

## Critical Thinking (VT 2025) Practice Exam

This is a practice exam for the module. It will give you an indication about what will be covered and the format. You should answer all the questions. Questions 1-16 are multiple choice questions, questions 17-20 require text input.

### 1. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. All humans should be treated with dignity.
2. It is not the case that John should be treated with dignity.
3. John is not a human.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 2. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. The temperature is warm and the sky is clear.
2. The sky is clear.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 3. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. Most people who live in Sweden are healthy.
2. Conrad is healthy.
3. Conrad lives in Sweden.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 4. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. If I wake up early, I will go running tomorrow.
2. I will not wake up early.
3. I will not go running tomorrow.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 5. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. Most cats are allergic to cheese.
2. All cats that are allergic to cheese are allergic to milk.
3. Tom is a cat.
4. Tom is allergic to milk.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 6. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. Most sovereign states are represented at the UN.
2. North Korea is a sovereign state.
3. North Korea is represented at the UN.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 7. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. If I pass the exam, then I will get drunk.
2. If I get drunk, then I will be hungover.
3. I will not pass the exam.
4. I will be hungover.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 8. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

All politicians are liars.  
Henrik is the Prime Minister of Sweden.  
Henrik is a liar.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 9. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. Almost all philosophers have studied logic.
2. Some people who have studied logic are boring.
3. Jurgen is a philosopher.
4. Jurgen is boring.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid  
☐ Cogent  
☐ Not well-formed

### 10. Logical Form (1 point)

Is the following argument valid, cogent, or not well-formed?

1. The conservatives will win the election or the socialists will win the election.
2. If inflation is above 5%, then the conservatives will not win the election.

3. Inflation is above 5%.
4. The socialists will win the election.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Valid
- ☐ Cogent
- ☐ Not well-formed

### 11. Conceptual Question (2 points)

Which of the following statements about rational belief is correct?

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ If it is rational to believe a proposition, the proposition must be true.
- ☐ If it is rational to believe a proposition, there must be no evidence against it.
- ☐ If a person's total evidence does not suggest that a proposition is false, it is rational for them to believe it.
- ☐ If a person's total evidence suggests that a proposition is true, it is rational for them to believe it.

### 12. Conceptual Question (2 points)

Which of the following statements about cogency is correct?

Choose an alternative:

- ☐ It might not be rational to believe the conclusion of a cogent argument.
- ☐ An argument can be cogent for one person and not cogent for another.
- ☐ A cogent argument always has a true conclusion.
- ☐ If a cogent argument has true premises, the conclusion must be true.

### 13. Conceptual Question (2 points)

Which of the following statements about strength is correct.

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ An argument can be both deductively strong and inductively strong.
- ☐ The strength of an argument can vary from person to person.
- ☐ If an argument is strong, it must have a true conclusion.
- ☐ If a strong argument has false premises, it must have a false conclusion.

### 14. Conceptual Question (2 points)

Which of the following is a correct attribution of vagueness?

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ The term "right" is vague because it has multiple meanings.
- ☐ The property of being bald is vague because there is no clear cut-off point between being bald and being not bald.
- ☐ The term "sright" is vague because it has no established meaning.

☐ The property of being ethical is vague because people disagree about what being ethical involves.

### 15. Informal Fallacies (2 points)

The following argument contains an informal fallacy. Indicate which informal fallacy it contains from the options below.

“If you want to study philosophy in Sweden, you should definitely go to Stockholm. After all, you don’t want to go to Gothenburg.”

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Tu quoque
- ☐ False dilemma
- ☐ Straw man
- ☐ Mistaking correlation for causation

### 16. Informal Fallacies (2 points)

The following argument contains an informal fallacy. Indicate which informal fallacy it contains from the options below.

“You tell me that I should not smoke in front of children, but I’ve seen you doing that as well. So your argument is weak.”

Choose one alternative:

- ☐ Tu quoque
- ☐ False dilemma
- ☐ Straw man
- ☐ Mistaking correlation for causation.

### 17. Reconstruction (3 points)

*Reconstruct the following argument, indicating after each line whether the line is an explicit premise (using (EP)), an implicit premise (using (IP)) or a conclusion (by listing the justification for each conclusion after them). Set out the pattern of the argument and include a lexicon.*

“Sama is an excellent football player. He works hard for his team and is very skillful. In addition, he scores goals regularly.”

### 18. Reconstruction (3 points)

*Reconstruct the following argument, indicating after each line whether the line is an explicit premise (using (EP)), an implicit premise (IP) or a conclusion (by listing the justification for each conclusion after them). Set out the pattern of the argument and include a lexicon.*

“The idea that India should be reducing its emissions is preposterous. India needs to alleviate poverty within its borders, and it can only do this by continuing to pollute. Moreover, most developing countries like India have done nothing to get us into our current climate predicament. We should adopt a very simple and plausible principle here: only those who harm others have the responsibility to set things right.”

## **19. Reconstruction and Evaluation (6 points)**

*The following argument is taken from a Swedish newspaper (and translated), and discusses whether euthanasia (actively ending a terminally ill patient's life) should be legalized.*

*(a) Reconstruct the 'argument, indicating after each line whether the line is an explicit premise (using (EP)), an implicit premise (IP) or a conclusion (by listing the justification for each conclusion after them). Set out the pattern of the argument and include a lexicon.*

*(b) Evaluate the argument. This should involve taking a stand on whether the argument is valid, cogent, or not well-formed, and also on whether each of the premises are reasonable (for you). Briefly justify your views.*

“Discussions with patients about their wishes for their end-of-life care are usually complex. We cannot be sure that patients have really grasped what is at stake if they are to make decisions like this. In addition to the significant ethical objections to a doctor's participation in intentionally ending a patient's life, there are considerable practical objections to any change in the law. Doctors are overworked and do not have the time to know or to explore the psychosocial background of patients. Little is known about the impact of legalising euthanasia and on recruitment or on the mental health consequences on participating healthcare professionals. In the absence of conclusive evidence that there will be no adverse effects, we should maintain the existing ban on euthanasia.”

## **20. Seminar Readings (6 points)**

*Carefully read the attached passage from Judith Jarvis Thomson's 'A Defense of Abortion.'*

*This is an argument by analogy, but what thesis is it an argument for? That is, what would be a reasonable ending to the final, cut off sentence? What are some relevant similarities and/or dissimilarities between the analogy and the case it represents? Are there any changes made to the analogy? If so, which and why? Finally, do you consider Thomson's argument by analogy strong, weak, or false?*

