

Non-deductive Arguments

Three Examples: enumerative induction, argument by analogy, and abduction

Day 5 – Philosophical Method

Non-deductive arguments

- Many different kinds of non-deductive (or inductive) argument have been identified
- See, for example, the Wikipedia article on inductive reasoning at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inductive_reasoning#Types

Three types of induction

We'll look at just three of these:

- Enumerative induction
- Abduction
- Argument by analogy

Enumerative induction

Enumerative induction seeks to choose an hypothesis (which we'll view as the conclusion of an argument) which has the greatest probability of being true, given the evidence.

Enumerative induction

Enumerative induction seeks to choose an hypothesis (which we'll view as the conclusion of an argument) which has the greatest probability of being true, given the evidence.

- Let e stand for existing evidence
- Let H_k stand for hypothesis number k
- Let $P(H_k | e)$ stand for the probability that H_k is true, given that e is true

Enumerative induction

Enumerative induction seeks to choose an hypothesis (which we'll view as the conclusion of an argument) which has the greatest probability of being true, given the evidence.

- Let e stand for existing evidence
- Let H_k stand for hypothesis number k
- Let $P(H_k | e)$ stand for the probability that H_k is true, given that e is true

Enumerative induction concludes that H_k is true if and only if $P(H_k | e) \geq P(H_i | e)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Enumerative induction



Enumerative induction concludes that H_k is true if and only if $P(H_k | e) \geq P(H_i | e)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = in a random sample of 20 SVGS students, 5 said they prefer Cinnamon Pop-Tarts to Lance Whole Grain Cracker Sandwiches with Cheddar Cheese





Enumerative induction

Enumerative induction concludes that H_k is true if and only if $P(H_k | e) \geq P(H_i | e)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = in a random sample of 20 SVGS students, 5 said they prefer Cinnamon Pop-Tarts to Lance Whole Grain Cracker Sandwiches with Cheddar Cheese

H_0 = 0% of all SVGS students have this preference

H_1 = 1% of all SVGS students have this preference

...

H_{100} = 100% of all SVGS students have this preference





Enumerative induction

Which hypothesis is most likely to be true, given e ?

Example:

e = in a random sample of 20 SVGS students, 5 said they prefer Cinnamon Pop-Tarts to Lance Whole Grain Cracker Sandwiches with Cheddar Cheese

H_0 = 0% of all SVGS students have this preference

H_1 = 1% of all SVGS students have this preference

...

H_{100} = 100% of all SVGS students have this preference



Enumerative induction



Which hypothesis is most likely to be true, given e ?

Example:

e = in a random sample of 20 SVGS students, 5 said they prefer Cinnamon Pop-Tarts to Lance Whole Grain Cracker Sandwiches with Cheddar Cheese

H_{25} = 25% of all SVGS students have this preference



Enumerative induction



The argument itself:

In a random sample of 20 SVGS students, 5 said they prefer Cinnamon Pop-Tarts to Lance Whole Grain Cracker Sandwiches with Cheddar Cheese.

25% of all SVGS students have this preference.



Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction seeks to choose an hypothesis (which we'll view as the conclusion of an argument) which gives the best explanation of the evidence we have.

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction seeks to choose an hypothesis (which we'll view as the conclusion of an argument) which gives the best explanation of the evidence we have.

- Let e stand for existing evidence
- Let H_k stand for hypothesis number k
- Let $P(e | H_k)$ stand for the probability that e is true, given that H_k is true

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction seeks to choose an hypothesis (which we'll view as the conclusion of an argument) which gives the best explanation of the evidence we have.

- Let e stand for existing evidence
- Let H_k stand for hypothesis number k
- Let $P(e | H_k)$ stand for the probability that e is true, given that H_k is true

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = Allowed to breed feely with adequate food, water, shelter, and space, the observed number of breeding pairs of rabbits (in successive months) over a 7 month period were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12.

H_1 = Number of pairs doubles each month

H_2 = Number of pairs increases exponentially with the number of months

H_3 = Number of pairs each month follows the Fibonacci Sequence

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = observed number pairs of rabbits (in successive months)

were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12

H_1 = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, and 64

H_2 = 3, 7, 20, 55, 148, 403, and 1097

H_3 = 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, and 13

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = observed number pairs of rabbits (in successive months)

were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12

$H_1 = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, \text{ and } 64$

error: $0+1+2+5+10+52 = 70$

$H_2 = 3, 7, 20, 55, 148, 403, \text{ and } 1097$ error:

$H_3 = 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, \text{ and } 13$

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = observed number pairs of rabbits (in successive months)

were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12

$H_1 = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, \text{ and } 64$ error: 70

$H_2 = 3, 7, 20, 55, 148, 403, \text{ and } 1097$

error: $2+6+18+52+142+395+1033 = 1748$

$H_3 = 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, \text{ and } 13$

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = observed number pairs of rabbits (in successive months)

were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12

$H_1 = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, \text{ and } 64$ error: 70

$H_2 = 3, 7, 20, 55, 148, 403, \text{ and } 1097$ error: 1748

$H_3 = 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, \text{ and } 13$

error: $0+0+0+0+1+0+1 = 2$

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = observed number pairs of rabbits (in successive months)

were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12

$H_1 = 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32,$ and 64 error: 70

$H_2 = 3, 7, 20, 55, 148, 403,$ and 1097 error: 1748

$H_3 = 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8,$ and 13 error: 2

Abduction

inference to best explanation

Abduction concludes that H_k is true if and only if

$P(e | H_k) \geq P(e | H_i)$ for all $i \neq k$.

Example:

e = observed number pairs of rabbits (in successive months)
were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12

H_3 = Number of pairs each month follows the
Fibonacci Sequence

Abduction

inference to best explanation

The argument itself

Allowed to breed feely with adequate food, water, shelter, and space, the observed number of breeding pairs of rabbits (in successive months) over a 7 month period were 1, 1, 2, 3, 6, 8, and 12.

Allowed to breed feely with adequate food, water, shelter, and space, the observed number of breeding pairs of rabbits each month follows the Fibonacci sequence.

Argument by Analogy

An argument by analogy appeals to the fact that object A has property X and object B is similar to object A. Therefore, object B probably also has property X.

Argument by Analogy

An argument by analogy appeals to the fact that object A has property X and object B is similar to object A. Therefore, object B probably also has property X.

- The strength of an argument by analogy (the probability that object B also has property X) is measured by the similarity between objects A and B

Argument by Analogy

An argument by analogy appeals to the fact that object A has property X and object B is similar to object A. Therefore, object B probably also has property X.

- The strength of an argument by analogy (the probability that object B also has property X) is measured by the similarity between objects A and B
- The more similar B is to A, the more probably it is that object B also has property X.

Argument by Analogy

An argument by analogy appeals to the fact that object A has property X and object B is similar to object A. Therefore, object B probably also has property X.

- The strength of an argument by analogy (the probability that object B also has property X) is measured by the similarity between objects A and B
- The more similar B is to A, the more probably it is that object B also has property X.
- Form of an argument by analogy:

Object A has property X.

Object A and object B are similar.

Object B has property X.

Argument by Analogy

An argument by analogy appeals to the fact that object A has property X and object B is similar to object A. Therefore, object B probably also has property X.

Example:

A fine watch is created by an intelligent designer.

The motions of the sun and planets are reliably predictable, like the mechanism of a fine watch.

The solar system was probably created by an intelligent designer.