## Critically evaluating sources

For most of us the problem is how to organise ourselves to check for these things routinely as we read. It will help if you keep a copy of this checklist by your side as you work.

| Evaluating arguments – checklist |   |  |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1                                | Arguments <ol> <li>Are there hidden assumptions in the argument?</li> <li>1.2 Does the conclusion follow from the reasons given?</li> <li>Qualifiers</li> <li>Distributing terms</li> <li>Converting claims</li> <li>Affirming and denying</li> </ol>   |  |  |
| 2                                | Evidence         2.1 Does the author have enough reliable evidence?         Untypical examples/ insufficient or weighted evidence         2.2 Does he represent the evidence accurately?         Statistics         2.3 Does he draw reliable inferences from it?         Analogies         Oversimplifying (stereotypes, straw man, special pleading, false dilemma)         Invalid causal inferences (post hoc fallacy, cause/ correlation, multiple and underlying causes)         2.4 Are the inferences relevant?         Attacking the person, popularity, authority, fear, compromise |  |  |
| 3                                | Language<br>3.1 Is the author's meaning clear?<br>Jargon<br>Loaded language<br>Begging the question<br>3.2 Does she use words consistently?<br>Equivocation   |  |  |

## Analogies

When authors use an analogy to draw inferences, check three things:

| Evaluating arguments – checklist |  |  |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| I                                | The <b>connection</b> between the analogy and the inference:   |  |
|                                  | I.I When does the connection break down? They all tend to at some point.   |  |
|                                  | <b>1.2</b> Is there a causal connection: does the evidence show that one thing really does cause another?        |  |
| 2                                | The <b>numbers</b> involved:   |  |
|                                  | 2.1 The number of examples between which the analogy holds – the more we have, the more confident we can be.     |  |
|                                  | 2.2 The number and variety of the characteristics shared by the analogy and what it is being used to explain.    |  |
| 3                                | The <b>relation</b> between the analogy and the inference drawn from it:   |  |
|                                  | 3.1 Is it the right strength or does it exaggerate the extent of the similarity?                                 |  |
|                                  | <b>3.2</b> How significant are the similarities and differences between the analogy and what is being explained? |  |

For more information, see How to Write Your Literature Review, Chapter 9.

8