Evaluating Arguments

Deductive, Inductive, and Abductive Reasoning

Brendan Shea, PhD

Intro to Logic

Three Types of Arguments and How to Evaluate Them

- Every day we encounter arguments that try to convince us of various conclusions, from scientific theories to criminal investigations.
- Not all arguments are created equal—some provide strong support for their conclusions while others are logically flawed.
- There are three main types of arguments: **deductive**, **inductive**, and **abductive**, each with different standards for evaluation.
- Understanding these differences is crucial for thinking critically about evidence and reasoning in any field.

Key Point

Different types of arguments require different evaluation criteria—what makes a deductive argument good is not the same as what makes an inductive argument good.

The Detective's Toolkit: Why Different Arguments Need Different Standards

- Think of a detective investigating a crime—they use multiple types of reasoning to build their case.
- Sometimes they use **deductive reasoning**: "If the suspect was at the coffee shop at 3 PM, then he couldn't have committed the murder at 3 PM across town."
- Other times they use **inductive reasoning**: "This suspect has committed similar crimes before, so he's likely our perpetrator."
- They also use **abductive reasoning**: "The best explanation for this evidence is that the butler did it."

Example

A forensic scientist might use math (deduction) to calculate height in cm (based on height in inches), induce that the crime rate will increase next month based on trends (probable), or abduce that the victim knew their attacker based on the evidence (best explanation).

Deductive Arguments: When Conclusions Follow Necessarily

- A **deductive argument** is one where the conclusion is supposed to follow necessarily from the premises.
- If the premises are true, then the conclusion *must* be true—there's no possibility of the premises being true and the conclusion false.
- We evaluate deductive arguments as either **valid** (the conclusion does follow necessarily) or **invalid** (it doesn't).
- The truth of the premises is a separate question from whether the argument is valid.

Definition: Deductive Argument

An argument where the conclusion is intended to follow with logical necessity from the premises. If valid and the premises are true, the conclusion must be true.

Valid vs. Invalid: The Foundation of Deductive Reasoning

- A **valid** deductive argument is one where if all the premises were true, the conclusion would have to be true.
- An **invalid** deductive argument is one where the premises could be true but the conclusion could still be false.
- Validity is about the logical structure of the argument, not whether the premises are actually true in reality.
- A valid argument with true premises is called **sound**—this gives us the strongest possible support for a conclusion.

Example

Valid: All detectives carry badges. Holmes is a detective. Therefore, Holmes carries a badge.

Invalid: Most detectives are observant. Holmes is observant. Therefore, Holmes is a detective.

Common Deductive Argument Forms Table

- Deductive arguments often follow recognizable patterns or **forms** that guarantee validity when used correctly.
- Learning these common forms helps you quickly identify valid deductive reasoning in everyday situations.
- Each form has a specific structure that, when followed precisely, ensures the conclusion follows necessarily from the premises.
- These forms appear frequently in legal reasoning, mathematical proofs, and logical problem-solving.

Argument Form	**Structure**
Categorical Syllogism	All A are B; All B are C; Therefore, All A are C
Modus Ponens (MP)	If P then Q; P; Therefore, Q
Modus Tollens (MT)	If P then Q; Not Q; Therefore, Not P
Hypothetical Syllogism (HS)	If P then Q; If Q then R; Therefore, If P then R
Mathematical Arguments	Based on definitions, axioms, and proven theorems

Sherlock Holmes and the Categorical Syllogism

- A **categorical syllogism** involves three categories and shows how they relate to each other through two premises.
- The classic form is: All A are B, All B are C, Therefore All A are C—this structure guarantees validity.
- The key is ensuring that the middle term (B) properly connects the other two categories.

Example

Holmes's reasoning:

- All murderers in this case left muddy footprints in the library.
- All people who left muddy footprints in the library entered through the garden door.
- Therefore, all murderers in this case entered through the garden door.

Modus Ponens: Detective Rodriguez's Logical Breakthrough

- **Modus Ponens** (MP) is the most fundamental deductive argument form: If P then Q, P, Therefore Q.
- This form captures the basic logic of conditional reasoning—when we know a condition leads to a result, and the condition occurs, we can deduce the result.
- The argument is valid regardless of what specific propositions we substitute for P and Q.

Example

Rodriguez's breakthrough:

- If the suspect used his credit card after 6 PM, then he wasn't at the crime scene at 6 PM.
- The suspect used his credit card at 6:15 PM (bank records confirm this).
- Therefore, the suspect wasn't at the crime scene at 6 PM.

Modus Tollens: How Inspector Chen Eliminated Suspects

- **Modus Tollens** (MT) works by denying the consequent: If P then Q, Not Q, Therefore Not P.
- This form is particularly useful for elimination—when we know what should happen if something were true, but it doesn't happen.
- MT is the logical foundation of many "proofs by contraction."

Example

Chen's elimination process:

- If Johnson committed the crime, then his DNA would be on the weapon.
- Johnson's DNA is not on the weapon (lab results show this).
- Therefore, Johnson did not commit the crime.

Hypothetical Syllogisms: Following the Chain of Evidence

- A **hypothetical syllogism** (HS) chains together conditional statements: If P then Q, If Q then R, Therefore If P then R.
- This form allows us to trace logical connections through multiple steps, linking distant causes to their effects.
- The strength of the chain depends on each individual conditional being true—one weak link breaks the whole argument.

Example

Chain of evidence:

- If the victim knew the attacker, then there would be no signs of forced entry.
- If there were no signs of forced entry, then the crime was committed by someone with a key.
- Therefore, if the victim knew the attacker, then the crime was committed by someone with a key.

Mathematical Arguments: CSI Thompson's Deductive Proof

- **Mathematical arguments** use definitions, axioms, and previously proven theorems to reach conclusions with absolute certainty.
- These arguments are deductive because their conclusions follow necessarily from mathematical principles.
- The precision of mathematics makes these arguments particularly powerful because they provide certainty, not just probability. IF we start from true premises, THEN we get true conclusions.

Example

Thompson's deductive proof: The evidence locker contains 247 pieces of evidence. Thompson removes 89 pieces for testing. By the mathematical definition of subtraction, there must be exactly 247 - 89 = 158 pieces remaining in the locker. This conclusion follows with absolute certainty from arithmetic.

Testing Validity: The Counterexample Method

- To test if a deductive argument is valid, we use the **counterexample method**: try to imagine a situation where all premises are true but the conclusion is false.
- If you can construct such a scenario, the argument is invalid; if you cannot, the argument is valid.
- This method works because validity means it's impossible for the premises to be true and the conclusion false.
- The counterexample doesn't need to reflect reality—it just needs to be logically possible.

Testing Validity Step-by-Step

1. Assume all premises are true
2. Try to imagine the conclusion being false
3. If this is possible, the argument is invalid
4. If this is impossible, the argument is valid

Worked-Out Counterexample: Testing Argument Validity

- The counterexample method first requires **abstracting the argument form** by identifying the logical structure with variables.
- Once we have the abstract form, we **substitute new values** for the variables to create a new argument with the same structure.
- To show invalidity, we find substitutions that make the premises true but the conclusion false.
- If we can construct such a counterexample, we've proven the argument form is invalid.

Complete Counterexample Process

1. **Detective Pikachu's Argument:** All criminals wear dark clothing at night. The suspect wore dark clothing last night. Therefore, the suspect is a criminal.
2. **Abstract Form:** All A are B. X is B. Therefore, X is A.
3. **Counterexample:** All cats are mammals. My son is a mammal. Therefore, my son is a cat.

Common Deductive Fallacies: When Logic Goes Wrong

- Even when attempting deductive reasoning, people often make logical errors called **fallacies**.
- **Affirming the consequent**: If P then Q, Q, Therefore P—this reverses the logic incorrectly.
- **Denying the antecedent**: If P then Q, Not P, Therefore Not Q—this also breaks the logical connection.
- Recognizing these patterns helps you spot invalid arguments that might seem convincing at first glance.

Common Invalid Forms

Affirming the Consequent: If it's raining, the ground is wet. The ground is wet. Therefore, it's raining.

Denying the Antecedent: If it's raining, the ground is wet. It's not raining. Therefore, the ground is not wet.

Sound Arguments: When Valid Logic Meets True Premises

- A **sound** argument is a valid deductive argument where all the premises are actually true in reality.
- Sound arguments give us the strongest possible support for their conclusions—the conclusion must be true.
- Many deductive arguments we encounter are valid but not sound because one or more premises are false or questionable.
- Distinguishing between validity (logical structure) and soundness (logical structure + true premises) is crucial for critical thinking.

Sound vs. Valid

Valid: The logic works correctly (if premises were true, conclusion would follow)

Sound: The logic works correctly AND the premises are actually true

Valid but Unsound: Veronica Mars's Logical but False Reasoning

- Here's a valid argument with false premises: "All high school students cheat on tests. Logan is a high school student. Therefore, Logan cheats on tests."
- The argument is **valid** because if the premises were true, the conclusion would necessarily follow.
- However, the argument is **unsound** because the first premise ("All high school students cheat on tests") is clearly false.
- This shows why both logical structure (validity) and factual accuracy (true premises) matter for strong deductive arguments.

Example

Analysis of Veronica's argument:

- *Premise 1:* All high school students cheat on tests. (False)
- *Premise 2:* Logan is a high school student. (True)
- *Conclusion:* Logan cheats on tests. (False conclusion from false premise)
- *Verdict:* Valid form but unsound due to false premise

Inductive Arguments: Reasoning from Evidence to Likelihood

- An **inductive argument** moves from specific observations to general conclusions that are probably, but not necessarily, true.
- Unlike deductive arguments, inductive arguments acknowledge that new evidence could change our conclusions.
- We evaluate inductive arguments as **strong** (premises provide good support) or **weak** (premises provide poor support).
- The conclusion of even a strong inductive argument could turn out to be false—that's the nature of reasoning about probabilities.

Definition: Inductive Argument

An argument where the premises are intended to provide probable support for the conclusion. If the premises are true and we've considered all relevant evidence, the conclusion is likely to be true.

Strong vs. Weak: Measuring Inductive Support

- A **strong** inductive argument is one where true premises make the conclusion very likely to be true.
- A **weak** inductive argument is one where true premises provide little support for the conclusion.
- Strength comes in degrees—arguments can be stronger or weaker rather than simply strong or weak.
- Unlike validity, inductive strength depends partly on what we know about the world, not just logical structure.

Example

Strong: In 95% of cases with this DNA evidence pattern, the suspect is guilty. We have this DNA pattern. Therefore, the suspect is probably guilty.

Weak: The suspect wore a red shirt. Some criminals wear red shirts. Therefore, the suspect is probably guilty.

Common Inductive Argument Forms Table

- Inductive arguments take several common forms, each with specific patterns and evaluation criteria.
- These forms help us reason from limited observations to broader conclusions about patterns and probabilities.
- Unlike deductive forms, inductive forms don't guarantee their conclusions but aim to make them highly probable.
- Understanding these forms helps identify when inductive reasoning is being used and how strong it is.

Argument Form	**Structure**
Generalization	Sample has property X; Therefore, population has X
Prediction	Pattern held in past; Therefore, pattern will continue
Argument from Analogy	A and B are similar; A has property X; Therefore, B has X
Argument from Authority	Expert E claims P; Therefore, P is probably true

The Total Evidence Requirement

- The **total evidence requirement** states that inductive arguments must consider all relevant available evidence, not just supporting evidence.
- For example, a detective might seem to have a strong case against the suspect based on fingerprints and motive.
- However, this argument would be much weaker if crucial security camera footage provided the suspect with an alibi.
- Ignoring contrary evidence or cherry-picking data makes even seemingly strong inductive arguments unreliable.

The Total Evidence Requirement

An inductive argument is only as strong as its weakest ignored piece of relevant evidence. All available relevant evidence must be considered for a fair assessment.

Generalizations: Officer Williams and the Crime Pattern

- **Inductive generalizations** move from observations about a sample to conclusions about a larger population.
- Example: Officer Williams notices that 80% of burglaries in her district occur between 2-4 PM on weekdays when residents are at work.
- Based on this pattern, she schedules extra patrols during these hours and sees a 30% reduction in break-ins.
- The strength of the generalization depends on sample size, representativeness, and the margin of the observed pattern.

Example

Williams's reasoning:

- *Sample:* 200 burglaries over 6 months, 160 occurred 2-4 PM on weekdays
- *Generalization:* Most future burglaries will occur 2-4 PM on weekdays
- *Action:* Increase patrols during high-risk hours

Predictions: Forensic Analyst Dr. Kim's Weather Case

- **Inductive predictions** use past patterns to forecast future events, acknowledging that patterns might change.
- Example: Dr. Kim analyzes how weather affects evidence preservation at outdoor crime scenes over several years.
- She discovers that DNA evidence degrades 50% faster in temperatures above 85°F with high humidity.
- Based on weather forecasts, she now prioritizes evidence collection and adjusts testing procedures accordingly.

Example

Dr. Kim's prediction model:

- *Past pattern:* Hot, humid weather significantly degrades DNA evidence
- *Current situation:* Weather forecast shows 90°F and 80% humidity
- *Prediction:* DNA evidence will degrade rapidly at this crime scene
- *Response:* Expedite evidence collection and use enhanced preservation methods

Arguments from Analogy: How Detective Foster Solved the Cold Case

- **Arguments from analogy** reason that if two things are similar in known ways, they're likely similar in unknown ways.
- Example: Detective Foster reopened a 10-year-old murder case and noticed striking similarities to a recent solved case.
- Both victims were similar age, profession, and found in similar locations with identical evidence patterns.
- Foster reasoned that the same perpetrator likely committed both crimes and focused her investigation accordingly.

Example

Foster's analogical reasoning:

- *Case A (solved):* Female lawyer, 35, found in park, specific knife wounds, no robbery
- *Case B (unsolved):* Female lawyer, 34, found in park, identical wounds, no robbery
- *Conclusion:* Same perpetrator likely committed both crimes
- *Result:* DNA from Case A led to arrest in Case B

Arguments from Authority: When Expert Testimony Matters

- **Arguments from authority** accept a conclusion because a credible expert or authority figure endorses it.
- These arguments can be strong when the authority is truly expert in the relevant field and there's expert consensus.
- However, they're weak when the authority lacks relevant expertise, has conflicts of interest, or experts disagree.
- In legal and scinetific settings, expert testimony often provides crucial inductive support for conclusions about complex technical matters.

Evaluating Arguments from Authority

Strong when: True expert, relevant field, expert consensus, no conflicts of interest

Weak when: False expert, irrelevant field, expert disagreement, conflicts of interest

Sample Size and Representativeness: Detective Johnson's Survey

- The strength of inductive generalizations depends heavily on **sample size** and **representativeness**.
- Example: Detective Johnson surveyed community members about drug activity but initially only interviewed people during business hours.
- This gave her a biased sample of mostly retirees and unemployed residents, missing working people's perspectives.
- After expanding her survey times and methods, she got a more representative sample and very different results.

Example

Johnson's sampling lesson:

- *Initial sample:* 50 people, 9 AM-5 PM, mostly elderly/unemployed
- *Result:* 80% said no drug problem in neighborhood
- *Expanded sample:* 200 people, various times, all demographics
- *New result:* 60% said significant drug problem exists

Evaluating Inductive Strength: A Step-by-Step Guide

- Evaluating inductive arguments requires checking multiple factors that affect how well the premises support the conclusion.
- Start by identifying the type of inductive argument (generalization, prediction, analogy, or authority).
- Check whether all relevant evidence has been considered and whether the sample or comparison is appropriate.
- Consider alternative explanations and assess whether the conclusion is the most likely given the evidence.

Inductive Evaluation Checklist

1. What type of inductive argument is this?
2. Has all relevant evidence been considered?
3. Is the sample size adequate and representative?
4. Are there alternative explanations for the evidence?
5. How probable is the conclusion given the premises?

Inspector Garcia and the Probability Assessment

- Example: Inspector Garcia must weigh conflicting evidence in a robbery case to assess the probability of the suspect's guilt.
- The fingerprint evidence strongly suggests guilt (found at 90% of crime scenes where perpetrator identified).
- However, the suspect has a solid alibi confirmed by three independent witnesses with no motive to lie.
- Garcia concludes the evidence is roughly balanced, requiring additional investigation before making an arrest.

Example

Garcia's probability assessment:

- *Supporting evidence:* Fingerprints (90% reliability), suspicious behavior
- *Contradicting evidence:* Solid alibi, no clear motive, good character references
- *Conclusion:* Evidence insufficient for high confidence in guilt
- *Action:* Continue investigation before proceeding

Common Inductive Fallacies: When Evidence Misleads

- **Hasty generalization** draws broad conclusions from insufficient or unrepresentative samples.
- **False analogy** compares things that are too different in relevant respects to support the conclusion.
- **Appeal to inappropriate authority** relies on expertise from the wrong field or biased sources.
- **Cherry-picking** selects only supporting evidence while ignoring contradictory data.

Warning Signs of Weak Inductive Arguments

Small sample sizes, biased samples, irrelevant comparisons, inappropriate experts, ignored contrary evidence, or conclusions much stronger than the evidence warrants.

Cogent Arguments: When Strong Logic Meets True Premises

- A **cogent** argument is a strong inductive argument where all the premises are actually true in reality.
- Just as soundness is the gold standard for deductive arguments, cogency is the gold standard for inductive arguments.
- Cogent arguments give us the best possible inductive support for their conclusions—the conclusion is very likely to be true.
- Many inductive arguments we encounter are strong but not cogent because one or more premises are false or questionable.

Cogent vs. Strong

Strong: The logic works well (if premises were true, conclusion would be very likely)

Cogent: The logic works well AND the premises are actually true

Abductive Arguments: Inference to the Best Explanation

- **Abductive arguments** (also called inference to the best explanation) start with puzzling observations and conclude that a particular explanation is most likely correct.
- Unlike deductive arguments (which guarantee conclusions) or inductive arguments (which assess probability), abductive arguments compare competing explanations.
- We evaluate abductive arguments as **better** or **worse** based on how well they explain the available evidence.
- Scientists, doctors, and detectives constantly use abductive reasoning to form hypotheses and diagnoses.

Definition: Abductive Argument

An argument that concludes a particular explanation is the best available account of some puzzling phenomenon or set of observations.

Better vs. Worse Explanations: The Criteria

- A **better explanation** accounts for more of the evidence, makes fewer unsupported assumptions, and fits with our background knowledge.
- **Explanatory scope**: How much of the evidence does the explanation account for?
- **Simplicity**: Does the explanation avoid unnecessary complexity and assumptions?
- **Consistency**: Does the explanation fit with other things we know to be true?

Criteria for Better Explanations

- **Scope:** Explains more phenomena
- **Simplicity:** Fewer assumptions, less complexity
- **Consistency:** Fits with background knowledge
- **Testability:** Makes predictions we can check
- **Precision:** Specific rather than vague

Common Abductive Reasoning Patterns Table

- Abductive reasoning appears in various forms across different fields, from medical diagnosis to criminal investigation.
- Each pattern involves comparing multiple possible explanations for observed phenomena.
- The goal is identifying which explanation best accounts for all available evidence with the fewest problematic assumptions.
- These patterns help structure our thinking when facing complex, puzzling situations that require explanatory hypotheses.

Reasoning Pattern	**Structure**
Medical Diagnosis	Symptoms X, Y, Z; Disease A best explains X, Y, Z
Criminal Investigation	Evidence A, B, C; Suspect theory best explains A, B, C
Scientific Hypothesis	Observations P, Q, R; Theory T best explains P, Q, R
Technical Troubleshooting	Problems X, Y; Cause C best explains X, Y

Dr. House's Diagnostic Method: Medical Abduction

- Dr. House faces a patient with fever, joint pain, skin rash, and neurological symptoms—a puzzling combination.
- He considers multiple diagnoses: lupus, Lyme disease, multiple sclerosis, and a rare autoimmune condition.
- The rare autoimmune condition explains all four symptoms, while other diagnoses only explain some symptoms well.
- House concludes this is the best explanation despite its rarity, and targeted tests confirm the diagnosis.

Example

House's diagnostic reasoning:

- *Lupus:* Explains fever, joint pain, rash but not neurological symptoms
- *Lyme disease:* Explains fever, joint pain, some neurological symptoms but rash is wrong type
- *Rare autoimmune:* Explains all four symptoms perfectly, fits patient's history
- *Conclusion:* Rare autoimmune condition is the best explanation

Detective Poirot's Explanation Evaluation

- Poirot investigates a locked-room murder where the victim was found alone in a study with the door locked from inside.
- **Suicide theory**: Simple but doesn't explain the missing gun or the victim's left-handed wound (victim was right-handed).
- **Secret passage theory**: Explains the locked room but no evidence of hidden entrances after thorough searches.
- **Accomplice theory**: The butler unlocked the door after the murder, explains all evidence with minimal assumptions.

Poirot's Comparison

- **Suicide:** Simple but fails to explain key evidence
- **Secret passage:** Explains locked room but unsupported by physical evidence
- **Accomplice:** Explains all evidence, requires only one reasonable assumption

Scientific Explanations: Forensic Scientist Dr. Lee's Discovery

- Dr. Lee analyzes unusual blood spatter patterns that don't match typical gunshot or stabbing scenarios.
- **Blunt force theory**: Doesn't explain the fine droplet pattern or the circular distribution.
- **Explosion theory**: Explains the droplet size and distribution but no chemical residue found.
- **High-velocity impact theory**: Best explains the pattern—victim was struck by a vehicle, then moved indoors.

Example

Dr. Lee's scientific reasoning:

- *Observation:* Fine blood droplets in circular pattern, no typical weapon signatures
- *Vehicle impact theory:* Explains droplet size, pattern, and secondary transfer
- *Prediction:* Should find vehicle paint or glass fragments
- *Confirmation:* Microscopic analysis reveals automotive paint particles

Competing Hypotheses: How Agent Cooper Weighs Evidence

- Agent Cooper investigates corporate fraud with evidence pointing toward two equally viable suspect theories.
- **Inside job theory**: CFO had access, motive (gambling debts), and opportunity during the audit period.
- **Cyber attack theory**: External hackers exploited security vulnerabilities, similar to recent attacks on other companies.
- Cooper must carefully weigh which explanation better accounts for the digital forensics, timing, and financial patterns.

Cooper's Evidence Analysis

- **Supporting inside job:** Access logs, financial pressure, specific knowledge required
- **Supporting cyber attack:** Sophisticated methods, international IP addresses, similar recent cases
- **Problem:** Both theories explain the evidence reasonably well
- **Solution:** Gather additional discriminating evidence

The Limits of Abductive Reasoning

- Abductive reasoning gives us the **best available explanation**, not necessarily the **true explanation**.
- Even the best explanation might be wrong if we lack crucial evidence or haven't considered the right alternative.
- Example: Scientists, detectives, etc. may know that evidence strongly suggests certain conclusions but doesn't provide absolute certainty.
- Abductive conclusions should be held tentatively and revised when new evidence emerges.

Abductive Limitations

The best explanation available now may not be the best explanation tomorrow. New evidence can dramatically change which explanation seems most plausible.

Comparing the Three Argument Types: A Summary Table

- Each argument type serves different purposes and requires different evaluation standards.
- Understanding when to use each type helps you reason more effectively in different situations.
- Many complex arguments combine all three types, using each where it's most appropriate.
- Critical thinking requires recognizing which type of argument is being used and applying the correct evaluation criteria.

Type	**Goal**	**Evaluation**	**Strength**
Deductive	Certainty	Valid/Invalid	Logical necessity
Inductive	Probability	Strong/Weak	Likely conclusions
Abductive	Best explanation	Better/Worse	Explanatory power

The Complete Investigator: When to Use Each Type of Reasoning

- Expert investigators combine all three reasoning types strategically throughout their cases.
- Use **deductive reasoning** when you have clear rules or principles that apply directly to your situation.
- Use **inductive reasoning** when you need to predict future events or generalize from observed patterns.
- Use **abductive reasoning** when you face puzzling evidence that needs explanation or when comparing competing theories.

Example

Complete investigation approach:

- *Deductive:* "If the suspect was at location X, then he couldn't have committed the crime at location Y."
- *Inductive:* "Based on similar cases, this type of crime usually involves someone the victim knew."
- *Abductive:* "The best explanation for all this evidence is that the business partner committed the murder."