

STANDARDISATION TASK SAMPLE (WITH ANNOTATIONS)

Please note the annotations added to this document are to explain the sample – You don't need to add annotations to your own work.

Section 1: Standardisation of the argument 'Advertising is not bad for children's health'

C: The Government should not ban the advertising of fast food to children

P1.: There is no clear proof that Australian children are becoming less healthy

P1.1.: A recent survey conducted by the NSW government of over 5000 children aged 4-16 in schools across NSW, found that the percentage who were overweight or obese had only risen by about 5% since 2008, to around 25%.

P1.2.: A recent survey conducted by the NSW government of over 5000 children aged 4-16 in schools across NSW, found that children were exercising significantly more than they were in 2008.

P2.: Fast food companies do not have a negative effect on children's health

P2.1.: Ryan is fit and healthy

P2.2.: Ryan lists fast food amongst his favourites

P2.3.: Without sponsorship offered by fast food companies, many junior sporting competitions could not afford to run at all

P2.4.: Researchers claiming to show a connection between fast food consumption in childhood and health problems later on are probably just biased

P3.: Even if health concerns about fast food were justified, placing a ban on advertising to children would not be appropriate.

P3.1.: advertisements for food aimed at children do not really make them eat any more of these foods than they otherwise would.

P3.1.1.: Advertising is designed to increase market share, not overall consumption

P3.2.: Children don't make the purchasing decisions

P3.3.: Children in the US consume more fast food than Australian children

P3.4.: The US has not banned fast food advertising to children

P3.5.: The ban would be a disservice to the companies who would suffer directly from the proposed bans

P3.6.: Children, like all consumers, need to have access to this information, to allow them to make informed decisions about their food choices

P1., P2., P3. = Convergent

P1.1., P1.2. = Convergent

P2.1., P2.2. = Linked

P2.3., P2.4. = Convergent

P3.3., P3.4. = Linked

P3.1., P3.2., P3.5., P3.6. = Convergent

Commented [JDY1]: There will be a lot of variation in the standardisations of the argument you're using for your assignment. There's not one exact standardisation we're looking for, but you should be aiming to give a clear representation of the argument.

Commented [JDY2]: This standardisation was developed in the App, and then downloaded using the 'Download argument' button. You don't have to use the App, but it's recommended. Note that when we standardise outside the App we've been just using "1", "2" etc as premise numbers rather than "P1", "P2" etc as is generated by the App. Either is fine.

Commented [JDY3]: These premises are both quite long, but they're only making one claim each, so that's fine.

Commented [JDY4]: I've done some paraphrasing here, to make the context for premise 1.2 clear. I think these premises should be treated as convergent, since they're independent claims, so I've paraphrased to make 1.2 clearer on its own.

Commented [JDY5]: I've only included one sub-sub premise here. Often going back as far as one level of sub premises is sufficient, but I've added an extra premise here to be fair to the author, since 3.1 is quite radical but 3.1.1 provides evidence for it. It seems to be an important claim

Commented [JDY6]: Note that most premises in this argument are convergent, but these are linked because they need to be taken together to support 3.

Section 2: Standardisation of a counterargument:

C: Fast food advertising aimed at children should be banned

P1.: Banning advertising of fast food to children would decrease their consumption of fast food

P1.1.: If children were not aware of fast food options, they wouldn't pester their parents for fast food

P1.2.: Advertisers wouldn't be trying to advertise to children if it didn't make them buy more fast food

P2.: Decreasing children's consumption of fast food would be a good thing

P2.1.: Fast food is associated with higher levels of obesity

P2.2.: Fast food is associated with poorer dental health

P3.: Banning fast food advertising would not prevent children playing sport

P3.1.: Children played sport for years before fast food advertising

P3.2.: Other companies can also donate money to children's sport if fast food sponsorship is banned.

P1., P2. = Linked

P1.1., P1.2. = Convergent

P2.1., P2.2. = Convergent

P3.1., P3.2. = Convergent

Sources:

<https://www.ama.com.au/media/ama-calls-digital-black-out-junk-food-ads>

<https://theconversation.com/junk-food-is-promoted-online-to-appeal-to-kids-and-target-young-men-our-study-shows-234285>

(Note : Note that you need to use at least two of the sources suggested in the instructions document and note which ones you used here. Do not use other sources for this assignment. You should be drawing on the sources you used to develop your argument, but your argument should all be in your own words)

Section 3: Reflection

My conclusion is relatively radical, because although there are bans in place for the advertising of other products like alcohol and gambling to children, the audience might not initially support similar bans in relation to fast food, since those other products are illegal for children and fast food is not. I think the linked main premises 1 and 2, which I've given to support that claim, are quite conservative, because the audience is likely to believe that it would be better for children not to eat so much fast food and that advertising makes them consume more. This conservative support strengthens my argument, since people are likely to accept those claims, which should then lead them to accept my conclusion.

The other main premise I've included (premise 3) is a response to premise 2.3 of the original argument. I've focussed on that claim because I that claim in the original argument is a relatively conservative claim that the audience is likely to accept, which makes it strong evidence for Premise 2 of that argument. I have tried to strengthen my own argument by responding directly to one of the stronger claims given by the arguer.

Word count: 195

Commented [JDY7]: This is an example of the kinds of issues you should consider here, but there are different approaches you can take when writing a response, so you need to make sure what you say is relevant to the approach you've taken. For example I've explained here why I chose to respond directly to a conservative claim, to strengthen my argument, but you could also choose to respond to one or more of the more radical claims, since they will be easier to refute, and if they're playing an important role in the argument, responding directly to them can be effective. So don't think of this example as a model for what you have to say. Ensure your reflection/comment is well focussed and relevant to your own counterargument, and that you demonstrate an understanding of the significance of premises being radical or conservative