

# Deductive reasoning video



Deductive Reasoning Video: A Response According to provided clip, shown (white) researcher provides two informants s), a black (colored) child and a black (colored) woman, with two distinct propositions, read out aloud from flashcards:

1. If you hit a glass with a hammer, the glass will break (hereafter referred to as “ 1”); and
2. If you hit a glass with a feather, the glass will break (hereafter referred to as “ 2”)

According to clip, black (colored) child is first shown provided with (white) researcher’s 1, followed by following statements respectively:

3. Dawn hit the glass with a hammer; and
4. So, what happened to the glass?

Child concludes to 1, 3 and 4 as follows:

5. It [glass] broke

This (5) is followed by (white) researcher’s:

6. It broke! Why did it break?

In turn, 6 evokes child’s:

7. Because the hammer is hard

Considering first informant’s (subject’s) conclusion to propositions 1, 3, and follow-up statement 4, his conclusion based on provided (1 & 3) propositions clearly demonstrates an example of both a valid and sound argument in which 5 necessarily follows from 1 and 3 in addition to 1 and 3 both being true propositions making 1, 3, and 5 a sound argument. Child’s 7, evoked by researcher’s 6, comes, moreover, as an implicit proposition (i. e. [Since] Dawn hit the glass with a hammer [which is hard], it [glass] broke).

Conversely, child’s conclusion to researcher’s 2, 4, and proposition “ Dawn

<https://assignbuster.com/deductive-reasoning-video/>

hit the glass with a feather” (8), is:

9. Nothing

Clearly, 2, 4, and 9 are an example of an invalid, unsound argument in which 2 is a false proposition and 9 does not follow necessarily from 2 and 8.

Similarly, evoked by researcher’s follow-up, “ Nothing happened. Why did nothing happen?” (10), child’s “ Because the feather is soft” (11), comes as an implicit proposition.

Black (colored) lady is then shown provided with (white) researcher’s 2 and 8 and followed up on by 4. Concluding, black (colored) lady’s response is:

12. It broke

This (12) is followed by researcher’s follow-up:

13. Why did it break?

Collectively, 2, 8, and 12 act as a valid but not a sound argument in which 12 necessarily follows from 2 and 8 but 2 is not a true (i. e. false) argument.

Informant’s later part of response, “ So, hitting a glass with a feather, [‘ t] broke” acts as an implicit proposition.