

1.) in a research argument, you make a *claim*, back it with *reasons* supported by *evidence*, *acknowledge* and *respond* to other views, and sometimes explain your *principles* of reasoning.

2.) at the core of every research argument is the answer to your research question, the solution to your problem-your main claim. You have to back up that claim with two kinds of support: reasons and evidence.

3.) the second kind of support is the evidence on which you base your reasons. We've said that reasons can be supported by still more reasons, but these chains don't go on forever. eventually you have to show some data. that's your evidence.

4.) careful readers will question every part of your argument, so you must anticipate as many of their questions as you can, and then acknowledge and respond to the most important ones.

5.) the challenge all researchers face, however, is not just responding to readers questions, alternatives, and objections, but imagining them in the first place.

6.) like all warrants, this one says that if a general circumstance exists, then we can infer a general consequence. The logic behind all words is that if a generalization is true or reasonable, then so must be specific instances of it.

7.) as we'll see it's not easy to decide when you even need a warrant. Experienced researchers usually state them only on two occasions: when they think readers in their fields might ask how a reason is relevant to a claim or when they are explaining their field's ways of reasoning to general readers.

8.) moreover, each reason, warrant, or response to an objection (all of which are statements or assertions) may itself have to be treated as a sub claim and supported by its own argument. only the evidence "stands alone" but even then you may have to explain where you got it, why you think it's reliable, and how it supports your reason-and that may require yet another argument.

9.) readers judge your arguments not just by the reasons and evidence you offer but also how well you anticipate in address their questions and concerns. by thickening your argument in this way, you earn the confidence of your readers building up what is traditionally called your ethos: the character you project in your argument.

10.) when some beginning researchers succeed at making one kind of argument, they just keep making it over and over. The mastery of one kind of complexity blinds them to another: they fail to see that their field, if it is an active one, is marked by competing methodologies, competing solutions, competing goals and objectives. don't fall into this trap.