

ARCT Reasoning Chains manual analysis

Llama-3 Correct chains:

Problem-1

Debate_title: Have Comment Sections Failed?

Debate_info: In recent years, many media companies have disabled them because of widespread abuse and obscenity.

Reason: They add a lot to the piece and I look forward to reading comments.

Claim: Comment sections have not failed

Warrant 0: comments sections are a welcome distraction from my work

Warrant 1: comments sections always distract me from my work

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. To determine which warrant makes the claim logically consistent with the reason, we need to understand the relationship between the reason and the claim.

[NC]

2. The reason states that the speaker looks forward to reading comments, implying that comments sections are beneficial or enjoyable for them.

[RR]

3. The claim states that comment sections have not failed, which suggests that they are still useful or effective.

[RR]

4. Warrant 0 states that comments sections are a welcome distraction from work. This means that comments sections are seen as a positive aspect, even if they are not directly related to the work.

[RR]

5. Warrant 1 states that comments sections always distract me from work, implying that comments sections are a negative aspect that interferes with work.

[RR]

6. Since the reason suggests that comments sections are beneficial, Warrant 0 aligns with this perspective, as it views comments sections as a welcome distraction.

[RR]

7. On the other hand, Warrant 1 contradicts the reason, as it portrays comments sections as a negative aspect that interferes with work.

[RR]

8. Therefore, Warrant 0 is the one that makes the claim logically consistent with the reason.

[RR]

Final Answer: 0

Correct Answer: 0

Problem-2

Debate_title: Are Medical Websites Healthful?

Debate_info: Does the internet add to patients' knowledge, or dangerously misinform them?

Reason: There are cases where internet research on medical websites improved condition or saved lives.

Claim: Medical websites are healthful

Warrant 0: there are also many more cases where internet research has put people in danger

Warrant 1: there are very few cases where internet research has put people in danger

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. We are given a debate title "Are Medical Websites Healthful?" and debate info "Does the internet add to patients' knowledge, or dangerously misinform them?" This indicates that the debate is about the overall impact of medical websites on patients.

[RR]

2. The reason given is "There are cases where internet research on medical websites improved condition or saved lives." This is a positive example of how medical websites can be beneficial.

[RR]

3. The claim is "Medical websites are healthful." This is a general statement about the nature of medical websites.

[RR]

4. We need to identify the correct warrant that justifies the use of the reason as support for the claim.

[NC]

A warrant is an underlying assumption that connects the reason to the claim.

[NC]

5. Warrant 0 states "there are also many more cases where internet research has put people in danger." This warrant implies that the positive examples of medical websites improving conditions or saving lives are outweighed by the negative examples.

[RR]

6. Warrant 1 states "there are very few cases where internet research has put people in danger."

[NC]

This warrant implies that the positive examples of medical websites improving conditions or saving lives are representative of the overall impact of medical websites.

[RR]

7. Given that the reason provided is a positive example, it suggests that the claim "Medical websites are healthful" is supported by the idea that the positive examples are representative of the overall impact of medical websites.

[RR]

8. Therefore, the correct warrant is Warrant 1, which assumes that the positive examples of medical websites improving conditions or saving lives are representative of the overall impact of medical websites.

[RR]

Final Answer: <1>

Correct Answer: 1

Problem-3

Debate_title: Can a Supreme Court Justice Denounce a Candidate?

Debate_info: Is it ever appropriate or ethical for a justice to announce his or her preference in a presidential election?

Reason: Ginsberg is brave for speaking out.

Claim: Supreme court justice can denounce a candidate

Warrant 0: it does not show that she will be biased against anything that has anything to do with Trump

Warrant 1: it shows she will be biased against anything that has anything to do with Trump

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. The reason states that Ginsberg is brave for speaking out, which implies that her action of speaking out is seen as a positive and courageous act.

[RR]

2. The claim states that a Supreme Court justice can denounce a candidate, which implies that such an action is acceptable and ethical.

[RR]

3. For the claim to be logically consistent with the reason, we need to find a warrant that connects the bravery of Ginsberg's action with the acceptability of a Supreme Court justice denouncing a candidate.

[RW saying "we need to find a warrant that connects the bravery of Ginsberg's action with the acceptability of a Supreme Court justice denouncing a candidate" changes the direction of the discussing, it is a reasoning issue]

4. Warrant 0 suggests that speaking out does not necessarily imply bias against Trump, which does not directly connect the bravery of Ginsberg's action with the acceptability of denouncing a candidate.

[wrong premise(previous step), right reasoning, wrong conclusion because the conclusion is not what we need.]

5. Warrant 1, on the other hand, suggests that speaking out implies bias against Trump, which means that if Ginsberg is brave for speaking out against a candidate (presumably Trump), it implies that she will be biased against anything that has anything to do with Trump.

[RR]

6. This bias could be seen as a reason why a Supreme Court justice should not denounce a candidate, as it could compromise their impartiality.

[RR]

7. Therefore, Warrant 1 provides a logical connection between the reason and the claim, but it does so in a way that undermines the claim, rather than supporting it.

[RR]

However, looking at the debate info, the question is whether a Supreme Court justice can denounce a candidate. The reason says Ginsberg is brave for speaking out, which could imply that denouncing a candidate is acceptable.

[RR]

Step-by-step solution: (continued)

8. If a Supreme Court justice is brave for speaking out, it implies that they are willing to take a stand on an issue, which could be seen as a positive trait.

[RR]

9. If a justice is willing to take a stand on an issue, it could imply that they are willing to denounce a candidate if they feel strongly about it.

[RR]

10. Therefore, the bravery of Ginsberg's action could imply that a Supreme Court justice can denounce a candidate, which supports the claim.

[RR]

Above lines does not mean that Warrant 1 supports claim and reason. [hallucination]

Final Answer: 1

Correct Answer: 0

Problem-4

Debate_title: Have Christians Created a Harmful Atmosphere for Gays?

Debate_info: Church-backed efforts to fight L.G.B.T. rights have been blamed for feeding a hateful atmosphere that accommodates attacks on gays.

Reason: The Orlando gun shooting where 38 gay people were killed are an example of how Christian hate of LGBT people can be comparable to the holocaust.

Claim: Christians have created a harmful atmosphere for gays

Warrant 0: an act created by a single person or group is representative of the religion as a whole

Warrant 1: an act created by a single person or group isn't representative of the religion as a whole

Reasoning Chain:

Step-by-step solution:

1. We are given a debate title, debate info, and a reason (R) that supports a claim (C).

[NC]

2. The claim is that Christians have created a harmful atmosphere for gays.

[NC]

3. The reason provided is the Orlando gun shooting where 38 gay people were killed, which is blamed on Christian hate of LGBT people.

[NC]

4. We need to identify the correct warrant that justifies the use of reason R as support for claim C.

[RR]

5. A warrant is a general principle that connects a reason to a claim.

[NC]

6. We have two possible warrants: Warrant 0 and Warrant 1.

[NC]

7. Warrant 0 states that an act created by a single person or group is representative of the religion as a whole.

[NC]

8. Warrant 1 states that an act created by a single person or group isn't representative of the religion as a whole.

[NC]

9. To determine the correct warrant, we need to evaluate whether the Orlando gun shooting is representative of Christianity as a whole.

[RR]

10. The claim is that Christians have created a harmful atmosphere for gays, implying that the Orlando gun shooting is an example of this atmosphere.

[RR]

11. However, the Orlando gun shooting was committed by a single individual (Omar Mateen), who was a Muslim, not a Christian.

[Referring to information outside of the passage(Reason)]

12. Therefore, the act of the Orlando gun shooting is not representative of Christianity as a whole.

[WW, Wrong premise leading to wrong conclusion]

13. This leads us to conclude that Warrant 1 is the correct warrant, as it states that an act created by a single person or group isn't representative of the religion as a whole.

[WW, Wrong premise leading to wrong conclusion]

Final Answer: <1>

Correct Answer: 0

Debate_title:

Debate_info:

Reason:

Claim:

Warrant 0:

Warrant 1:

Reasoning Chain:

Correct Answer:

Q ID: 17412381_709_A34QZDSTKZ3JO9

Debate Title

Is the A.D.H.D. Diagnosis Helping or Hurting Kids?

Debate Info

Some say the criteria for medication and disability support is too subjective.

W0 most ADHD kids were already diagnosed

W1 some ADHD kids are undiagnosed

Reason - If ADHD children were undiagnosed and unmedicated, I do not believe they would succeed in school.

Claim - The A.D.H.D. diagnosis is helping kids

"Step-by-step solution:

1. We are given a reason (R) and a claim (C) in the context of a debate about whether the A.D.H.D. diagnosis is helping or hurting kids. **[NC]**
2. The reason (R) states: ""If ADHD children were undiagnosed and unmedicated, I do not believe they would succeed in school."" **[NC]**
3. The claim (C) states: ""The A.D.H.D. diagnosis is helping kids."" **[NC]**
4. We need to identify the correct warrant (0 or 1) that justifies the use of reason (R) as support for claim (C). **[RR]**
5. Warrant 0 states: ""most ADHD kids were already diagnosed."" **[NC]**
6. Warrant 1 states: ""some ADHD kids are undiagnosed."" **[NC]**
7. To determine the correct warrant, we need to consider how reason (R) supports claim (C). **[RR]**
8. Reason (R) implies that if ADHD children were undiagnosed and unmedicated, they would not succeed in school. **[NC]**
9. This suggests that the A.D.H.D. diagnosis and medication are necessary for these children to succeed in school. **[RR]**
10. Therefore, the reason (R) supports the claim (C) by implying that the A.D.H.D. diagnosis is helping kids by enabling them to succeed in school. **[RR]**
11. However, Warrant 0 states that most ADHD kids were already diagnosed, which does not directly support the idea that the diagnosis is helping kids. **[RW]**
12. On the other hand, Warrant 1 states that some ADHD kids are undiagnosed, which is consistent with the implication of reason (R) that these children would not succeed in school without the diagnosis and medication. **[RW The claim says that the ADHD diagnosis is helping kids. This can be possible only if most of the ADHD kids are already diagnosed.]**
13. Therefore, the correct warrant that justifies the use of reason (R) as support for claim (C) is Warrant 1.

Final Answer: <1>"

Wrong Reasoning Chains:

Chain 1:

Does Iran Remain a Threat?

Despite the accord that reduced its ability to build nuclear weapons, is it still a threat to safety and stability of the region?

Warrant 0: our advancement will be equally inconsequential

Warrant 1: our advancement will be equally consequential

Reason:

Iran is not in the game just for today, but has long-term goals and plans. A major weakness of the nuclear agreement signed with Iran, which guarantees Iran a free nuclear hand in a decade or so.

Claim:

Iran remains a threat

Step-by-step solution:

1. The debate title is "Does Iran Remain a Threat?" and the debate info states that despite a nuclear agreement, Iran still has long-term goals and plans that may pose a threat to regional safety and stability. - **No conclusion / correct premise**
2. The reason provided is that a major weakness of the nuclear agreement is that it guarantees Iran a free nuclear hand in a decade or so. - **No conclusion / correct premise**
3. This implies that even if Iran complies with the agreement for the short term, it will eventually regain its ability to build nuclear weapons, which could lead to a renewed threat. - **Correct premise correct conclusion**
4. The claim is that Iran remains a threat. - **No Conclusion**
5. To justify the use of the reason as support for the claim, we need to consider how the long-term goals and plans of Iran relate to its threat level. - **Correct Premise correct conclusion**
6. Warrant 0 suggests that our advancement (i.e., the agreement) will be equally inconsequential, implying that Iran's ability to build nuclear weapons in the future will have no significant impact on its threat level. - **Correct premise correct conclusion**
7. However, this does not align with the reason provided, which highlights a major weakness of the agreement that allows Iran to regain its nuclear capabilities in the future. - **correct premise wrong conclusion (wrong reasoning)**
8. Warrant 1 suggests that our advancement will be equally consequential, implying that Iran's ability to build nuclear weapons in the future will have a significant impact on its threat level. - **correct premise wrong conclusion (wrong reasoning)**
9. This aligns with the reason provided, which suggests that Iran's long-term goals and plans, facilitated by the agreement's weakness, will lead to a renewed threat in the future. - **wrong premise wrong conclusion (error propagation)**

10. Therefore, the correct warrant is Warrant 1, which justifies the use of the reason as support for the claim that Iran remains a threat. - **wrong premise (error propagation) wrong conclusion (error propagation)**

Final Answer: <1>

Correct answer: 0

Chain 2:

Have Comment Sections Failed?

In recent years, many media companies have disabled them because of widespread abuse and obscenity.

Warrant 0: those ideas are rarely lunatic

Warrant 1: those ideas are often lunatic

Reason:

Comment sections provide a voice to thoughts and ideas outside the scope of regular editorial content.

Claim:

Comment sections have not failed

Step-by-step solution:

1. We are given a debate title "Have Comment Sections Failed" and some debate information.
2. The reason (R) provided is that comment sections provide a voice to thoughts and ideas outside the scope of regular editorial content.
3. The claim (C) is that comment sections have not failed.
4. We need to find the correct warrant from two candidates that justifies the use of reason as support for the claim.
5. The first warrant (W0) is "those ideas are rarely lunatic", which implies that the ideas expressed in comment sections are generally reasonable and valuable.
6. The second warrant (W1) is "those ideas are often lunatic", which implies that the ideas expressed in comment sections are often unreasonable and invaluable.
7. The debate information mentions that many media companies have disabled comment sections due to widespread abuse and obscenity, suggesting that the ideas expressed in comment sections are often problematic.
8. Given this information, the correct warrant should justify the use of reason as support for the claim that comment sections have not failed.

9. If the ideas expressed in comment sections are often lunatic (W1), then it's difficult to argue that comment sections have not failed, as they would be providing a platform for invaluable and problematic ideas.

10. Therefore, the correct warrant is W1, as it provides a justification for the use of reason as support for the claim that comment sections have not failed.

Final Answer: <1>

Correct answer: 0

Chain 3:

Have Comment Sections Failed?

In recent years, many media companies have disabled them because of widespread abuse and obscenity.

Warrant 0: making better journalists is the responsibility of commenters

Warrant 1: making better journalists isn't the responsibility of commenters

Reason:

Comment sections complete incomplete articles even if the authors don't agree, it makes them better journalists.

Claim:

Comment sections have not failed

Step-by-step solution:

1. The reason states that comment sections complete incomplete articles, making authors better journalists. This implies that the authors benefit from the comments. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

2. The claim is that comment sections have not failed. To be logically consistent with the reason, we need to find a warrant that supports this claim. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

3. Warrant 0 suggests that making better journalists is the responsibility of commenters. If this were true, then comment sections failing would mean that commenters are not fulfilling their responsibility, which would contradict the reason that comment sections are beneficial. - **wrong premise (misinterpretation) wrong conclusion (wrong interpretation)**

4. On the other hand, Warrant 1 states that making better journalists isn't the responsibility of commenters. This means that the value of comment sections lies in something else, not in making the authors better journalists. - **wrong premise (error propagation) wrong conclusion (wrong interpretation)**

5. If the value of comment sections lies in something else, then it's possible for comment sections to be beneficial even if they're failing in their supposed role of making authors better journalists. - **wrong premise (error propagation) wrong conclusion (wrong interpretation)**

6. Therefore, Warrant 1 is the one that makes the claim logically consistent with the reason. - **wrong premise (error propagation) wrong conclusion (wrong interpretation)**

Final Answer: 1

Correct answer: 0

Correct reasoning chains:

Chain 4:

Have Christians Created a Harmful Atmosphere for Gays?

Church-backed efforts to fight L.G.B.T. rights have been blamed for feeding a hateful atmosphere that accommodates attacks on gays.

Warrant 0: the religious people who make these comments are not Christians

Warrant 1: the religious people who make these comments are Christians

Reason:

When religious people say gay people don't deserve equality they aren't valuing gay people as humans or citizens.

Claim:

Christians have created a harmful atmosphere for gays

Step-by-step solution:

1. The reason states that when religious people say gay people don't deserve equality, they aren't valuing gay people as humans or citizens. This implies that the actions of these religious people are the reason for the harm towards gay people. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning, correctly deduced)**

2. The claim is that Christians have created a harmful atmosphere for gays. This means that the harm towards gay people is a direct result of the actions or beliefs of Christians. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

3. To establish a logical connection between the reason and the claim, we need to identify a group of people who are both responsible for the harm and are also Christians. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

4. Warrant 0 states that the religious people who make these comments are not Christians. If this were true, it would mean that the harm is caused by non-Christians, which contradicts the claim that Christians have created a harmful atmosphere. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

5. Warrant 1 states that the religious people who make these comments are Christians. This would mean that the harm is indeed caused by Christians, which aligns with the claim that Christians have created a harmful atmosphere. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

6. Based on the analysis, Warrant 1 is the only option that logically connects the reason and the claim, making the claim consistent with the reason. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

Final Answer: <1>

Corrected answer: 1

Chain 5:

Have Comment Sections Failed?

In recent years, many media companies have disabled them because of widespread abuse and obscenity.

Warrant 0: those ideas are rarely lunatic

Warrant 1: those ideas are often lunatic

Reason:

Comment sections provide a voice to thoughts and ideas outside the scope of regular editorial content.

Claim:

Comment sections have not failed

Step-by-step solution:

1. The reason states that comment sections provide a voice to thoughts and ideas outside the scope of regular editorial content. - **correct premise, correct conclusion.**

2. This implies that the ideas expressed in comment sections are valuable and worth considering, even if they differ from the editorial content. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

3. The claim states that comment sections have not failed, which suggests that they continue to serve their purpose. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

4. To make the claim logically consistent with the reason, we need to find a warrant that explains why comment sections are still valuable despite the abuse and obscenity. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

5. Warrant 0 suggests that the ideas expressed in comment sections are rarely lunatic, which implies that they are generally reasonable and worth considering. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

6. This aligns with the reason, which values the expression of outside ideas. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

7. Warrant 1, on the other hand, suggests that the ideas expressed in comment sections are often lunatic, which implies that they are not worth considering. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

8. This contradicts the reason, which values the expression of outside ideas. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

9. Therefore, the warrant that makes the claim logically consistent with the reason is Warrant 0. - **correct premise correct conclusion (correct reasoning)**

Final Answer: 0

Correct answer: 0

LLAMA Row 6

Should Brazil Postpone the Olympics?

The country is in the midst of a political and economic crisis, not to mention a Zika outbreak, and the Summer Games are three months away.

Brazil should postpone Olympics

Attending the Olympics will risk the health of participants and fans as well as their families and entire countries.

a huge pandemic would be a great news story

a huge pandemic would not be a great news story

"Step-by-step solution:

1. The reason states that attending the Olympics will risk the health of participants and fans as well as their families and entire countries. **NC**

2. This implies that a huge pandemic, which is a significant risk to health, would be a bad outcome. **RP, RC**

3. If a huge pandemic is a bad outcome, then it would not be a great news story. **RP, RC**

4. Therefore, the claim that Brazil should postpone the Olympics is logically consistent with the reason if the pandemic would not be a great news story. **RP, RC**

Final Answer: <1>"

Correct Answer: 1

LLAMA Row 21

Should Brazil Postpone the Olympics?

The country is in the midst of a political and economic crisis, not to mention a Zika outbreak, and the Summer Games are three months away.

Brazil should not postpone Olympics

The Olympics are a dream for many athletes since they train extremely hard.

the athletes won't get sick going to Brazil

the athletes won't be able to compete if they are sick

Step-by-step solution:

1. We are given a reason that "The Olympics are a dream for many athletes since they train extremely hard." This implies that the athletes have put in significant effort and are eager to participate in the Olympics. **RP, RC**

2. The claim is that "Brazil should not postpone the Olympics." This suggests that the Olympics should proceed as scheduled, despite the current challenges. **RP, RC**

3. We need to find a warrant that makes the claim logically consistent with the reason. In other words, we need to find a reason why the Olympics should not be postponed, given that it's a dream for many athletes. **RP, RC**

4. Let's examine Warrant 0: "the athletes won't get sick going to Brazil." This warrant doesn't directly connect the reason to the claim. It's possible that the athletes might still get sick, and this wouldn't necessarily affect the Olympics being postponed or not. **RP, WC - Wrong Reasoning - If athletes won't get sick after going to Brazil then olympics won't get postponed. Their hard work will pay off**

5. Now, let's examine Warrant 1: "the athletes won't be able to compete if they are sick." This warrant creates a connection between the reason and the claim. If the athletes are sick, they won't be able to compete, which would be a disappointment for them since the Olympics are their dream. **This would make the claim (not postponing the Olympics) logically consistent with the reason (the Olympics being a dream for many athletes).** **RP, WC - Contradictory Conclusion - This sentence supports why it should be postponed. If athletes won't be able to compete after getting sick, then better postpone it. It takes the correct premise but concludes with contradiction**

6. Therefore, Warrant 1 provides a logical connection between the reason and the claim, making the claim consistent with the reason. **WP, WC - Error Propagation**

Final Answer: <1>

Correct Answer: 0

LLAMA Row 29

Should the U.S. Embassy Be Moved From Tel Aviv to Jerusalem?

The location has long been a diplomatic thorn in the American-Israeli relationship.

The U.S. Embassy should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem

If the embassy is moved to Jerusalem the Palestinians will know they need to compromise.

the Palestinians will be willing to compromise

the Palestinians will not be willing to compromise

"Step-by-step solution:

1. The reason states that ""If the embassy is moved to Jerusalem the Palestinians will know they need to compromise."" **RP, RC**

This implies a causal relationship between the embassy's location and the Palestinians' willingness to compromise. **RP, RC**

2. The claim states that ""The U.S. Embassy should be moved from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.""

This is the conclusion that we are trying to justify using the reason. **RP, RC**

3. To find the correct warrant, we need to consider how the reason supports the claim.

If the reason is true, then moving the embassy to Jerusalem should lead to the Palestinians knowing they need to compromise. **RP, RC**

4. Now, let's examine the two warrants:

Warrant 0: ""the Palestinians will be willing to compromise.""

This warrant does not logically follow from the reason, as the reason states that moving the embassy will make the Palestinians know they need to compromise, not that they will actually compromise. **WP, WC - Misinterpretation - The US Embassy should be moved to Jerusalem. Claim states that Palestinians will know they need to compromise if moved, hence they will be willing to compromise.**

Warrant 1: ""the Palestinians will not be willing to compromise.""

This warrant is also not supported by the reason, as the reason suggests that moving the embassy will make the Palestinians aware of their need to compromise, implying that they may be willing to do so.

RP, RC - This is correct. This reason should have been given for Warrant 0. Then it would have picked the right one

5. However, if we look closely, we can see that the reason actually implies that the Palestinians' willingness to compromise is a consequence of the embassy's move, not a given.

Therefore, the correct warrant should be the one that states that the Palestinians will not be willing to compromise, because if they were willing, the embassy's move would not be necessary to make them know they need to compromise. **WP, RC - US is confident of them willing to compromise hence they want to move the embassy to signal Palestinians to compromise. Concludes rightly with the wrong premise.**

Final Answer: <1>"

Correct Answer 0

