## **Subject Description Form**

| Subject Code                                  | APSS2200  |                       |                  |  |  |  |
|---|---|-----------------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| Subject Title                                 | The Art of Reasoning  |                       |                  |  |  |  |
| Credit Value                                  | 3   |                       |                  |  |  |  |
| Level   | 2   |                       |                  |  |  |  |
| Pre-requisite /<br>Co-requisite/<br>Exclusion | Nil   |                       |                  |  |  |  |
| Assessment Methods                            |   |                       |                  |  |  |  |
|   | 100% Continuous Assessment  | Individual Assessment | Group Assessment |  |  |  |
|   | Seminar Presentation and     Participation  | 30%                   | 10%              |  |  |  |
|   | 2. Seminar Report   |                       | 20%              |  |  |  |
|   | 3. Quiz   | 40%                   |                  |  |  |  |
| Objectives                                    | <ul> <li>The grade is calculated according to the percentage assigned;</li> <li>The completion and submission of all component assignments are required for passing the subject; and</li> <li>Student must pass all the components if he/she is to pass the subject.</li> </ul> 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                             | Upon completion of the subject, students will be able to:   |                       |                  |  |  |  |
| Outcomes                                      | 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/<br>Indicative Syllabus      | 1. Introduction   |                       |                  |  |  |  |
|   | 2. The Structure of Argument  |                       |                  |  |  |  |
|   | 3. Meaning and Clarity  |                       |                  |  |  |  |

|  | 4. Informal Fallacies  |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
|--|--|------|----------|----------|-----------|---|--|--|
|  | 5. Argument Analysis and Evaluation  |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
|  | 6. Human Service, Social Policy and Reasoning  |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
| Teaching/Learning<br>Methodology                       | 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.   |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
| Assessment Methods in Alignment with Intended Learning | Specific assessment % Intended subject learning outcomethods/tasks weighting assessed (Please tick as appropria  |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
| Outcomes   |  |      | a        | b        | c         |   |  |  |
|  | Seminar     Presentation and     Participation   | 40%  | <b>√</b> | <b>√</b> | <b>✓</b>  |   |  |  |
|  | 2. Seminar Report  | 20%  | <b>✓</b> | <b>✓</b> |           |   |  |  |
|  | 3. Quiz  | 40%  | ✓        | ✓        | ✓         |   |  |  |
|  | Total  | 100% |          |          | 1         | l |  |  |
|  | Explanation of the appropriateness of the assessment methods in assessing the intended learning outcomes:  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. |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
| Student Study Effort                                   | Class contact:   |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
| Expected   | <ul> <li>Lectures</li> </ul>   |      |          | 27 Hrs.  |           |   |  |  |
|  | Seminars   |      |          | 12 Hrs.  |           |   |  |  |
|  | Other student study effort:  |      |          |          |           |   |  |  |
|  | Seminar Report   |      |          | 10 Hrs.  |           |   |  |  |
|  | Seminar Project     Oviz Proposition   |      |          |          | 16 Hrs.   |   |  |  |
| ast undated in June 2024                               | <ul> <li>Quiz Preparation</li> </ul>   |      | A DCC22  | 00 / 6 / | he acader | • |  |  |

|                                | <ul> <li>Self-studies</li> </ul>  | 39 Hrs.                           |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
|                                | Total student study effort  | 117 Hrs.                          |  |  |  |
| Reading List and<br>References | Reference   |                                   |  |  |  |
|                                | Trudy Govier. (2014). A Practical Study of Argument (Learning.  | 7 <sup>th</sup> edition). Cengage |  |  |  |
|                                | Harry Gensler. (2017). <i>Introduction to Logic</i> , (3 <sup>rd</sup> ed.). R  | Routledge.                        |  |  |  |
|                                | Copi, I. M., Cohen, C., & Rodych, V. (2019). Introduction edition.). Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.                                 |                                   |  |  |  |
|                                | Cohen, A. (2018). <i>Philosophy and public policy</i> . L Littlefield International.  | London: Rowman &                  |  |  |  |
|                                | Hospers, J. (1997). <i>An introduction to philosophical analysis</i> (4 <sup>th</sup> e Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.                |                                   |  |  |  |
|                                | Mayfield, M. (2014). Thinking for yourself: Developing of through reading and writing (9 <sup>th</sup> ed.). Call Publishing Company.   | _                                 |  |  |  |
|                                | Reamer, F. G. (2022). The philosophical foundations of social work (Second edition.). Columbia University Press.                        |                                   |  |  |  |
|                                | Ruggiero, V. R. (2015). <i>The art of thinking: A guide to critical and creative thought</i> (11 <sup>th</sup> ed.). New York: Longman. |                                   |  |  |  |
|                                | 方子華、陳浩文、盧傑雄等:(2005)《批判思考》。<br>Hill.   | Singapore: McGraw                 |  |  |  |
|                                |   |                                   |  |  |  |