

Arguments by Analogy, selected *possible* analysis. Use this as a possible guide for ways you might expand and elaborate on arguments in general.

2. My boss ordered me to buy a computer powerful enough to do complicated 3-dimensional terrain modeling. LandStar Engineering does the same type of work my boss wants me to do, and they use a computer with a large amount of RAM, the fastest Intel Processor available, and a powerful Nvidia Graphics card dedicated to 3-D rendering. Tigerdirect sells a computer with the same configuration for less than local stores, *so if I buy their computer, I should have a computer powerful enough to do complicated 3-dimensional terrain modeling.*

The analogy is not well supported by induction. Only one Engineering firm is cited, so it fails on that account.

However, the comparison terms (RAM memory, processor speed, graphics card) all contribute to what is necessary for a computer to do work, hence their inclusion in the list is relevant to the conclusion (in italics). However, the argument is weakened if software is not included in the purchase.

The analogy could be made stronger if more firms than LandStar Engineering were included in the list, and software were also mentioned.

For the analogy to be weak, Landstar engineering would have to be exceptional (what is true of them is not true in general), and perhaps computers sold from Tigerdirect are of lesser quality than others.

5. *If there are laws requiring people to wear motorcycle helmets then there should also be laws requiring people to buckle up in their cars.* Since the primary reason there are laws requiring people to wear motorcycle helmets is because such helmet use saves many lives, and wearing a helmet is not inconvenient or causes the wearer a great deal of discomfort, and people would rather live than die in accidents, all of these reasons apply to wearing seat belts too, so the law should be extended to seat belt use as well.

The analogy is not supported by induction. The number of times helmets save lives (compared with not wearing a helmet) is not mentioned, nor is an indication given as to whether such studies, even if cited, would carry over to seat belt use.

However, the comparison terms are relevant (one puts on a seat belt just like one puts on a helmet, the reason given for requiring people by law to wear helmets extends to wearing seat belts)

The analogy could be weakened if seat belt use saves people in a different way than helmet use saves people in motorcycles accidents. Also, one might note other risky behaviors where one is

not required to wear safety gear, and cite the absence of such laws in those areas as a reason not to extend them to wearing seat belts.

Finally, one might note that the same argument could be used to argue that since seat belt use is not mandatory, then motorcycle helmet use should not be mandatory either.

9. Ever since Galileo, scientists have known that all objects are affected by gravity in the same way, such that if one drops a light-weight ball versus a heavy ball they will reach the ground at the same time. *Therefore, when I hold a bucket full of water, and a bucket empty of water, and jump down a small height with the buckets in different hands, they will feel as if they "weigh" the same amount while we are all falling together (since I - like the buckets, will be effected by gravity in the same way!)*

The argument is somewhat supported by induction, since it is stated that “all objects are affected by gravity . . .”, however what is not stated is whether gravity is the cause of weight. If it is not, then the argument’s conclusion is weak. On the assumption that gravity is the cause of weight, then “me”, “a heavy bucket” and a “light bucket” will all “fall” at the same rate (since we hit the ground at the same time). This means that gravity is affecting us the same, so if gravity is the reason behind the feeling of weight, then the difference in light-weight vs. heavy weight vanishes.

11. Every male in the Logic class got a grade higher than average, while every female in the same Logic class received a grade less than average. *Therefore, females perform on average poorer in Logic than do males.*

The argument’s conclusion seems at first glance to be supported by induction, since every male and every female is cited. What is left out is how many males, and how many females are in the class . On further consideration, since one class is just a small sample of the total number of males and females that take such a class, the argument is certainly not supported by induction (one class is cited, the conclusion is about all females, not just the females in the class)

Also there are few comparison terms (the only comparison is that both sexes took the test, and the grades they received)