

**Table E.6a Good versus Bad argumentation**

<b>Good argumentation contains:</b>	<b>Bad argumentation contains:</b>
• clarity	• ambiguity
• succinctness	• lengthiness (too many words)
• simplicity	• unnecessary use of complex vocabulary
• precision	• inaccuracy (sloppy phrasing)

**Table E.6b Common Fallacies in Argumentation**

<b>Fallacies in argumentation</b>	<b>Example</b>
Authority/big names	'As Weber already stated...', or 'I agree with Marx that...'
Normative adjectives:	'exceedingly expensive houses', 'incredible statements', 'honourable major'
Normative assessments	'Everyone knows', 'It is clear', 'It is obvious that', 'Naturally', 'It is a fact'
Clichés	proverbs like 'unknown, unloved'
Stereotypes	('the' Italian, 'the Chinese', 'women', 'men')
Rationalisations	making something or someone look more purposeful afterwards than was the case
Conclusive words	'thus', 'therefore' (☹E9)
Suggestive dots	'but we know better...'
Improper inductions	only generalise examples after proving their representativeness
Improper deductions	apply a general statement to a specific case only when the statement holds true for all cases (which is very unlikely in social sciences)
Improper causality	if X comes <i>after</i> Y, it is not necessarily caused by Y ( <i>post-hoc reasoning</i> )
Tautologies	rephrasing the same argument as if it were additional evidence