

Human Evaluation Guidelines

Fallacy Categories

Appeal to Popular Opinion

- **Definition:** This fallacy covers instances of attempted reinforcement of political claims by referring to the fact that something is very popular, or the will of the people.



He can make any excuse he wants, but the facts are that we're reducing the number of uninsured percentage of our population. And as the percentage of the population is increasing nationally, somehow the allegation that we don't care and we're going to give money for this interest or that interest and not for children in the State of Texas is totally absurd. **Let me just tell you who the jury is. The people of Texas. There's only been one governor ever elected to back-to-back four-year terms, and that was me.**

Justification: The candidate is using his selection as governor to appeal to popular opinion. He is saying: since the majority of people chose me as governor for a four year term, the popular opinion is that I am a good governor thus I am a good governor(who conducts correct insurance laws).

Appeal to Pity

- **Definition:** An appeal to pity may be an evasion of relevant considerations needed to make a decision on the issue.



So gun laws are important, no question about it, **but so is loving children, and character education classes, and faith-based programs being a part of after-school programs. Some desperate child needs to have somebody put their arm around them and say, we love you.**

Justification: Instead of providing relevant premises against conducting gun laws, the candidate tries to appeal to the emotion of the audience to feel pity for the children who commit shooting in schools.

Appeal to Fear

- **Definition:** Seeking to build support for an idea by instilling anxiety and/or panic in the population towards an alternative.



Well, I think it's terrible. **If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.**

Justification: The candidate is trying to put fear of the law which the other candidate is proposing by painting an image of a baby ripped out of their womb as a premise to justify why this abortion law is not good.

Loaded Language

- **Definition:** In this category of fallacies politicians make use of specific words and phrases with strong emotional implications (either positive or negative) to influence an audience



Well, I actually agree with that. I agree with everything she said. I began this campaign because I was so tired of seeing **such foolish things** happen to our country.

Justification: The word “foolish” has a negative connotation and is a loaded word which will put the premise used in a loaded language and thus the argument is considered fallacious.

Flag Waving:

- **Definition:** *Flag waving is a propaganda technique which falls under the category of appeal to popular opinion by trying to appeal to a group of people by using arguments which contain emotions concerning nation, race, gender, political preference or in general a group, idea or country.*



In 1933, Franklin Roosevelt said in his inaugural that this generation of Americans

has a rendezvous with destiny.

I think our generation of Americans has the same rendez-vous. The question now is: Can freedom be maintained under the most severe attack it has ever known? I think it can be. And I think in the final analysis it depends upon what we do here. **I think it's time America started moving again.**

Justification: By constantly talking of American will, the candidate is trying to appeal to the patriotic emotion to imply that a move (away from the previous administration) is needed in the US.

Guide to the scores

Relevance

How relevant is the unveiled fallacious argument to the correspondent fallacious one, in terms of topic and category of fallacy?

Score	Explanation
5	The generated text unveils perfectly the topic and the category of fallacy starting from the fallacious argument.
4	The generated text is highly relevant, accurately identifying the topic and category of fallacy, with only minor deviations or inaccuracies.
3	The generated text is somewhat relevant, capturing the general topic and category of fallacy, but with some noticeable errors or omissions.
2	The generated text has limited relevance, failing to adequately address the topic or category of fallacy, with significant errors or misunderstandings.
1	The text is the same without any changes.

Suitableness

How much is the style of the unveiled fallacy suitable? I.e., The unveiled fallacy is polite, it contains no explicit references, expresses the same meaning neutrally?

Score	Explanation
5	The unveiled fallacy is paraphrased in a perfect way, conveying the fallacious argument neutrally and with an entirely appropriate, polite language.
4	The unveiled fallacy is suitably paraphrased, remaining largely neutral and polite, with only minor instances of unsuitable language or tone.
3	The unveiled fallacy is somewhat suitably paraphrased, but contains noticeable

Score	Explanation
	instances of unsuitable language, explicit references, or non-neutral tone.
2	The unveiled fallacy is poorly paraphrased, with significant issues in terms of unsuitable language, explicit content, or a heavily non-neutral tone.
1	The text is the same without any changes.

Informativeness

How informative is the unveiled fallacy as a response to the fallacious argument in terms of the quantity and factual correctness of the facts reported by the initial message?

Score	Explanation
5	The unveiled fallacy has been paraphrased using highly informative and factually correct additional details and context, significantly enhancing the understanding of the fallacious argument.
4	The unveiled fallacy provides some useful additional information and context, making it more informative than the original fallacious argument, although there may be minor factual errors or omissions.
3	The unveiled fallacy adds a moderate amount of relevant information, but there are noticeable gaps or factual inaccuracies that limit its overall informativeness.
2	The unveiled fallacy includes very little useful additional information, failing to provide sufficient context or details to properly elucidate the fallacious argument.
1	The unveiled fallacy contains no additional or necessary information to help unveil the fallacy beyond the original fallacious argument.

Cogency

This dimension measures the amount and logical correctness of the unveiled fallacy based on the prompt we assigned.

Score	Explanation
5	The generated text respects perfectly the prompt instruction fully addressing the requirements.
4	The generated text largely follows the prompt instruction, providing a cogent and mostly logically correct unveiling of the fallacy, with only minor deviations or omissions.
3	The generated text moderately adheres to the prompt instruction, offering a partially cogent unveiling of the fallacy, but with some noticeable gaps in the output format.
2	The generated text has limited cogency in relation to the prompt instruction, failing to unveil the fallacy in a logically satisfactory manner, with significant flaws or misunderstandings.
1	The generated text doesn't follow the prompt instruction in any way, completely lacking cogency.

Examples

Relevance

High relevance (5 points)

FA: It means that we are helping state and local governments set up road projects and bridge projects that keep people in their jobs. And then long - term we've got to fix our health care system, we've got to fix our energy system that is putting such **big load** on families. You need somebody working for you and you've got to have somebody in Washington who is thinking about the middle class and not just those who can afford to hire lobbyists.

UA: It means that we are helping state and local governments set up road projects and bridge projects that keep people in their jobs. And then long - term

we've got to fix our health care system, we've got to fix our energy system that is putting such a **big burden** on families. You need somebody working for you and you've got to have somebody in Washington who is thinking about the middle class and not just those who can afford to hire lobbyists.

Low relevance (1 points)

FA: They're going to expand their companies. They're going to do a great job. **I'm getting rid of the carried interest provision.**

UA: They are committed to economic success, **and their expansion will create jobs and boost the economy.**

Suitableness

High relevance (5 points)

FA: Why that's more than the average teacher makes. **I'm tired of this**, ladies and gentlemen. We've run up more debt in the last eight years than under all the presidents from George Washington to Jimmy Carter combined.

UA: Why that's more than the average teacher makes. We've run up more debt in the last eight years than under all the presidents from George Washington to Jimmy Carter combined.

Low relevance (1 points)

FA: **And I just don't think that dog will hunt this time.** Here's the record: We cut deficit four years in a row for the first time before the Civil War -- I mean, before World War II, and maybe before the Civil War, too.

UA: **And I just don't think that dog will hunt this time.** Here's the record: We cut deficit four years in a row for the first time before the Civil War -- I mean, before World War II, and maybe before the Civil War, too.

Informativeness

High relevance (5 points)

FA: And I grew up learning how to respect those views. **I believe that I can't legislate or transfer to another American citizen my article of faith.**

UA: And I grew up learning how to respect those views. **But I disagree with them. I believe that I can't legislate or transfer to another American citizen**

my article of faith.

Low relevance (1 points)

FA: But it's locker room talk, and it's one of those things. **I will defeat ISIS. We're going to defeat ISIS.**

UA: **We will defeat ISIS**

Cogency

High relevance (5 points)

Prompt: Given an argument 'It's called Immediate Helping Hand. Instead of squabbling and finger pointing, he gets immediate help. Let me say something.' where 'squabbling and finger pointing' is a fallacious argument. 1. Label the fallacious argument among the following categories: Appeal to Fear, Loaded Language, Flag Waving, Appeal to Pity, Appeal to popular opinion 2. Generate the argument in such a way it preserves the same meaning and the argument is not fallacious anymore. The context is a political debate. Output of the answer in the following structure: - **Fallacy Label:** - **Fixed Argument:**

GA: - **Fallacy Label: Loaded Language - Fixed Argument: Instead of engaging in unproductive arguments and blame games, he provides immediate assistance. Let me make a point.**

Low relevance (1 points)

Prompt: Given an argument 'For two years, the president didn't even engage with North Korea, did nothing at all, while it was growing more dangerous, despite the warnings of former Secretary of Defense William Perry, who negotiated getting television cameras and inspectors into that reactor. We were safer before President Bush came to office. Now they have the bombs and we're less safe. So what do we do?' where 'We were safer before President Bush came to office. Now they have the bombs and we're less safe.' is a fallacious argument. 1. Label the fallacious argument among the following categories: Appeal to Fear, Loaded Language, Flag Waving, Appeal to Pity, Appeal to popular opinion 2. Generate the argument in such a way it preserves the same meaning and the argument is not fallacious anymore. The context is a political debate. Output of the answer in the following structure: - **Fallacy label:** - **Fixed Argument:**

GA: 1. The fallacious argument in this context falls under the category of ****Appeal to Fear****. The argument uses fear-invoking language to persuade the audience by emphasizing the potential danger posed by North Korea having nuclear weapons. 2. A non-fallacious way to present the same argument could be: - Revised Argument: "Two years into the presidency, there was a lack of direct engagement with North Korea, even as the situation grew more threatening, despite the warnings of former Secretary of Defense William Perry regarding their reactors. This inaction arguably contributed to North Korea's acquisition of nuclear weapons, which may have left us in a less favorable security position today."

By avoiding the emotionally charged language and focusing on the argument's core elements, the revised argument is no longer fallacious.