

# 24.223 Paper 1 Prompts

Kevin Dorst

**Instructions:** Please write a roughly 2000-word paper (7–8 pages double-spaced) that responds to one of the following prompts.

**ChatGPT and AI:** You can use whatever methods you like to brainstorm and outline, but once you start writing your draft, all your writing must be your own. **You must write your draft, from start to finish, in Google Docs.** When you submit your paper, you will **share editing privileges with me for your paper**, so that—if needed—I can use Draftback to verify that you wrote it yourself, rather than using an AI to write it.

The aim is to make one small contribution to the conversation started by the paper and in class. You should begin with a thesis paragraph, explaining what you will argue and how you will proceed. You should then reconstruct the argument you will be engaging with in a way that is understandable to someone who has not read the paper or come to class. (You may presuppose the basics of Bayesian epistemology and decision theory, though it is good to remind your readers what any terms and equations mean.) After doing so, you should make your contribution, which should come in the form of raising or responding to an objection to the argument you have reconstructed. I will grade your paper by evaluating it for

- (1) sentence-level and structural *clarity*,
- (2) accuracy and adequacy of its *exposition* of the target argument, and
- (3) the novelty and substance of its *engagement* with that argument.

Papers should be submitted over email to kevindorst0@gmail.com by sharing editing privileges with your Google Doc. The due date is **11:59pm on November 5**. Late papers will be marked down 1/3 of a letter grade for each late day.

## Prompts:

1. Tversky and Kahneman argue that the conjunction fallacy shows that people don't reason like Bayesians. What's their most-convincing argument for this? Is it right?
2. Dorst and Mandelkern argue that the conjunction fallacy can be explained and rationalized by an accuracy-informativity tradeoff. What's the best (empirical and/or normative) objection to this proposal? Is it convincing?
3. Hedden argues that hindsight bias is not necessarily a bias. What does this mean, and how does he argue for it? Is he right?
4. Past-Kevin argues that the gambler's fallacy is due to rational inference. What's the basic argument, and what's the most convincing objection to it?