

Final Draft Assignment

Instructions: this assignment is due by noon on **April 26**. If you can't make the deadline, I'll be pretty open to extensions without penalty so long as you email beforehand. Otherwise, you lose a point per day it's late. You should email your final paper to me. It does not count as turned in until you get an email confirming that I have received it. Its main text (i.e. excluding footnotes, bibliography, abstract and headings) should be at least 2500 words. If you have any questions about how to complete the assignment, please let me know.

The topic of this paper is your choice as long as it has to do with philosophy of mind. It is fine to discuss a topic we didn't mention in class. Meanwhile, if there is some subject we have (or will) touch on in class that you find interesting, that is fine. But it would not be ok simply to recapitulate what we say in class; instead you should go beyond it in some way. The majority (if not all) of your paper should be new things. It should include an abstract and bibliography, as well as the main text.

Here are several suggestions for picking a topic area:

- This website here http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/browse?module_0=obo-9780195396577 contains a number of topics in philosophy of mind (and, as a bonus, a number of helpful readings on each topic).
- You could play around on a site like the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (see <http://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html>) until you find something that looks interesting. David Chalmers has helpfully collected a list of Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy articles related to philosophy of mind at <http://consc.net/guide.html>
- There are a number of textbooks that collect together classic and influential essays in philosophy of mind. You can usually find the table of contents for them online and see if anything in them looks interesting.

- Perhaps you have some question in philosophy of mind you always wondered about. Now would be the perfect time to look into it more.

Here are several suggestions for finding readings, once you have picked a topic area:

- One way is to find anthologies that deal with the topic you're interested in and then go to the library, find them, and see if any of the articles in them look interesting. Usually they will have the word "guide", "companion", "readings" or "anthology" in the title, so you can try googling e.g. "guide philosophy of mind." Some examples of presses that produce them are Blackwell, Oxford, Cambridge, Routledge, and Continuum, so you could also try googling e.g. "Blackwell philosophy of mind."
- Another way is to search the internet for syllabi on the topic you're interested in (or just syllabi on philosophy of mind in general). Usually, you'll be able to find some, and they often have readings that are especially important and influential for the topic you're interested in.
- If you can find an article on your topic in an online encyclopedia like the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (see <http://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html>), it will often have a bibliography with a bunch of articles on your topic. I would recommend reading through the article; it will probably talk about various arguments in it, so then you can see which arguments you find interesting, and look up the authors of those. Often, they will have personal webpages in which they list various things they've written that you can find by googling them.
- Another resource is PhilPapers (the website is <http://philpapers.org/>) which is searchable and has a huge collection of philosophy articles. It also has them categorized, so you can explore various categories in philosophy of mind.

Once you've found the title of an article that sounds interesting, here's how to get access to it.

- Sometimes the article you're looking for is part of a collection in a book. In that case, you should check and see if the library has the book.

- Often, the article won't be part of a book, but will instead be printed in a journal:
 - If you're on campus, usually you can just do a google search for the article and find and download a copy of it.
 - If you're off campus, or you're having trouble getting access to the article through just googling it, you should go to the library website. The library website offers two ways to search for articles. One is by clicking on the tab that says "articles" and entering the article title and information. The other is by clicking the tab that says "eJournals," searching for the journal the article was printed in, and then entering the other bibliographic info about the article (when it was written, etc.) to get the article.

I will be using my standard paper rubric for grading these papers – see the next page for details.

Paper Rubric - Phil Mind - Daniel Immerman

Structuring	(3) It is extraordinarily clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things follow in a logical order.	(2) It is quite clear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things for the most part follow in a logical order.	(1) It is somewhat unclear what the main goal of your paper is and what you are doing at each point in it. Things sometimes fail to follow in a logical order.	(0) It is massively unclear what the main goal of your paper is and there are several points in which it is unclear what you are doing in it. Things often fail to follow in a logical order.
Clarity and Precision	(3) Extremely clear and precise. This includes telling me exactly how your arguments go, exactly where you object to arguments you object to, etc.	(2) You are rather clear and precise.	(1) There are a fair number of places in which you fail to be clear and precise.	(0) Your paper is massively unclear and imprecise.
Answering Prompt	(2) Answered all parts of the prompt.	(1) Answered most parts of the prompt.	(0) Ignored the prompt.	Note: you only are eligible for points in rows after the first two if you get one or more points in each of the first two rows.
Interpretation	(2) Maximally accurate and charitable in interpretation, presenting keen insight into other author's ideas.	(1) Fairly accurate and charitable in interpretation.	(0) A number of problems in accuracy or charity of interpretation.	
Depth	(2) Discusses issues in depth, considering objections and responses, rather than talking through a number of points quickly.	(1) Discusses several issues in a moderate amount of depth.	(0) Discusses a large number of issues very quickly.	
Persuasion	(2) The points you make in defense of your main claims are all extremely plausible, or if somewhat implausible, you consider and respond to the most important objections to them.	(1) The points you make in defense of your main claims are, for the most part, fairly plausible.	(0) The points you make in defense of your main claims are rather implausible.	
Concision	(1) No unnecessary sentences or words. Everything regarding what other authors say is necessary to explain the points you'll be making.	(.5) Occasional extra words or sentences. Sometimes adds unnecessary remarks about what other authors say.	(0) Often adds extra words or sentences or talks about irrelevant points.	
Creativity	(2) You make some extremely creative points.	(1) Your points are rather creative.	(0) Your points are not especially creative, but rather fairly standard.	
Ambition	(1) Your conclusions are extremely surprising.	(.5) Your conclusions are rather controversial.	(0) Your conclusions are not particularly controversial, but rather fairly mainstream.	