

The Chinese University of Hong Kong
2018/19 2nd semester
UGED1111D Logic 邏輯
Course Outline

Instructor: Dr. Kwok Pak Nin, Samson
Time: Friday 9:30-11:15am
Venue: YIA LT9

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. Reading and Exercise:** 2 to 3 hours per week.

Assessment:

Task nature	Description	Weight
Class participation	Class discussion	5%
Mid-term quiz	In class quiz	30%
Final exam	Centralized exam	50%
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	Jan 11	Introduction	
2	Jan 18	Logic and Argumentation theory	《思方導航》，第一篇 <i>Informal Logic</i> , Ch.1&9
3	Jan 25	Basic Concepts of Logic	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch. 1
4	Feb 1	Categorical Syllogisms	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.4-5
5	Feb 8	<i>Lunar New Year Holiday</i>	
6	Feb 15	Categorical Syllogisms	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.4-5
7	Feb 22	Propositional Logic: Truth table	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.6
8	Mar 1	Propositional Logic – Natural Deduction	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.7
9	Mar 8	<u>Mid-term quiz</u>	
10	Mar 15	Propositional Logic – Natural Deduction	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.7
11	Mar 22	Inductive Reasoning	<i>A Concise Introduction to Logic</i> , Ch.1, 9&13 <i>How to Think About Weird Things</i> , Ch.6
12	Mar 29	Informal Fallacies	《思方導航》，第五篇
13	Apr 5	<i>Reading Week</i>	
14	Apr 12	Informal Fallacies	《思方導航》，第五篇

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:

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.

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

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.

Contact:

Lecturer	
Name:	Dr. Kwok Pak Nin, Samson
Office Location:	KHB 414
Consultation Hours	Thur 10:30-12:00
Telephone:	3943-1519
Email:	samsonkpn@cuhk.edu.hk

Feedback for evaluation:

1. Students are strongly encouraged to provide feedback on the course via email or meetings with lecturer.
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.

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/academichonesty/> .

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.