

Started on	Sunday, 5 March 2023, 6:37 PM
State	Finished
Completed on	Friday, 17 March 2023, 8:16 PM
Time taken	12 days 1 hour
Grade	26.00 out of 30.00 (87%)

[Print friendly format](#)

Question 1

Correct

Mark 5.00 out of 5.00

Question 1a

Read the following passage from a newspaper report and then answer the question below:

The filmmakers of the documentary "Machine" spent a year researching the state of artificial intelligence (AI), in the hope their documentary might provoke some serious thinking on the subject before it's too late. "There's a lot of decisions we're making right now that will have ripple effects for decades to come," says Justin Krook, the director of the film. "In the whole history of humanity we've never had so much power at our disposal, and we only have one chance to get these decisions right". Given this, the filmmakers contend, it is important to consider the potential consequences and ethical implications of AI now – before it becomes more advanced. Michael Hilliard, one of the film's producers, admits that right now, "the machine is not actually that smart". But that doesn't mean it's not to be feared: as the filmmakers argue, decisions we make in 2019, 2020 will affect the world in 2050 and 2060.

(Adapted from a report in The Age newspaper, 2019)

Which one of the following most accurately represents the main conclusion of the argument reported above?

Select one:

- ☐ The filmmakers of the documentary "Machine" spent a year researching the state of artificial intelligence (AI), in the hope their documentary might provoke some serious thinking on the subject before it's too late.
- ☒ It is important to consider the potential consequences and ethical implications of AI now – before it becomes more advanced. ✔ That's the right answer, well done! Note the conclusion indicator phrase, "**Given this**, the filmmakers contend..."
- ☐ Right now, artificial intelligence is not actually that smart.
- ☐ We only have one chance to get decisions about artificial intelligence right.
- ☐ Decisions we make in 2019, 2020 will affect the world in 2050 and 2060.

The correct answer is:

It is important to consider the potential consequences and ethical implications of AI now – before it becomes more advanced.

Question 2

Correct

Mark 5.00 out of 5.00

Question 1b

Read the following passage from a newspaper report and then answer the question below:

When the COVID-19 pandemic arrived in Australia in the early days of 2020, employees and employers scrambled to implement work-from-home policies. As restrictions eased across Australia in 2022, employers found themselves in a tug of war with employees who were keen to retain their new-found pandemic privileges. Amantha Imber, founder of behavioural science consultancy Inventium, says that employers need to continue offering flexible work arrangements in order to attract and retain talent. The evidence is hard to argue with: in November 2022, the most searched term on SEEK was "working from home", and businesses are seeing an ever-growing number of requests to keep pandemic policies, such as flexible working, in the new year.

(Adapted from a report in The Age newspaper, 2023)

Which one of the following most accurately represents the main conclusion of the argument reported above?

Select one:

- ☐ When the COVID-19 pandemic arrived in Australia in the early days of 2020, employees and employers scrambled to implement work-from-home policies.
- ☒ Employers need to continue offering flexible work arrangements in order to attract and retain talent. ✔ That's the right answer, well done!
- ☐ As restrictions eased across Australia in 2022, employers found themselves in a tug of war with employees who were keen to retain their new-found pandemic privileges.
- ☐ In November 2022, the most searched term on SEEK was "working from home".
- ☐ Businesses are seeing an ever-growing number of requests to keep pandemic policies, such as flexible working, in the new year.

The correct answer is:

Employers need to continue offering flexible work arrangements in order to attract and retain talent.

Information

Question 2: Evaluating simple arguments

Write a short evaluation of each of the following two arguments, answering the following questions:

- (1) Do the premises provide **deductive support** the conclusion? That is, *if* all the premises were all true, would they provide a sufficient reason to accept the conclusion?
- (2) Are the premises all **true**? If you do not know whether a premise is true, you can either do some research to find out (stating your sources) or say what sources you would need to use to find out the answer. Even if a premise is not a straightforwardly factual matter, you should (a) state whether you would accept the premise or not and (b) give at least one reason why or why not.
- (3) Overall, is the argument **sound**? Briefly explain why or why not.

Approximately 100-150 words per argument

Marking scheme

		Comments
Discussion of whether the premises support the conclusion	/4	
Discussion of the truth of each premise	/4	
Overall evaluation of the argument	/2	
TOTAL	/10	

EXAMPLE ANSWERS for this type of question:

Example 1

1. All ungulates have hooves
2. Goats do not have hooves

Therefore:

C. Goats are not ungulates

(1) If the premises were all true, the conclusion would have to be true too, so the premises support the conclusion. If goats do not have hooves, then they cannot be ungulates if the first premise is true.

(2) The term 'ungulate' can be defined as 'animal with hooves' so the first premise is true. Information found on Wikipedia states that

(2) The term ungulate can be defined as animal with hooves, so the first premise is true. Information found on Wikipedia states that goats do have hooves however, so the second premise is false. (Sources: Wikipedia entry on 'ungulate': <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ungulate>).

(3) Overall, the argument is not sound. Although the premises support the conclusion, the second premise is false.

Example 2

1. Illegally downloading a film or television series is morally equivalent to stealing.

2. Stealing is sometimes morally wrong.

Therefore:

C. Illegally downloading a film or television series is morally wrong.

(1) The premises do not support the conclusion because the second premise only says that stealing is sometimes wrong. So even if illegally downloading a film or TV series is stealing, it might be a case of stealing that is not morally wrong. The second premise leaves this possibility open. (If the second premise stated that stealing is always morally wrong, the premises would support the conclusion).

(2) The first premise is arguable. A reason for not accepting it might be that when you illegally download a film or TV series, you do not thereby deprive the owner of it: they still own it. This is unlike stealing someone's handbag, since by doing that you really do deprive the owner of their property: they no longer have their handbag. A reason for accepting the premise might be that downloading does deprive the owner of the money they would have received if you had legally purchased the film or TV series. I think that the deprivation of something of value is what makes stealing morally wrong, so I will accept this premise as true. The second premise, as stated, is true – it surely is sometimes morally wrong to steal, even if it is not always wrong. For example, it is morally wrong to steal money from someone who needs it more than you.

(3) Overall the argument is not sound. Even if we accept both premises as true, the premises would still not be sufficient to support the conclusion.

Question 3

Complete

Mark 7.00 out of 10.00

Argument 1

1. Primates are the only mammals with opposable digits.

2. Pandas are not primates.

Therefore,

C. Pandas do not have opposable digits.

(1) Do the premises deductively support the conclusion (is the argument valid)?

Yes, the argument is deductively valid. The first premise states that only primates have opposable digits, and the second premise states that pandas are not primates. If assuming both premises are true, it logically follows that pandas do not have opposable digits.

(2.1) Is premise 1 true?

Premise 1 is not entirely true because not all primates have fully opposable thumbs. Some primates, such as Strepsirrhini, possess pseudo-opposable thumbs, while others like Tarsiers and marmosets have non-opposable thumbs. However, they still belong to the primate group.

(Sources: Order

Primates: <https://untamedscience.com/order/primates/#:~:text=However%2C%20not%20all%20primates%20have,lemurs%2C%20lorises%2>

(2.2) Is premise 2 true?

Premise 2 is true. It is true that pandas are not considered members of the primate group. This is because they have similarities with both bears and raccoons. Studies of their DNA have shown that giant pandas are part of the bear family, which is called Ursidae.

(Sources: Giant panda: [Giant panda - Wikipedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Giant_panda))

(3) Overall, is the argument sound?

Overall, the argument is not sound because the first premise is not completely true. Therefore, the premises cannot fully support the conclusion.

Comment:

Discussion of whether the premises support the conclusion	1/4	The premises do not deductively support the conclusion. Even if primates were the only mammals with opposable digits, there could be non-mammal species with opposable digits. (In fact, there are: some species of frogs and birds have opposable digits). The premises do not explicitly state that pandas are mammals so, for all that we are told, pandas could fall in the category of non-mammals with opposable thumbs. Thus, even if the premises were true, the conclusion could be false.
Discussion of the truth of each premise	4/4	Premise 1 is false. Correct. If you weigh the evidence, as you did, it is fine to just say true or false, rather than 'not entirely true'. Premise 2 is true. Correct. Reasons are supplied for both evaluations.
Overall evaluation of the argument	2/2	Correct. But you should have just stopped at the first sentence. The second sentence is not true. An untrue premise can support a conclusion, making it valid, but not sound.
TOTAL	7 /10	

Question 4

Complete

Mark 9.00 out of 10.00

Argument 2

1. Access to green spaces is important for children's development.
2. In the future, a greater proportion of families will live in urban areas.

Therefore,

- C. We will see a negative impact on child development, in the future.

(1) Do the premises deductively support the conclusion (is the argument valid)?

No, the argument is not deductively valid. Even if premise 1 and premise 2 are true, the conclusion goes beyond what the premises provide which does not necessarily follow that an increase in the urban living will negatively impact child development, and the premises never state urban areas do not have green spaces.

(2.1) Is premise 1 true?

Premise 1 is true. There is study have indicated that green spaces can benefit children's physical, mental, and emotional health and development. The evidence suggests a positive correlation between exposure to green spaces and children's emotional and behavioural well-being, with improvements in hyperactivity and inattention problems. Therefore, providing children with access to green spaces can have a good impact on their development.

(Sources: Impact of Green Space Exposure on Children's and Adolescents' Mental Health: A Systematic Review: [Impact of Green Space Exposure on Children's and Adolescents' Mental Health: A Systematic Review - PMC \(nih.gov\)](#))

(2.2) Is premise 2 true?

Premise 2 is true. It is true that more and more families are moving to urban areas. UN stated that the global urban population proportion is expected to increase to 68% from 55% in 2050. Therefore, premise 2 is true.

(Sources: 68% of the world population projected to live in urban areas by 2050, says UN: [68% of the world population projected to live in urban areas by 2050, says UN | UN DESA | United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs](#))

(3) Overall, is the argument sound?

Overall, the argument is not sound because the conclusion does not logically follow from the premises and the premises never state urban areas do not have green spaces. Even if both premises are true, there could be many other factors that produce a negative impact on child development in urban areas. Therefore, the argument is not strong enough to support the conclusion.

Comment:

Discussion of whether the premises support the conclusion	3/4	Very good. Both major issues relating to lack of deductive validity are noted. There was however scope for more detail in your discussion of them.
Discussion of the truth of each premise	4/4	Premise 1 is true. Correct. Premise 2 is true. Correct.
Overall evaluation of the argument	2/2	Correct. Very good understanding of soundness present.
TOTAL	9 /10	

[◀ Topic 6 Quiz Question](#)

Jump to...

[Assessment Task 2 ▶](#)

