

The Chinese University of Hong Kong
2018/19 1st semester
UGED1112B Logic and Argumentation 邏輯與論辯
Course Outline

Instructor: Dr. Kwok Pak Nin, Samson
Time: Lecture- Thursday 12:30-14:15; Tutorial- TBA
Venue: Lecture- WMY 505; Tutorial- TBA

Course overview:

This course is designed to develop the student's ability to analyze and critically evaluate arguments from a logical point of view. It will provide students with a basic understanding of such concepts as reasons, implication, validity, and fallacies. Students will learn the logical principles of deductive and inductive inferences and the techniques of applying them for determining the validity of arguments. Elements of good reasoning from an informal perspective will also be covered.

Learning outcomes:

1. Acquire analytic skills and a critical disposition.
2. Grasp the central concepts in classical logic.
3. Describe the essential elements of good reasoning and argumentation.
4. Demonstrate familiarity with major proof-theoretic methods in propositional logic.
5. Translate arguments in ordinary language into symbolic argument forms.
6. Recognize common valid argument forms.
7. Identify, classify, and assess arguments in various contexts.
8. Identify and analyze informal fallacies.

Learning activities and workload:

1. **Lecture:** 2 hours each week.
2. **Interactive tutorial:** one 2-hour session every two weeks. Students are required to discuss reading material assigned and do exercises on the following topics:
 - (Week 3): Basic Concepts of Argumentation theory;
 - (Week 5): Basic Concepts of Logic;
 - (Week 7): Syllogisms and Venn Diagrams;
 - (Week 9): Truth Table;
 - (Week 11): Natural Deduction;
 - (Week 13): Inductive Reasoning and Informal Fallacies

Assessment:

Task nature	Description	Weight
Tutorial	Discussion and exercises	20%
Mid-term quiz	In class quiz	25%
Final exam	Centralized exam	40%
Take home assignment	Group assignment on Argumentation theory and Informal Fallacies	15%

Details of course website:

Lecture notes and information on assignments will be posted on the Blackboard Learn website.

Topics & schedule:

Week	Date	Topic	Reading
1	Sept 6	Introduction	
2	Sept 13	Basic Concepts of Argumentation theory	《思方導航》，第一篇 <i>Informal Logic</i> , Ch.1&9
3	Sept 20	Basic Concepts of Logic	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch. 1
4	Sept 27	Categorical Syllogisms	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.4-5
5	Oct 4	Categorical Syllogisms	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.4-5
6	Oct 11	Propositional Logic: Truth table	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.6
7	Oct 18	Propositional Logic – Natural Deduction	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.7
8	Oct 25	<u>Mid-term quiz</u>	
9	Nov 1	Propositional Logic – Natural Deduction	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.7
10	Nov 8	Inductive Reasoning	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.1, 9&13 <i>How to Think About Weird Things</i> , Ch.6
11	Nov 15	<i>Holiday: 85rd Congregation</i>	
12	Nov 22	Informal Fallacies	《思方導航》，第五篇
13	Nov 29	Logic and Pragmatic	<i>Studies In the Way of Words</i> , Ch.2

Recommended learning resources: (# main reference)**Formal Logic:**

Patrick Hurley, *A Concise Introduction to Logic*, 12th ed., Cengage Learning, 2015.#

David Bostock, *Intermediate Logic*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Irving Copi, Carl Cohen and Kenneth McMahon, *Introduction to Logic*, 14th ed., Pearson Education Limited, 2014.

Merrie Bergmann and James Moore, *The Logic Book*, 4th ed., McGraw-Hill, 1998.

林正弘,《邏輯》, 三民書局, 1994。

Informal Logic and Argumentation theory:

Douglas Walton, *Informal Logic 2nd edition*, Cambridge University Press, 2008#

Alec Fisher, *The Logic of Real Arguments*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Anthony Weston, *A Rulebook for Arguments*, 4th ed., Hackett Publishing Company, 2009.

Douglas Walton, *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*, Cambridge University Press, 2006

Paul Grice, *Studies In the Way of Words*, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Theodore Schick and Lewis Vaughn, *How to Think About Weird Things: Critical Thinking for a New Age*, 7th ed., McGraw-Hill, 2014.

Trudy Govier, *A Practical Study of Argument*, 7th ed., Belmont, CA: Cengage Learning, 2010.

Trudy Govier, *Problems in Argument Analysis and Evaluation*, Foris Publications, 1987.

貝剛毅,《思方導航》(第四版), 匯智出版有限公司, 2014.#

李天命,《李天命的思考藝術》(最終定本), 明報出版社, 2009

Contact:

Lecturer	
Name:	Dr. Kwok Pak Nin, Samson
Office Location:	KHB 414
Consultation Hours	Tue 14:30-16:00
Telephone:	3943-1519
Email:	samsonkpn@cuhk.edu.hk
Teaching Assistant	
Name:	Chan Ching Nam
Office Location:	KHB 413
Consultation Hours	Thur 9:30-12:30
Email:	ccnaries0409@gmail.com

Feedback for evaluation:

<p>1. Students are strongly encouraged to provide feedback on the course via email or meetings with lecturer.</p> <p>2. Students evaluate the course through a survey and written comments at the end of the term as well as via regular feedback between teacher and students. This information is highly valued and is used to revise teaching methods, tasks, and content.</p>

Grade Descriptors for Tutorial Performance

Attendance: Note that marks cannot be given for mere attendance, but marks may be deducted for absences.

<p>[Excellent] A (85-92) Or [Very Good] A- (80-84)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You concisely explain the relevant material in a way that clarifies how the various pieces are meant to fit together. - You raise and clearly explain your own insightful questions of interpretation about the material. - You raise and clearly explain your own challenging yet fair objections to the material. - You construct charitable replies on the author's behalf to your points, and provide your own rejoinders. - You carefully discuss the significant of your points and their theoretical or practical implications. - In discussion, you demonstrate a willingness to share newly formed ideas, and you effectively begin to develop ideas on the spot through constructive yet critical interaction with others.
<p>[Good] B+ (76-79), B (72-75) or B-(68-71)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation of material contains minor errors, or is correct but adds little or nothing. - Questions/objections are relevant, but obvious. - Author's reply is absent or oversimplified. - Implications are not discussed or are only briefly explained. - Good effort at discussion, but hesitant to take risks and has difficulty developing ideas on the spot.
<p>[Fair] C+ (64-67) C (60-63) or C-(56-59)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation of material contains significant errors and oversights. - Questions/objections are often confused or unclear. - Author's reply is absent or mistaken. - Implications are not discussed or are confused or unclear. - Little or no effort at discussion.
<p>[Pass] D+ (53-55) D (50-52)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You attend and show a reasonable interest in the discussion and a willingness to participate minimally if called upon.

Grade Description for Assignment

	Argument	Theory Analysis	Writing Style
[Excellent] A (85-92) Or [Very Good] A- (80-84)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You provide a detailed and specific thesis statement that clearly describes the main claim(s) you will be arguing for and indicates how and what you plan to say adds something to the discussion, rather than mostly repeating the material we have read. - You defend your claims in a well-developed way by giving and explaining your reasons for your position. - You identify likely objections, present them charitably and respond to them effectively. - You carefully explain the theoretical and/or practical implications of your argument. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You provide an accurate account of the relevant parts of the theory. - You illuminate the relationship between the theory's conclusion(s) and its arguments. - You quote relevant key passages with proper citations. - You define key terms, and explain their role and how they relate to each other. - You discuss what the thinker would probably have said about an issue by drawing on what he/she did say about other related matters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You choose your words carefully. The language is precise rather than vague, natural rather than awkward, straightforward rather than ostentations. - Each piece of the essay is presented in a way that makes it clear to the reader how it is relevant to your thesis - Where appropriate, you use real or hypothetical examples to help illustrate abstract points.
[Good] B+ (76-79), B (72-75) or B-(68-71)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thesis statement is clear, but general and unambitious. - The reasons given to support claims are occasionally weak or too brief. Some claims in need of defense are merely asserted. - Some key objections are not considered, or the response is weak or too brief. - Theoretical and/or practical implications are not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are minor inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some small points are overlooked. - The theory's arguments for its conclusion(s) are described, but the relationship between them is not explained, or the explanation is vague and imprecise. - Use of quotations is sometimes missing or erratic or without proper citations. - Some key concepts are not defined, or are defined carelessly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language is generally clear, but occasionally lacks precision or naturalness or desirable simplicity. - The relevance of small parts of the essay is not made clear. - Illustrative examples are used rarely or not at all.
[Fair] C+ (64-67) C (60-63) or C-(56-59)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thesis statement is absent or insignificant or confused. - The reasons given to support claims are usually weak or too brief. Many claims in need of defense are merely asserted. - Objections are not considered, or they are only a straw-man version, or the response is ineffective. - Implications are not identified, or they are asserted without explanation. - The argument is likely to contain contradictions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are significant inaccuracies in the account of the theory. Some major points are overlooked. - The theory's conclusion(s) are described without reference to its argument. - Use of quotations is missing or erratic or without proper citations. - Key concepts are not defined, or are defined incorrectly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language is often unclear, due to being vague or awkward or ostentatious. - The relevance of significant parts of the essay is not made clear. - Illustrative examples are used incorrectly or not at all.
[Pass] D+ (53-55) D (50-52)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The student demonstrates an awareness of what an argument is, and tries to make one. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The student grasps at least the main features of some of the theory's most important points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language is intelligible more often than not.

Academic honesty and plagiarism:

Attention is drawn to University policy and regulations on honesty in academic work, and to the disciplinary guidelines and procedures applicable to breaches of such policy and regulations.

Details may be found at http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/policy/academic_honesty/ .

With each assignment, students will be required to submit a signed **declaration** that they are aware of these policies, regulations, guidelines and procedures. For group projects, all students of the same group should be asked to sign the declaration.

For assignments in the form of a computer-generated document that is principally text-based and submitted via VeriGuide, the statement, in the form of a receipt, will be issued by the system upon students' uploading of the soft copy of the assignment. Assignments without the receipt will not be graded by teachers. Only the final version of the assignment should be submitted via VeriGuide.