

**DEDUCTIVE ARGUMENTS**  
 deductively invalid  
 premises are true  
 (inductively strong not by virtue of its logical form, but when certain conditions are satisfied)

**INDUCTIVE ARGUMENTS**  
 can not be offered as a proof  
 can not guarantee their conclusions  
 conclusions are probable  
 conclusions are based on the noted relationships  
 "scientific method"  
 the conclusion always stretches beyond the premises  
 require inductive leap  
 conclusions can be strong and plausible

**Logical Relationships**

**SIMILARITIES:**  
 strong (inductive strength)  
 relevant,  
 numerous  
 nonmetaphorical

**DIFFERENCES:**  
 minor  
 irrelevant  
 few

**Arguments from Analogy**  
 Literal: fundamental similarities  
 Metaphorical: fundamental differences  
 Fallacy: tu quoque ( "you are another" )

INSTANCES, PARTICULARITIES, NARROW EXPERIENCES, SAMPLING OF A CLASS, STATISTICAL DATA  
**Arguments from Examples**  
 ( Inductive Generalizations: Universal and Statistical Syllogisms )  
 Fallacy: ad hominem ( "directed to a man" )  
 Fallacy: gambler's fallacy

ARE NOT CERTAIN  
 COINCIDENTAL /CHRONOLOGICAL  
 NECESSARY/ SUFFICIENT

<p><b>Mill's Method of Agreement</b>          different circumstances          similar result          shared element=cause          necessary condition for the effect</p>	<p><b>Mill's Method of Difference</b>          similar circumstances          different result          not shared element=cause          sufficient condition for the effect</p>
---	---

**Causal Arguments**  
 Fallacy: post hoc ( "after that" )