



# Evidence

## 1. Descriptions and generalisations

- 1 Are my generalisations based on a sufficient number?
- 2 Are they a fair sample?
- 3 Is there a reasonable probability that they are true?
- 4 Have I used simple absolutes, like 'all', where other qualifiers, like 'some', would be more accurate?
- 5 Have I presented by evidence with enough precision?
- 6 Is it clear what I mean by 'typical', 'normal' and 'average'?
- 7 Have I chosen the right average to use: mean, median or mode?
- 8 Have I checked in the statistics I've used that,
  - 8.1 there are no hidden qualifications;
  - 8.2 there is uniformity between the comparisons I make;
  - 8.3 I have not confused absolute and comparative figures?

## 2. Drawing inferences

- 1 Have I checked that my analogies stand up according to the three key points?
- 2 Have I thought through clear criteria for my value judgements?
- 3 Have I made clear the basis of them?
- 4 Have I avoided arguing my case by using irrelevant inferences to support them?

## Analogies

- 1 Connection:
  - 1.1 Causal connection.
  - 1.2 When does it break down?
- 2 Numbers:
  - 2.1 The number of samples used.
  - 2.2 The number and variety of characteristics thought to be similar.
- 3 Relation to the conclusion:
  - 3.1 Is it the right strength?
  - 3.2 How significant are the differences and similarities?

## 3. Creating causal connections

### Oversimplifying causal connections

- 1 Stereotypes
- 2 The straw man
- 3 Special pleading
- 4 Fallacy of false dilemma

### Invalid causal connections

- 1 The *post hoc* fallacy
- 2 Cause/correlation
- 3 Multiple causes
- 4 Underlying causes
- 5 The fallacy of false cause (*non-sequitur*)

