

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Student Number: \_\_\_\_\_

                     / COMMUNICATION STUDIES 3E03

Dr. D. L. Hitchcock

DAY CLASS

DURATION OF EXAMINATION: 3 Hours

McMaster University Final Examination

April 2012

THIS EXAMINATION INCLUDES 2 PAGES AND 3 QUESTIONS. YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT YOUR COPY OF THE PAPER IS COMPLETE. BRING ANY DISCREPANCY TO THE ATTENTION OF YOUR INVIGILATOR.

Special instructions: You are allowed to use one 8.5" × 11" crib sheet both sides.

The exam will be marked out of 150 points, so you have slightly over one minute for each point.

The maximum points for each question are given at the end of the question. Answer all three questions.

1. Identify the author of **ANY FOUR (4)** of the following quotations. Explain the meaning and significance of the quotation. (worth 5 points [about 5 minutes] each)

a. On the counterfactual-supporting truth-transmission account, then, a conclusion follows from given premisses if and only if the argument is an instance of an argument scheme, which may or may not be purely formal, that has no actual or possible instances with true premisses and an untrue conclusion, even though it has an instance with true premisses and an instance with an untrue conclusion.

b. The logic of argumentation does not refer to deductive connections between semantic units [sentences] as does formal logic, but to nondeductive relations between the pragmatic units [speech acts] of which arguments are composed.

c. To understand the product that we call an argument, it is necessary to situate it within its proper context: the practice of argumentation.

d. In general, the problem with such types of dialogues as **PPD** is how to strike a good balance between such leniency as will give each participant sufficient opportunity to express his or her views on an issue and such strenuousness as is necessary for keeping the discussion to the point and avoiding digressions.

e. Of the modes of persuasion furnished by the spoken word there are three kinds. The first kind depends on the personal character of the speaker; the second on putting the audience into a certain frame of mind; the third on the proof, or apparent proof, provided by the words of the speech itself.

f. Thus, in general, a defeasible argument can be attacked in only three ways, by an attack on a premise, by a counterargument with an opposite conclusion, or by an argument attacking the inference rule.

g. In the particular linguistic-pragmatic model to be developed in this book, argumentation will be defined as a communicative activity whose constitutive goal is to show a target-claim to be correct.

h. The logician does not stand above and outside practical argumentation or, necessarily, pass judgment on it. He is not a judge or court of appeal, and there is no such judge or court: he is, at best, a trained advocate. It follows that it is not the logician's particular job to declare the truth of any statement, *or the validity of any argument*.

2. Answer **ANY FOUR (4)** of the following questions. Each is worth 20 points (about 20 minutes).

a. What does it mean to say that argumentation is a complex of second-order speech acts? State the three respects in which Bermejo-Luque's account of this complex differs from that of van Eemeren and Grootendorst. According to Bermejo-Luque, what steps are involved in interpreting utterances or inscriptions in a language as argumentation?

b. What is an inference claim? How does Hitchcock's account of inference claims differ from that of Bermejo-Luque? What is the most obvious objection to Bermejo-Luque's account? How does she defend herself against this objection?

c. In what ways is the generic description of a permissive persuasion dialogue by Walton and Krabbe similar to the various versions of Hamblin's why-because game with questions. In what ways is it different?

d. What goals do Perelman, van Eemeren and Grootendorst, and Johnson respectively attribute to argumentation, critical discussion, and argument? According to Bermejo-Luque, what approach to evaluating argumentation do they share? What is her objection to that approach?

e. What do Walton, Reed and Macagno propose as the basic scheme for argument from expert opinion? What critical questions do they associate with this scheme? Explain the role of each of these critical questions in evaluating an argument from expert opinion.

f. According to Johnson, what are the two main components of an argument? By what criteria does he propose that each component be evaluated? Give an example of your own invention of an argument that does **NOT** meet Johnson's criteria, and explain why it does not do so.

3. Answer, with reference to the readings assigned for the course, **ANY ONE (1)** of the following questions, which are worth 50 points [about 50 minutes] each.

a. What is an argument?

b. What is argumentation?

c. How should we evaluate arguments?

d. How should we evaluate argumentation?

**THE END**