

Subject Description Form

Subject Code	APSS2200														
Subject Title	The Art of Reasoning														
Credit Value	3														
Level	2														
Pre-requisite / Co-requisite/ Exclusion	Nil														
Assessment Methods	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">100% Continuous Assessment</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Individual Assessment</th> <th style="width: 25%;">Group Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Seminar</td> <td style="text-align: center;">30%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Seminar Report</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> <td style="text-align: center;">20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Quiz</td> <td style="text-align: center;">40%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">--</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grade is calculated according to the percentage assigned; The completion and submission of all component assignments are required for passing the subject; and Student must pass all the components if he/she is to pass the subject. 			100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment	1. Seminar	30%	10%	2. Seminar Report	--	20%	3. Quiz	40%	--
100% Continuous Assessment	Individual Assessment	Group Assessment													
1. Seminar	30%	10%													
2. Seminar Report	--	20%													
3. Quiz	40%	--													
Objectives	The subject aims to provide students with an understanding of the structure of arguments and reasoning. The subject will also help students develop logical skills in rationally constructing, analyzing, justifying and criticizing arguments.														
Intended Learning Outcomes	<p>Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. understand the basic structure of arguments and reasoning; b. improve their logical competence in constructing, evaluating, and criticizing arguments; c. apply the reasoning skills to analyze everyday issues with particular emphasis on human services. 														
Subject Synopsis/ Indicative Syllabus	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The nature of arguments and reasoning b. The relevance of arguments and reasoning 2. The Structure of Argument <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Premise and conclusion b. Evidence and logical relationship c. Soundness, truth and validity 														

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Meaning and Clarity <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Atomistic meaning and contextual meaning b. Paraphrasing and interpretation c. Accuracy and ambiguity 4. Informal Fallacies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The nature of fallacies b. Fallacies of relevance c. Fallacies of presumption, ambiguity and grammatical analogy d. Fallacies in ordinary language 5. Scientific Method <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The problem of induction b. Scientific explanation and truth c. Perception and theory d. The context of discovery and the context of justification 6. Human Service, Social Policy and Reasoning <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Theory, assumption, and human services b. Rationality, values, principles, and social policy 																																														
Teaching/Learning Methodology	<p>The approach will be comprised of lectures and seminars. In the seminars, small groups of 3 to 5 students are to be assigned to undertake selected topics and present their work to the seminar class. Students are also encouraged to participate actively in tutorials/seminars.</p>																																														
Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning Outcomes	<table border="1" data-bbox="453 1077 1479 1518"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Specific assessment methods/tasks</th> <th rowspan="2">% weighting</th> <th colspan="6">Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>a</th> <th>b</th> <th>c</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Seminar</td> <td>40%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Seminar Report</td> <td>20%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Quiz</td> <td>40%</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td>✓</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>100%</td> <td colspan="6"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes:</p> <p>The subject is intended to provide students with an understanding of the structure of arguments and reasoning; it also helps students to develop logical skills in rationally constructing, analyzing, justifying, and criticizing arguments. So seminar discussion among students on the one hand, and seminar report on the other, could facilitate better learning outcomes. Quiz is for assessing student's ability to understand the basic structure of arguments and reasoning, their logical competence in constructing, evaluating, and criticizing arguments, and their ability in applying the reasoning skills to analyze everyday issues.</p>	Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting	Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)						a	b	c				1. Seminar	40%	✓	✓	✓				2. Seminar Report	20%	✓	✓					3. Quiz	40%	✓	✓	✓				Total	100%						
Specific assessment methods/tasks	% weighting			Intended subject learning outcomes to be assessed (Please tick as appropriate)																																											
		a	b	c																																											
1. Seminar	40%	✓	✓	✓																																											
2. Seminar Report	20%	✓	✓																																												
3. Quiz	40%	✓	✓	✓																																											
Total	100%																																														

Student Study Effort Expected	Class contact:	
	▪ Lectures	27 Hrs.
	▪ Seminars	12 Hrs.
	Other student study effort:	
	▪ Seminar Report	20 Hrs.
	▪ Seminar Project	10 Hrs.
	▪ Quiz Preparation	13 Hrs.
	▪ Self-studies	39 Hrs.
	Total student study effort	117 Hrs.
Reading List and References	<p><u>Reference</u></p> <p>Trudy Govier, <i>A Practical Study of Argument</i> (7th edition, Cengage Learning, 2014)</p> <p>Harry Gensler, <i>Introduction to Logic</i>, (3rd edition, Routledge, 2017).</p> <p>Copi, I. M., & Cohen, C. (2010). <i>Introduction to logic</i> (14th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.</p> <p>Missimer, C. A. (2005). <i>Good arguments: An introduction to critical thinking</i> (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.</p> <p>Fogelin, R. J. (2005). <i>Understanding arguments: An introduction to informal logic</i> (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.</p> <p>Cohen, A. (2018). <i>Philosophy and public policy</i>. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.</p> <p>Hospers, J. (1997). <i>An introduction to philosophical analysis</i> (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.</p> <p>Mayfield, M. (2014). <i>Thinking for yourself: Developing critical thinking skills through reading and writing</i> (9th ed.). California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.</p> <p>Reamer, F. G. (1993). <i>The philosophical foundations of social work</i>. New York: Columbia University Press.</p> <p>Ruggiero, V. R. (2015). <i>The art of thinking: A guide to critical and creative thought</i> (11th ed.). New York: Longman.</p> <p>方子華、陳浩文、盧傑雄等：《批判思考》。Singapore: McGraw Hill,</p>	

	2005.
--	-------