shown above.	1
Total	1
Note: Accept brackets placed before the punctuation.	

- (c) Using the numbers from part (b), draw a diagram of the argument. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
(2) + (3) ↓ (1)	1
Total	1

Question 4

(4 marks)

Vegetarianism is a morally dubious practice because Hitler was a vegetarian.

For the above argument:

- (a) Underline the conclusion. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The conclusion is underlined (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as shown above. Nothing else is underlined.	1
Total	1

- (b) Circle the inference indicator (1 mark)

Description	Marks
'because' is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as shown above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

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

Cogent

Not cogent

Description	Marks
The words 'Not cogent' are circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

- (d) Identify **one** reason that justifies your evaluation of the cogency. (1 mark)

Description	Marks
non sequitur (by irrelevantly associating Hitler with the practice of vegetarianism)	1
Total	1
Note: Accept 'guilt by association' or 'genetic' fallacy, or other plausible criticisms of the inference.	

Question 5

(4 marks)

- (a) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

Tamara’s manager must be guilty of religious discrimination, since Tamara was fired from her job at the supermarket after wearing a crucifix to work.

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

- (b) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

If we allow students to wear casual dress to school every day, they will not learn self-discipline. If they don’t learn self-discipline, they will become juvenile delinquents and end up in the prison system.

Description	Marks
slippery slope or slippery precedent or appeal to adverse consequences	1
Total	1

- (c) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

Either we adhere to the moral guidance provided by the Bible or we find ourselves lost in a sea of postmodern relativism, with no objective ethical standards.

Description	Marks
false dichotomy or false alternatives	1
Total	1

- (d) Name the fallacy committed in the following argument. (1 mark)

How can anyone doubt that the web browser I invented is the best one available, when it is so superior to all of the alternatives!

Description	Marks
begging the question or circular reasoning	1
Total	1

Question 6

(6 marks)

(1) {Excessive smartphone use is a genuine addiction.} (2) {An addiction is medically defined as any behaviour characterised by a recurrent failure to control it despite significant negative consequences.} (3) {Smartphone overuse has been shown to cause decreased cognitive functioning that is connected with sleep problems,} and (4) {it causes a reduction in grey matter volume in the brain.} (5) {It also causes a marked decrease in impulse control} and (6) {it causes an increase in reward seeking behaviours.}

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

Description	Marks
Brackets and numbers are placed in the locations as shown above.	1
Total	1
Note: Accept brackets placed before the punctuation.	

- (b) Circle the word that **best** describes the inferential strength of the argument. (1 mark)

Weak

Moderate

Strong

Description	Marks
The word 'Strong' is circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

- (c) Using the numbers from part (a), draw a diagram of the argument. (4 marks)

Description	Marks
(2) + (3) + (4) + (5) + (6) ↓ (1)	
Shows (2) linked with (3), (4), (5) and (6), supporting (1) as the conclusion.	4
Shows (2) linked with two or three other premises, supporting (1) as the conclusion.	3
Shows (2) linked with one other premise, supporting (1) as the conclusion or Shows (3) linked with (4), (5) and (6), supporting (1) as the conclusion.	2
Shows (1) as the conclusion.	1
Total	4

Question 7

(3 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) For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document
- (2) For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document
- (3) For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document
- (4) For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document
- (5) For copyright reasons this text cannot be reproduced in the online version of this document

Description	Marks
$(4) + (5)$ \downarrow $(2) + (1)$ \downarrow (3)	
Shows (4) and (5) linked to support (2)	1
Shows (2) and (1) linked to support (3)	1
Shows (3) as the main conclusion	1
Total	3

Question 8

(5 marks)

(1) {Widespread acceptance of cultural relativism would corrode the foundations of our society.} Why? Well, (2) {any behaviour would become acceptable} since (3) {people would believe, under cultural relativism, that there are no absolute moral standards.} (4) {Cultural relativism should thus be rejected.}

For the above argument:

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

Description	Marks
Brackets and numbers are placed in the locations as shown above.	1
Total	1
Note: Accept brackets placed before the punctuation.	

- (b) Write out the separable statements from part (a) in full. (2 marks)

Description	Marks
(1) Widespread acceptance of cultural relativism would corrode the foundations of our society.	1
(2) [If cultural relativism is widely accepted then] any behaviour would become acceptable.	
(3) People would believe, under cultural relativism, that there are no absolute moral standards.	1
(4) Cultural relativism should be rejected.	2
Total	

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

Cogent

Not cogent

Description	Marks
The words 'Not cogent' are circled (or otherwise indicated in a distinctive or unambiguous way) as above. Nothing else is circled.	1
Total	1

- (d) Identify **one** reason for your answer to part (c). (1 mark)

Description	Marks
The argument from (3) to (2) to (1) contains the fallacy of slippery slope. or The argument concluding in (4) contains an appeal to adverse consequences. or There is an implicit false dichotomy with options being either to believe in an objective moral standard or think that anything goes behaviour-wise. or There is a philosophical misunderstanding of what cultural relativism is. It is not the doctrine that says that anyone can do what they like.	1
Total	1

Section Two: Philosophical analysis and evaluation**40% (40 Marks)****Part A****20% (20 Marks)****Question 9****(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)
- evaluate them critically. (12 marks)

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Summary of the contributions of each participant	
Summarises accurately and succinctly the contributions of each participant.	2
Summarises accurately the contribution of only one participant.	1
Total	2
Criterion 2: Clarification of the contributions	
Clarifies the contributions of both participants succinctly and accurately by explaining their arguments, using relevant examples where appropriate. A clear and accurate understanding of the philosophical concepts at issue in the dialogue is demonstrated throughout.	6
Provides clarification of the contributions of both participants, but at times lacks brevity and accuracy. Some demonstration that philosophical concepts at issue in the dialogue are accurately understood.	4–5
Makes some relevant claims about the contributions of the participants, but merely describes rather than clarifies the arguments. Some errors in comprehending the philosophical concepts at issue in the dialogue.	2–3
Limited clarification of the contributions of either participant.	1
Subtotal	6
Criterion 3: Critical Evaluation	
Provides a targeted and coherent critical evaluation of the contributions of each participant in the context of a dialogue, giving clear reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency, correctly referring to fallacies where necessary, and accurately using the appropriate disciplinary terminology.	11–12
Provides a critical evaluation of the contributions of each participant in the context of a dialogue, giving some reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency, identifying some fallacies where necessary, and using the appropriate disciplinary terminology.	9–10
Some evidence of critical evaluation of the contributions of each participant, with stated reasons for premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. May not mention fallacies where relevant. Some inaccuracies using the appropriate disciplinary terminology.	7–8
Some evaluation of the contributions of each participant, with assertions about premise acceptability, inferential strength or overall cogency. May not mention fallacies where relevant. Disciplinary terminology used inaccurately or participant contributions not evaluated in their dialogic context.	5–6
Makes assertions about the cogency of the arguments presented by the participants. Disciplinary terminology used inaccurately and participant contributions not evaluated in their dialogic context.	3–4
Limited critical evaluation of the contributions.	1–2
Subtotal	12
Total	20
<p>Note: The following notes for Question 9 are not exhaustive and are to be used as a guide to judgement according to the marking key. Candidates are not required to make all of the following points to achieve full marks.</p>	

Question 9 (continued)

Analysis and evaluation

Summary:

Lena is arguing that parents should allow their growing children unlimited access to social media. Jenna is arguing that parents should not allow their children to use social media. Jenna's main argument is that denying social media access gives children a better chance of becoming well-adjusted individuals with a sense of worth and social identity that does not depend on validation from strangers. Lena's main argument is that unlimited social media access allows children to develop a proper sense of social identity and that without such access they will be marginalised.

Contribution 1 clarification:

Lena's argument:

Premise: Either parents should allow their children unlimited access to social media or they revert back to the pre-internet pen-and-paper age.

Conclusion: Parents should allow their children unlimited access to social media.

Critical evaluation:

It is not a cogent argument. It commits the fallacy of false dichotomy by implying in premise 1 that the only two options are to either allow one's children unlimited social media access or to forbid it altogether and have them revert to the pre-internet pen and paper age. There are clearly other options. A parent can allow their children access to the internet without it involving social media or they might restrict their children's social media use without denying them access altogether.

Contribution 2 clarification:

Jenna's main argument here is that parents should deny their children access to social media because it gives them a much better chance of becoming well-adjusted individuals. Two main reasons are given in support of the claim about well-adjustment: it avoids a major cause of depression and allows teens to develop a sense of self-worth that depends on things other than flimsy validation from those they don't know.

In more detail:

P1: The use of social media is linked to depression in teens.

C1: The use of social media is a major cause of depression in teens.

P2: With the use of social media, one's feeling of self-worth can easily depend on validation from people they don't know, such as how many 'likes' they get on a post.

C2: Denying access to social media improves the chances of one's self-worth such that it depends on more stable things, such as people that are actually known.

C3: Denying children access to social media gives them a much better chance of becoming a self-sufficient, well-adjusted individual.

Conclusion: Parents should deny their children access to social media.

Critical evaluation:

The overall argument does have merit insofar as the sub-conclusions C1 and C2 if true lend support to C3 and C3 lends support to the overall conclusion. The move from P1 to C1 involves the fallacy of inferring causation from correlation although the presence of a correlation indicates that there *could* be a causal story. The causal story could be filled in with a discussion about how emotional dependence on validation from strangers (e.g. 'likes') is so fickle that one could very easily feel marginalised and depressed when such desires are inevitably frustrated. One's sense of individual and social identity may in this way be built on highly disposable material. While P2 may come from reputable sources it would be fair to mention, given that Jenna just inferred causation from correlation, that we need more detail from the studies in support of P2. This, the move to C2, C2 itself, and the move from C2 and to C3 give a further chance for discussion about a growing person's sense of social identity in relation to social media. For example, when one's sense of social identity includes at its core in-person friends it is likely to be less volatile and more stable. But this doesn't show that social media access should be completely denied.

Jenna's argument could possibly be made stronger if her conclusion was that social media access should, instead, be somewhat limited.

Contribution 3 clarification:

Lena is responding to Jenna's claim that one can have self-esteem without social media use.

She is arguing that as we are social creatures, our self-esteem depends on social media use; one cannot develop self-esteem without it. One will be socially marginalised with a weak sense of social identity.

In more detail:

P1: We are social creatures who need to interact and cannot live in isolation.

P2: Social media is a prevalent form of social interaction in modern times.

C1: Our need for social interaction will have to be entirely met through social media.

C2: If children are denied access to social media, then they end up isolated with no friends.

P3: If a child grows up isolated with no friends, then they develop no self-esteem.

Conclusion: If a child is denied access to social media then they develop no self-esteem.

Critical evaluation:

The inference from P1 and P2 to C1 is, on a plausible reading of P2, weak. If C1 were true it would lend strong support to C2. The inference from C2 and P3 through to the main conclusion is valid (hypothetical syllogism). The argument is not cogent as it stands, although if made less extreme it could be good. P1 is for the most part acceptable. P2 is acceptable if 'prevalent' means 'widespread' or 'common'. However, if 'prevalent' is taken to mean something like 'exclusively dominant' then P2 becomes implausible since the use of social media is in modern times not an exclusively dominant form of social interaction. There is still much face-to-face verbal and non-verbal social communication or online interaction, such as email that is not social-media based. It is only on the implausibly strong reading that P2 (with P1) lends strong support to C1. If C1 were true then it would provide strong support for C2, but the unacceptability of C1 means that C2 has little support from C1. As a stand-alone statement C2 can be seen to commit the fallacy of slippery slope. This statement is too extreme to be acceptable as there are obvious cases of children, even in a social-media climate, who are not friendless outcasts despite not using social media. That said, it can be argued in favour of C2 (or weaker variant) that being completely left out of social media groups can contribute to a child being marginalised, such as not being invited to things. This marginalisation could lead to a compromised sense of social identity and with it, depression, thereby countering Jenna's point about social media causing depression. P3 is acceptable, since having friendships when in a social context can be seen as an important part of developing a healthy sense of self-identity within a community. To the extent that C2 is plausible/implausible, the main conclusion is supported or unsupported by this argument. Its rather extreme formulation detracts from its acceptability. The truth may lie somewhere in between.

Contribution 4 Clarification: Jenna responds with two short arguments:

The first argument:

Premise: Becky's friends come over regularly and hang out at the house.

Conclusion: Becky has a happy in-person social life.

The second argument:

P1: Bill will be glued to his device.

P2: Being glued to one's device is unsocial by definition.

C: Bill will not have any friends.

Critical evaluation:

The first argument is cogent. The premise is acceptable. Becky's mum Jenna is in a good position to know what happens at the house they share. It provides good support for the conclusion and a further counter to Lena's previous argument. The second argument is not cogent. P1 is not acceptable as it is based on speculation given Lena's remarks about social media. P2 commits the definist fallacy by defining being 'glued to one's device' as unsocial behaviour. And even if being glued to his device is unsocial behaviour that Bill engages in, then unless he is glued to the phone 24/7 it does not imply that he will not also engage in social behaviour or lack friends.

Part B

20% (20 Marks)

Question 10

(20 marks)

Choose **one** of the following passages and:

- summarise the passage (2 marks)
- clarify its argument (8 marks)
- evaluate it critically. (10 marks)

Description	Marks
Criterion 1: Summary of the passage	
Summarises the passage accurately and succinctly.	2
Summarises the passage only partially or with only partial accuracy.	1
Total	2
Criterion 2: Clarification of the argument of the passage	
Clarifies the argument of the passage succinctly and accurately by explaining its inferential structure, correctly identifying its main conclusion and the rationales (sub-arguments, premises, or examples) advanced in support. Demonstrated proficiency with philosophical concepts at issue in the passage.	8
Provides clarification of the argument of the passage and its inferential structure, identifying its main conclusion and the rationales advanced in support, but at times lacks in brevity and accuracy. Some evidence of proficiency with philosophical concepts at issue in the passage.	6–7
Provides clarification of the argument of the passage and its inferential structure, but at times lacks in brevity and accuracy. May demonstrate some misunderstandings of the argument structure and/or the philosophical concepts at issue in the passage.	4–5
Makes some relevant claims about the argument of the passage, but merely describes rather than clarifies the inferential structure and philosophical concepts.	2–3
Limited clarification of the argument of the passage.	1
Subtotal	8
Criterion 3: Critical evaluation of the passage	
Provides a targeted and coherent critical evaluation of the passage giving clear reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. Where relevant, fallacies are correctly identified, theoretical positions are clarified, counter arguments are elaborated and the disciplinary terminology is used appropriately.	9–10
Provides a critical evaluation of the passage giving some reasons for the stated evaluation of premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. Some evidence of having identified fallacies, clarified theoretical positions and elaborated counter arguments where relevant, with appropriate use of the disciplinary terminology.	7–8
Some evidence of critical evaluation of the passage with stated reasons for premise acceptability, inferential strength and overall cogency. May not mention fallacies or counter arguments where relevant. Some inaccuracies using the appropriate disciplinary terminology or in demonstrated understandings of the relevant theoretical viewpoints.	5–6
Some evaluation of the passage, with assertions about premise acceptability, inferential strength or overall cogency. May not mention fallacies or counter arguments where relevant. Disciplinary terminology used inaccurately.	4–5
Makes assertions about the cogency of the argument in the passage. No mention of fallacies or counter arguments where relevant.	2–3
Limited critical evaluation of the passage.	1
Subtotal	10
Total	20
<p>Note: The following model answers and notes for Passages One, Two and Three are not exhaustive and are to be used as a guide to judgement according to the marking key. Candidates are not required to make all of the following points to achieve full marks.</p>	

Passage One

Summary:

This passage is about the usefulness of the concept of human rights in social and political debates. It provides an argument to the conclusion that this concept has no legitimate role to play in such debates.

Clarification:

The conclusion is the opening sentence: "In social and political debates the many appeals we hear to the concept of 'human rights' can safely be ignored by any rational person." The argument has a convergent structure, with sub-arguments for three distinct sub-conclusions, each of which – plus a premise – is supposed to provide some independent support for the conclusion.

P1: The whole concept of human rights is a recent invention of the modern West.

SC1: The notion [of human rights] is nothing but a convenient fiction (P1).

SC2: [Unstated]. It is not the case that human rights exist objectively, regardless of what anyone thinks (SC1).

P2: The governments that make the biggest noise about human rights on the international stage are invariably the most flagrant violators of those so-called rights.

SC3: We can't take the pronouncements of those governments on the matter of human rights seriously (P2).

P3: No physicists, chemists, or biologists have ever discovered anything like human rights in their studies of the natural world.

SC4: Believing in rights is incompatible with the scientific worldview (P3).

P4: Jeremy Bentham famously said that talk of rights is nothing but 'nonsense on stilts' and should be replaced with more rigorous and realistic talk of pleasure, pain, and the consequences of actions.

C: The many appeals we hear to the concept of 'human rights' in social and political debates can safely be ignored by any rational person (SC2, SC3, SC4, P4).

Evaluation:

The move from P1 to SC1 is flagrantly invalid and non-cogent; lots of concepts (e.g. spacetime, genes, quantum fields) are recent inventions of the modern West, but are not therefore convenient fictions. The move from SC1 to SC2 is valid.

The move from SC2 to C is controversial – do things like rights need to 'exist objectively, regardless of what anyone thinks' in order for us to take them seriously? In other words, do moral truths need to exist in a 'mind-independent' way to have any claim on us? There is room to argue 'yes, because the authority moral claims have over us is predicated on their supposed objectivity', and room to argue 'no, moral truths arise out of human interaction and are different in kind from empirical facts' – both are respectable positions in meta-ethics.

The move from P2 to SC3 is an ad hominem fallacy, though students need not name the fallacy to diagnose the error: the behaviour of governments is irrelevant to the truth of their claims about human rights. Their behaviour might constitute a legitimate ground for moral criticism of their conduct, but it does not impugn the truth of their pronouncements. The move from SC3 to C can also be criticised: even if we can ignore governments' pronouncements about human rights, that doesn't mean we can ignore **all** appeals to the concept in social and political debates (governments aren't the only ones who make such appeals).

The move from P3 to SC4 is invalid; it relies on the implausible unstated premise that belief in anything not discovered by physicists, chemists or biologists is incompatible with the scientific worldview. What about things discovered by geologists, psychologists, economists ...? And what about the idea that 'the scientific worldview' – an ambiguous phrase – can have room for belief in things not discovered by science at all? The move from SC4 to C is controversial and could be criticised or defended – it relies on compatibility with the scientific worldview as a necessary condition for taking something seriously, and good

Question 10 (continued)

arguments can be given in both directions. Again, issues about treating moral claims as similar in kind to scientific claims arise.

The move from P4 to C is an appeal to inappropriate authority, though, again, students need not name the fallacy to diagnose the error: the fact that Bentham said it is no good reason to think it's true.

Passage Two**Summary:**

This passage is about the relationship of faith, belief and knowledge. It provides an argument to the conclusion that our certainties are not grounded in knowledge but in faith.

Clarification:

The conclusion is the opening sentence: 'All belief ultimately rests on faith.'

P1: To know that a typical dog has four legs is to be able to offer evidence for this claim.

P2: Evidence for the belief that dogs have four legs would have to be more certain than our belief that dogs have four legs.

P3: Nothing is more certain to us than that dogs have four legs.

SC1: We cannot know that dogs have four legs (P1, P2 and P3 linked).

P4: We cannot doubt that dogs have four legs.

SC2: We must accept the certainty that dogs have four legs (SC1 and P4 linked).

P5: That dogs have four legs is a textbook example of common sense.

C: All belief ultimately rests on faith (SC2 and P5 linked).

Evaluation:

The move from P1, P2 and P3 to SC1 is valid, however, the acceptability of P2 is questionable: it seems subject to counter-example. For example, few things seem more certain than that the sun will rise tomorrow, but the evidence we can appeal to support this from physics is not more certain than the belief it supports.

While P1 is uncontroversial, the acceptability of P3 can be questioned. For example, Descartes thought the existence of the thinking self was not subject to doubt, while the existence of our physical bodies (and hence dogs' legs) was subject to doubt. Moreover, other claims, including analytical truths such as $2 + 2 = 4$, seem more certain than the existence of dogs' legs.

The move from SC1 and P4 to SC2 seems to rely on the unstated assumption that we either know something, doubt it, or accept it as a certainty. The acceptability of P4 is questionable. In fact, this begs the question against scepticism. (Could also appeal here to Descartes' doubt about the existence of dogs' legs.

P5 is non-controversial, however, the move from SC2 and P5 to C is invalid. The move from a premise that some particular belief (that dogs have four legs) or set of beliefs (common sense beliefs) rests on faith to a conclusion that **all** belief rests on faith is a hasty generalisation (hasty generalisation is a Unit 2 (Year 11) fallacy, but it does not need to be named here to make the point). It admits of counter-example: analytical truths (such as that $2 + 2 = 4$) do not rest on faith. It is not just that we couldn't get on practically in the world if we doubted such analytical propositions, but rather that it makes no sense to doubt them.

Passage Three

Summary:

This passage is about the relationship between a creationist worldview and evolution by natural selection. It provides an argument for the conclusion that creationism and evolution are not on par as theories of the same kind.

Clarification:

The conclusion of the passage is that advocates of a creationist worldview are wrong to think that creationism and evolution by natural selection are on par. This is stated in the third sentence, and repeated in the final sentence of the passage.

The major thrust of the argument could be represented as follows:

1. Advocates of a creationist worldview claim that evolution is on par with the belief in 7-day creation (Premise)
2. According to the internet, evolution by natural selection is one of the most robustly supported ideas in modern science (Premise)
3. Everybody knows that creationism lacks any scientific evidence (Premise)
4. Creationism lacks any scientific evidence (3)
5. Advocates of a creationist worldview are wrong to claim that evolution is on par with the belief in seven-day creation (1+2+4, linked)

There is also a secondary argument about the ambiguous meaning of the word “theory” in its speculative and scientific senses that could be represented as follows:

6. In a scientific context, a theory is an explanation of some aspect of the natural world that is well-substantiated by evidence (Premise)
7. Evolution is a scientific theory (2+6, linked)
8. Creationism is not falsifiable (Premise)
9. Creationism is sheer speculation (Premise)
10. Creationism is not a scientific theory (6+8+9, linked)

Evaluation:

The move from 3 to 4 involves a fallacious appeal to popularity (*ad populum*): a move from the claim that it is common knowledge that creationism lacks evidence to the conclusion that it in fact does lack evidence. A charitable reading of 4 may see that it is not supported by 3, but is itself an acceptable, common sense starting premise.

The move from 1, 2, and 4 to 5 lacks cogency. P2 fails to support the claim that there is evidence for evolution because it appeals to a potentially irrelevant authority (the internet). 1 is acceptable: though there are surely advocates of a creationist worldview who do not think creationism is on par with evolution, we must assume this is a good faith statement of a real opponent’s position that is “often” made and not a straw man.

The validity of the move from 6, 8 and 9 to 10 can be questioned – especially the move from 8 to 10: The falsifiability criterion is extremely controversial and not widely accepted nowadays in philosophy of science. Further, the acceptability of 8 is questionable – it claims that creationism is not falsifiable. However, one could argue not only that creationism is falsifiable but that has in fact been falsified by pointing out that it is inconsistent with observational evidence (for example, with the fossil record).

The move from 2 and 6 to 7 is not cogent. 6 is acceptable (it is not a fallacious definition). But the appeal to potentially irrelevant authority in 2 undermines the inference to 7.

Section Three: Construction of argument

30% (30 Marks)

Marks will be awarded for demonstration of:

- philosophical understandings (10 marks)
- philosophical argument (15 marks)
- clarity and structure. (5 marks)

The marking key below applies to Questions 11 to 15.

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
Subtotal	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
Limited relevant argument (e.g. fails to address the question).	1
Subtotal	15
Criterion 3: Clarity and structure	
Writes with structure and clarity (e.g. clarifies key terms, sign-posts key steps of the argument, logical ordering of topics).	4–5
Writes with some structure and some clarity.	2–3
Limited structure and clarity (e.g. fails to clarify key terms, unclear argument structure).	1
Total	5
Total	30

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Question 7

Statements (1)–(5) adapted from: Craig, W. L. (1979). *The Kalām Cosmological Argument*. Macmillan Press.

Copyright

© School Curriculum and Standards Authority, 2023

This document – apart from any third party copyright material contained in it – may be freely copied, or communicated on an intranet, for non-commercial purposes in educational institutions, provided that it is not changed and that the School Curriculum and Standards Authority (the Authority) is acknowledged as the copyright owner, and that the Authority's moral rights are not infringed.

Copying or communication for any other purpose can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with prior written permission of the Authority. Copying or communication of any third party copyright material can be done only within the terms of the *Copyright Act 1968* or with permission of the copyright owners.

Any content in this document that has been derived from the Australian Curriculum may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons [Attribution 4.0 International \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) licence.

An *Acknowledgements variation* document is available on the Authority website.

*Published by the School Curriculum and Standards Authority of Western Australia
303 Sevenoaks Street
CANNINGTON WA 6107*