2012 Senior External Examination

Philosophy & Reason
Paper Two — Question book

Thursday 8 November 2012
1:15 pm to 4:25 pm

Time allowed

• Perusal time: 10 minutes
• Working time: 3 hours

Examination materials provided

• Paper Two — Question book
• Paper Two — Response book

Equipment allowed

• QSA-approved equipment

Directions

You may write in this book during perusal time.
Paper Two has two parts:
• Part A — Critical Reasoning
• Part B — Philosophy
Attempt all of Part A.
In Part B, you must attempt Question 1 and one other question.

Suggested time allocation

• Part A: 50 minutes
• Part B: 2 hours (1 hour per essay)
The suggested time allocation allows 10 minutes for checking responses.

Assessment

Assessment standards are at the end of this book.

After the examination session

Take this book when you leave.
Planning space
Planning space
Question 1

Consider the following inductive analogy.

When I was at school, 20 years ago, we didn’t have fancy computers and the internet to do our work for us. We learned the traditional way — history came from books, and maths by memorisation. Reading and writing was done with pencil and paper. If we had to do research for an assignment we would go to the library. In this way we became literate, and proficient in mental arithmetic. My classmates and I have gone on to lead successful, fulfilling lives.

I don’t understand what’s going on with my son — he seems to spend so much time at school in front of computers, his handwriting is shocking, and he can’t add up without a calculator. If only his school would get back to the basics, he too might stand a chance at getting ahead in life.

i. Explain the structure of the analogy by identifying its premises and conclusion.

ii. Evaluate the strength of the analogy, giving reasons to justify your evaluation.

Question 2

Identify and explain the fallacy in reasoning in the following cartoon.

"If I do my homework, I’ll get good grades. If I get good grades, you’ll send me to college. If I go to college, I’ll graduate and get a job. If I get a job, I might get fired. If I get fired, I could go bankrupt and lose everything. That’s why I didn’t do my homework!"
Question 3

Consider the following conversation.

Alex: Research shows that married people are significantly happier than single people. I’m tired of my miserable life, so I’m going to find a nice man, get married and settle down.

Bobbie: Have you considered that perhaps you should work on being a bit less grumpy first?

Bobbie suspects that Alex might be committing a fallacy of reasoning. Identify and explain this fallacy.

Question 4

Identify and explain the fallacy of reasoning in the following argument.

It’s a well-accepted fact that children who experience the loss of a pet while they are at school are susceptible to emotional stress, and that their grades might suffer. If I don’t get my kids a puppy in the first place, they should do well at school.

Question 5

Write a paragraph explaining the fallacy “appeal to authority” (ad verecundiam). Provide an example of its use in the media and comment on why it can be persuasive.

End of Part A
Part B — Philosophy

Part B has **five** questions. You **must** attempt Question 1, and **one** other question selected from Questions 2–5. Respond in essay form.

Each response should be approximately 600 words in length. Write your responses in the response book.

Suggested time allocation: **2 hours** (1 hour per essay).

---

**Question 1 — Ethics/Moral philosophy**

In Queensland, the legal system allows judges to impose sentences (i.e. punishments) upon people who are found guilty of committing a crime. The guidelines for such sentences are set out by the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992.

One of the purposes for which a sentence may be imposed is:

*to deter the offender or other persons from committing the same or a similar offence.*

Compare and contrast the views that a utilitarian and a Kantian might have of a sentence imposed for the purpose of deterrence.

---

**Question 2 — Philosophy of religion**

*Either*

Name and set out one of the traditional arguments for the existence of God. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of this argument, comparing and contrasting with other named arguments.

*or*

Set out the problem that the existence of evil poses against belief in the existence of God. Discuss the problem, presenting some of the typical philosophical responses.

---

**Question 3 — Philosophy of science**

Outline the traditional problem of induction and, through a discussion of at least one well-known “solution”, assess the relevance of the “problem” to science.

---

**Question 4 — Social and political philosophy**

What does it mean to be free? Compare the interpretation of the concept of freedom in two major political philosophies.

---

**Question 5 — Philosophy of mind**

Explain the main differences between dualist theories and materialist theories as responses to the mind–body problem. Name the individual theories included in your explanation.

---

End of Part B

End of Paper Two
## Assessment standards derived from the Philosophy & Reason Senior External Syllabus 2004

### Paper Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates accurate recall and extensive understanding of a comprehensive range of concepts, ideas, procedures and principles. Occasional minor errors may be made, but do not indicate fundamental misunderstandings.</td>
<td>The candidate demonstrates accurate recall and understanding of a range of concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
<td>The candidate recalls and describes most concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
<td>The candidate recalls and describes some concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
<td>The candidate describes few concepts, ideas, procedures and principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies and evaluates a wide range of simple and complex arguments, both sourced and artificial, and constructs well-supported arguments drawing on a wide range of inductive skills • outlines, analyses and evaluates philosophical theories, by: – explaining intrinsic concepts – explaining simple and complex relationships within and between theories – discerning and describing the application of theories in different contexts (including in the formulation of own and others’ views).</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies and evaluates a range of simple and complex arguments, both sourced and artificial, and constructs, with some support, arguments that draw on a range of inductive skills • outlines, analyses and evaluates philosophical theories, by explaining: – most intrinsic concepts – simple (and some complex) relationships within and between theories.</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies and evaluates simple arguments, and constructs arguments drawing on some inductive skills • outlines philosophical theories, and explains primary concepts.</td>
<td>The candidate: • classifies some simple arguments; few inductive skills are evident • describes some primary philosophical concepts.</td>
<td>The candidate: • occasionally classifies some simple arguments • describes very few philosophical concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>The candidate: • consistently and accurately employs discriminating vocabulary, and adheres to the conventions of language • consistently organises and presents information cogently and coherently, and communicates both evident and implied meaning effectively • produces explanations, descriptions, arguments and justifications that are precise, pertinent and purposeful.</td>
<td>The candidate: • consistently employs appropriate vocabulary, and adheres to the conventions of language • organises and presents information coherently, and communicates meaning effectively • produces clear and purposeful explanations, descriptions, arguments and justifications.</td>
<td>The candidate: • usually employs appropriate vocabulary and conventions of language • organises and presents information so that meaning is usually evident • produces explanations, descriptions and arguments that are adequate to convey intention.</td>
<td>The candidate: • makes some appropriate choices of vocabulary, and obeys some conventions of language • presents information and produces explanations that lack detail and clarity.</td>
<td>The candidate: • makes inconsistent and inaccurate choices of basic vocabulary and conventions of language • presents disjointed information and descriptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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