

Claim: Students should take English 102

| because ↓ | Grounds: (support the reason) | Warrants: | Backing: (support the warrant) |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Reason 1: English 102 will help students become better arguers.</p> <p>→</p> | <p>Grounds provide support for the reason. In this case, grounds would include various proofs and evidence that English 102 helps students to become better arguers, i.e. statistics about student success rates after taking English 102. Additionally, a cause/effect argument of <i>how</i> English 102 helps students to become better arguers would provide good grounds, i.e. students learn millennia-old models of argument, students learn how to conduct good research to find evidence for arguments.</p> | <p>Warrant for reason 1: It is good/desirable for students to become better arguers.</p> | <p>Backing provide support for the warrant. In this case, the backing would include all the advantages and good outcomes pertaining to students becoming better arguers. The goal of the backing would be to prove that becoming a better arguer is, in fact, a good or desirable thing to do.</p> |
| <p>Reason 2: English 102 will help students to think critically.</p> <p>→</p> | <p>Show evidence that English 102 in general helps students improve their ability to think critically. A cause/effect argument might discuss how English 102 exposes students to new concepts and ways of thinking, and how such exposure helps students to see the world from other perspectives, as well as how English 102 helps students to address arguments against their own stances in a helpful, non-antagonistic manner.</p> | <p>Warrant for reason 2: It is good/desirable for students to think critically.</p> | <p>Backing might focus on the benefits to society of having a citizenry who can think critically, i.e. citizens would be less susceptible to being controlled or manipulated by powerful leaders & interests that work against the citizens' own interests. Backing might focus on the individual benefits of thinking critically, i.e. people's can see more options when they have a difficult decision to make, can think more clearly with more focus.</p> |
| <p>Reason 3: English 102 will improve any given student's ability to write.</p> <p>→</p> | <p>Show evidence that students who have completed English 102 are better writers than students who have not completed English 102. Find statistics about the writing abilities of workers who took English 102 or an equivalent course when in college. Interview bosses who oversee such workers about those workers' writing abilities. Also, explain how common English 102 assignments help to improve students' writing abilities.</p> | <p>Warrant for reason 3: It is good/desirable for any given student's writing ability to improve.</p> | <p>Cite surveys showing that 1/3 of American workers cannot write well enough to do their jobs. Explain how poor communication contributed to some well-known disasters, like the space shuttle disaster of the eighties or the Illinois bridge collapse. Explain some benefits of improved communication in the workplace, like the money and time saved. Explain that employees who write better are promoted more often.</p> |
| <p>The opposition argument you will address:</p> | <p>Summary of the opposition's grounds:</p> | <p>Strategy: Rebut or concede? Rebut: what evidence disproves opposition? Concede: shift to what values?</p> | |
| <p><u>Students should not have to take English 102 because it doesn't apply to their majors.</u></p> | <p>English 102 talks focuses on irrelevant ideas, forcing students to learn material that they will not be able to use when they get a job in their chosen fields. Why do accountants, for example, need to know how to argue? Time could be better spent on classes related to major.</p> | <p>Rebut. Show that the skills learned in an English 102 class are relevant to all majors and all career fields. All workers can benefit from thinking critically. Moreover, surveys show that 1/3 of American workers cannot write well enough to do their jobs. English 102 will help.</p> | |

Claim: We need to build a standing anti-zombie army that can defend us from the zombie hordes

| Because . . . ↓ | Grounds: | Warrant: | Backing: |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Reason 1: if we don't build the army, our children will inherit a world of conflict and strife.</p> | <p>How do I know this? Cause-effect argument: The zombies never stop trying to kill humans. With more zombies, there is more conflict of this type. Zombies cause conflict. Eliminating zombies eliminates the conflict; leaving zombies will perpetuate the conflict. Emotional appeals: Our children will inherit an earth ravaged by zombies, with no hope to carry on the human species. Imagine your child fighting against a zombie.</p> | <p>What unstated assumption connects this claim to this reason?</p> <p>It is bad/wrong/ethically unjust for children to inherit a world of conflict and strife.</p> | <p>Why do I think it is wrong for children to inherit a world of conflict and strife?</p> <p>I've seen the bad effects that conflict and strife have on people. People become scared and anxious. They can't concentrate on important things because they're always afraid. Emphasize the bad effects that conflict and strife have on people.</p> |
| <p>Reason 2: our risk of being bitten and infected by the zombie plague increases whenever we don't have such an army.</p> | <p>How do I know that our risk of being bitten lessens? Logic, statistics, and anecdotal evidence. Studies have shown that incidents of humans being bitten by zombies increase by 57% when there is no anti-zombie army standing guard. When the volunteer anti-zombie militia was formed, these incidents dropped by just 10%. A well-trained, professional anti-zombie army will provide even more of a drop in zombie bites. Emotional appeal: Consider the story of Ray, whose family was saved by anti-zombie soldiers.</p> | <p>What unstated assumption connects this claim to this reason?</p> <p>It is good to avoid being bitten and infected by zombies.</p> | <p>Why is it good to avoid being bitten by zombies? My audience will probably share this warrant, so I probably won't have to support it. But if I do, I could emphasize the bad consequences of being bitten by zombies. The bite infects people and turns them into zombies. The life of a zombie is horrible compared to the life of a human. Etc.</p> |
| <p>Reason 3: building the army will affirm our humanity in the face of the inhuman zombies by allowing us as humans to do what the zombies cannot—cooperate.</p> | <p>How do I know that zombies are inhuman? They attack piecemeal, not in full-fledged forces. They have no leaders. This shows that they are not human. We, on the other hand, can cooperate with one another. We form groups and elect leaders. We work together to defend this Wal-Mart. By working together, we emphasize the qualities about ourselves that make us human instead of zombies.</p> | <p>What unstated assumption connects this claim to this reason?</p> <p>It is good/desirable/ethically right to affirm our humanity.</p> | <p>Why is it right to affirm our humanity? What is the value of being human? The value of being human might not be obvious to my audience. I can point out all the great accomplishments humans have made—our art, our science, our technology. By contrast, zombies only know how to destroy. Humans have culture and community—we care for one another, we love and defend our families.</p> |
| <p>The opposition claim and reason you will address:</p> | <p>Summary of the opposition's grounds:</p> | <p>Rebut or concede? What will be the basis of your rebuttal? If you concede, how will you shift the values?</p> | |
| <p><u>We shouldn't build an anti-zombie army because such an army will waste resources to raise and support the army.</u></p> | <p>An anti-zombie army uses a lot of resources, which we can't spare. The soldiers will need extra food and medicine to keep up their strength. Training centers will need to be built.</p> | <p>Concede: It is true that an army will use a lot of our limited resources. However, the best defense is a good offense. Conserving resources is not as important as the hope of gaining new resources. Once we've beat back the zombies, we can find more resources.</p> | |