

Toulmin Model – Classical Argumentation

1. Claim:

An explicit statement that firmly claims what side of an issue the author will take/argue.

2. Modals/Qualifiers:

This is the necessary section wherein the author needs to explain the context of his/her argument. He/She may need to define terms or historical context or the limitations of the argument; meaning, are you defending the ethics of capital punishment in general and philosophical terms or are you arguing why capital punishment should still be supported by the State of Texas specifically in murder cases of only 3+ victims? BE SPECIFIC.

3. Grounds:

These are the author's reasons for WHY he/she is arguing her perspective. This includes evidence to also support his/her view on the issue. Typically comprised and a balance of logos and pathos as are the other parts of Toulmin (Warrant/Backing/Rebuttal).

4. Warrant:

Think of this like explicating textual evidence from your work on critical analysis. This is the moment in the argument wherein you CLEARLY/SPELL OUT the connection between the **Grounds** and the **Claim**.

5. Backing:

Sometimes the author may need additional support to explain the connection between the **Grounds** and **Claim** (i.e. **Warrant**), so he/she may bring in secondary evidence/reason.

6. Rebuttal:

This is a look at the most likely objections to an author's claim. Rebuttals are essential in creating solid ethos, proving the author has considered the likely opposing argument to her claim, and yet, she is so sound in her reason/evidence, her viewpoint is still the more effective, preferable, justified, etc.

Rebuttals are comprised of two parts:

Concession: The author "concedes" there are certain valid aspects of her opposition's perspective. She should also back these up with EVIDENCE AND SOUND REASON.

Refutation: However, the author then demonstrates that, regardless of these aspects, her position is still more just, effective, preferable, etc.

Suggested/Possible Toulmin Essay Outline:

- I. Introduction
 - a. Hook audience
 - b. Deliver firm/explicit claim
- II. Definition/Historical Context
- III. Grounds 1
 - a. Evidence/Reason
 - b. Warrant
 - c. Backing
- IV. Grounds 2
 - a. Evidence/Reason
 - b. Warrant
 - c. Backing
- V. Grounds 3
 - a. Evidence/Reason

- b. Warrant
- c. Backing

- VI. Rebuttal
 - a. Concession
 - b. Refutation

- VII. Conclusion

OR

- I. Introduction
 - a. Hook audience
 - b. Deliver firm/explicit claim
- II. Definition/Historical Context
- III. Grounds 1
 - a. Evidence/Reason
 - b. Warrant
 - c. Backing
- IV. Rebuttal to Grounds 1
 - a. Concession
 - b. Refutation
- V. Grounds 2
 - a. Evidence/Reason
 - b. Warrant
 - c. Backing
- VI. Rebuttal to Grounds 2
 - a. Concession
 - b. Refutation
- VII. Grounds 3
 - a. Evidence/Reason
 - b. Warrant
 - c. Backing
- VIII. Rebuttal to Grounds 3
 - a. Concession
 - b. Refutation
- IX. Conclusion

Rogerian Model – A Diplomatic Mode of Argumentation, Problem-Solution

1. State the problem.
2. Give the opponent's position
3. The writer then grants whatever validity he/she finds in the oppositions perspective—for instance, the writer may recognize certain circumstances wherein the position would be acceptable.
4. Then the writer discusses how his/her perspective/position, if taken into account by the opposition, would further strengthen/improve/solve the “problem”

Potential/Suggested Outline for Rogerian

- I. Introduction
 - a. Hook
 - b. Writer explains the PROBLEM
 - c. Writer begins to show why this problem needs to be addressed.
- II. The writer further defines the problem, perhaps showing how depending on different circumstances, different solutions may be more applicable.
 - a. The writer explains any definitions/historical context to further develop/illustrate problem
 - b. The writer illustrates various perspectives that could be taken on the issue
 - c. The writer hints at his perspective
- III. The writer focuses on the opposition's perspective
 - a. The writer clearly illustrates what the opponent's perspective is
- IV. The writer begins to give solid validity to the opponent's position.
 - a. Gives grounds (evidence/reasons)
 - i. Warrant
 - ii. Backing
- V. The writer may bring in situational circumstances wherein the opposition's perspective is even more necessary.
- VI. The writer then begins to illustrate his/her perspective
- VII. The writer begins to defend his/her position
 - a. Gives grounds (evidence/reasons)
 - i. Warrant
 - ii. Backing
- VIII. The writer then begins to show how his/her perspective could compliment the oppositions – together, these two perspectives can work toward solving the problem.

Scientific Method – An Exploratory Mode

1. Ask a question
2. Do Background Research
3. Construct a Hypothesis/Answer
4. Test the Hypothesis/Experiment
5. Analyze the Data
6. Draw a Conclusion

Suggested/Potential Outline for Exploratory Model

- I. Introduction:
 - a. Hook
 - b. The writer states a question
 - c. Establishes why this issue/question is important
 - d. The writer shows how there are no clear/definitive answers to his/her question.
 - e. The writer gives a thesis of sorts stating what he/she is exploring and how he/she may go about finding the answer to his/her question.
- II. The writer offers what IS known about the question.
 - a. Gives definitions to clarify
 - b. Sets parameters (i.e. if he is defining what love is, he may clarify here that he is specifically discussing romantic love, not brotherly or familial love).
 - c. May offer history/background information on topic.

- III. The writer speculates what the various answers could be to her question. For each of these, she will provide grounds/warrant/backing.
 - a. Possible Answer 1
 - i. Grounds (Reason/Evidence)
 1. Warrant
 2. Backing
 - b. Possible Answer 2
 - i. Grounds (Reason/Evidence)
 1. Warrant
 2. Backing
 - c. The writer could bring in even more possible answers to investigate repeating the pattern above.
- IV. The writer begins to more clearly state which “answer”/“theory” she believes will be correct.
 - a. She provides solid grounds (reason/evidence)
 - i. Warrant
 - ii. Backing
- V. Next, she examines her theory/answer and why it is more plausible/effective/just than the others she has explored.
 - a. She may go through a series of concession/rebuttal for Possible Answer 1 and Possible Answer 2
- VI. She reconfirms the question may still be open/needs to be asked, but now claims which theory does best to respond to it.