



# Deductive Arguments: Checking for Validity

ID1050– Quantitative & Qualitative Reasoning

# Basic Truth Tables

- Here is a combined truth table for the three binary logical operators AND, OR, and IF..THEN...
  - AND is only True if both of its simple statements are True.
  - OR is only False if both of its simple statements are False.
  - IF..THEN.. is only False for row  $p=T, q=F$ .
- Here is the truth table for unary logical operator NOT.
  - The NOT operator switches True to False and False to True.

p	$\sim p$
T	F
F	T

p	q	$p \cap q$	$p \cup q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

# Steps for Checking Validity

An argument is **VALID** if, in **all cases where the premises are True, the conclusion is also True**.

- If there is *even one case* where all the premises are True but the conclusion is False, the entire argument is **INVALID**.
- So testing for validity is really **searching for a row that invalidates the argument**. If you can't find such a row, then the argument must be **VALID**.
- Rows that don't have all true premises can be ignored. They do not contribute to the validity of the argument.
- When presented with a deductive argument, you must first **build a truth table** for all of the statements and for all permutations of the basic statements being True or False.
  - There will be a row for each True/False permutation of the basic statement logical variables.
  - For two variables, like  $p$  and  $q$ , there are  $2^2=4$  rows. In general **there are  $2^n$  rows**, where  $n$  is the number of variables. Three variable arguments have 8 rows, etc.
  - There will be **a column for each premise and for the conclusion**. The column will have a value for each row depending on whether it is True or False under those conditions of the variables.
- Once the table is built, look for any row that has all premises = True but the conclusion = False. (i.e. **'TT...TTF'**)

# Examples to follow

- Following are **seven examples** of executing this process and determining validity of a deductive argument.
- There are four 2-variable, 3-statement arguments.
  - **Three of these** are classic argument types, and have fairly simple statements.
  - **The fourth** is a slightly more complex argument.
- There is **one example** of a 2-variable, 4-statement argument.
- There are **two examples** of 3-variable, 3-statement arguments.
  - Some of these are arguments we discussed before and guessed were either valid or invalid, but the proof is now furnished.

# Example 1: two variables, 3 statements

- Here is an argument we have seen before:
  - “If I eat apples, then I’ll eat bananas.”  $a \rightarrow b$
  - “I ate apples.”  $a$
  - “Therefore, I ate bananas.”  $b$
- Fill in the truth table.
- Check for ‘TTF’.
  - There is no ‘TTF’, so this argument is **VALID**.

p	q	$p \cap q$	$p \cup q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

a	b	P1: $a \rightarrow b$	P2: a	C b
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	F	F

# Example 2: two variables, 3 statements

- This argument seems similar:
  - "If I eat apples, then I'll eat bananas."  $a \rightarrow b$
  - "I ate bananas."  $b$
  - "Therefore, I ate apples."  $a$
- Fill in the truth table.
- Check for 'TTF'.
  - Row 3 has a 'TTF', so this argument is **INVALID**.
  - (That is a case with all True premises, but a conclusion that is False, which invalidates the argument.)

p	q	$p \cap q$	$p \cup q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

a	b	P1: $a \rightarrow b$	P2: b	C a
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	F

# Example 3: two variables, 3 statements

- One more variation:
  - “If I eat apples, then I’ll eat bananas.”  $a \rightarrow b$
  - “I didn’t eat bananas.”  $\sim b$
  - “Therefore, I didn’t eat apples.”  $\sim a$
- Fill in the truth table.
- Check for ‘TTF’.
  - There is no ‘TTF’, so this argument is **VALID**.

p	q	$p \cap q$	$p \cup q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

a	b	P1: $a \rightarrow b$	P2: $\sim b$	C $\sim a$
T	T	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	T
F	F	T	T	T

# Example 4: A more complex argument

- Here is an argument:

- $P_1: c \cup \sim d$

- $P_2: c \rightarrow d$

- $C: c \cap d$

- Fill in the truth table.

- A helper column for  $\sim d$  is needed here.

- Check for 'TTF'.

- Row 4 has a 'TTF', so this argument is **INVALID**.

- (The 'TTT' in row 1 makes no difference.)

p	q	$p \cap q$	$p \cup q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

c	d	$\sim d$	$P_1: c \cup \sim d$	$P_2: c \rightarrow d$	C $c \cap d$
T	T	F	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	F	F
F	T	F	F	T	F
F	F	T	T	T	F

# Example 5: two variables, 4 statements

- A simple four-statement argument.
  - P<sub>1</sub>:  $\sim g$
  - P<sub>2</sub>:  $g \cup h$
  - P<sub>3</sub>:  $h \cap \sim g$
  - C:  $\sim h$
- Fill in the truth table.
- Check for 'TTTF'.
  - Row 3 has a 'TTTF', so this argument is **INVALID**.

p	q	$p \cap q$	$p \cup q$	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	T
F	F	F	F	T

g	h	P <sub>1</sub> : $\sim g$	P <sub>2</sub> : $g \cup h$	P <sub>3</sub> : $h \cap \sim g$	C $\sim h$
T	T	F	T	F	F
T	F	F	T	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	F
F	F	T	F	F	T

## Example 6: Dogs, Animals, and Things That Eat

- Here is an argument we have seen before:
  - “All dogs are animals.”  $d \rightarrow a$
  - “All animals must eat.”  $a \rightarrow e$
  - “Thus, all dogs must eat.”  $d \rightarrow e$
- There are 3 variables, so we will have 8 rows.
- Fill in the truth table.
- Check for ‘TTF’.
  - There is no case where all premises are true and yet the conclusion is false. So this argument is **VALID**.

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

d	a	e	P1: $d \rightarrow a$	P2: $a \rightarrow e$	C $d \rightarrow e$
T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	F
T	F	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	F	T
F	F	T	T	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T

# Example 7: Dogs, Animals, and 4-Legged Things

p	q	$p \rightarrow q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

- Here is another argument we have seen before:
  - “All dogs are animals.”  $d \rightarrow a$
  - “All dogs have 4 legs.”  $d \rightarrow f$
  - “Thus, all animals have 4 legs.”  $a \rightarrow f$
- Fill in the truth table.
- Check for ‘TTF’.
  - There is at least one case of ‘TTF’, so this argument is **INVALID**.

d	a	f	P1: $d \rightarrow a$	P2: $d \rightarrow f$	C $a \rightarrow f$
T	T	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	F	F
T	F	T	F	T	T
T	F	F	F	F	T
F	T	T	T	T	T
F	T	F	T	T	F
F	F	T	T	T	T
F	F	F	T	T	T

# Conclusion

- An argument is **valid** if there are **no cases with all True premises but a False conclusion**.
- To check for validity, we build the **truth table** for the argument.
  - There will be enough rows to accommodate all permutations of the number of variables. ( $2^n$ , where  $n = \#$  of variables)
  - There will be one column for each statement (premise or conclusion). You should leave room for helper columns.
  - Complete the truth table using the basic truth tables for logical operators.
- **Check for any instance of 'TT...TTF'.**
  - If one or more exist, the argument is **INVALID**.
  - Otherwise, the argument is **VALID**.