

Toulmin's Argument Model

Claim

A claim is a statement that you are asking the other person to accept. This includes information you are asking them to accept as true or actions you want them to accept and enact.

For example:

You should use a hearing aid.

Many people start with a claim, but then find that it is challenged. If you just ask me to do something, I will not simply agree with what you want. I will ask why I should agree with you. I will ask you to prove your claim. This is where grounds become important.

Grounds

The grounds (or data) is the basis of real persuasion and is made up of data and hard facts, plus the reasoning behind the claim. It is the 'truth' on which the claim is based. Grounds may also include proof of expertise and the basic premises on which the rest of the argument is built.

The actual truth of the data may be less than 100%, as all data are based on perception and hence there is some element of assumption about it.

It is critical to the argument that the grounds are not challenged because, if they are, they may become a claim, which you will need to prove with even deeper information and further argument.

For example:

Over 70% of all people over 65 years have a hearing difficulty.

Information is usually a very powerful element of persuasion, although it does affect people differently. Those who are dogmatic, logical or rational will more likely to be persuaded by factual data. Those who argue emotionally and who are highly invested in their own position will challenge it or otherwise try to ignore it. It is often a useful test to give something factual to the other person that disproves their argument, and watch how they handle it. Some will accept it without question. Some will dismiss it out of hand. Others will dig deeper, requiring more explanation. This is where the warrant comes into its own.

Warrant

A warrant links data and other grounds to a claim, legitimizing the claim by showing the grounds to be relevant. The warrant may be explicit or unspoken and implicit. It answers the question 'Why does that data mean your claim is true?'

For example:

A hearing aid helps most people to hear better.

The warrant may be simple and it may also be a longer argument, with additional sub-elements including those described below.

Warrants may be based on **logos, ethos or pathos**, or values that are assumed to be shared with the listener. In many arguments, warrants are often implicit and hence unstated. This gives space for the other person to question and expose the warrant, perhaps to show it is weak or unfounded.

This information comes from a website on argument. Their information on syllogisms and on fallacies is pretty good, too: <http://changingminds.org/disciplines/argument/argument.htm>

Toulmin's Argument Model

Backing

The backing (or support) for an argument gives additional support to the warrant by answering different questions.

For example:

Hearing aids are available locally.

Qualifier

The qualifier (or modal qualifier) indicates the strength of the leap from the data to the warrant and may limit how universally the claim applies. They include words such as 'most', 'usually', 'always' or 'sometimes'. Arguments may thus range from strong assertions to generally quite floppy or largely and often rather uncertain kinds of statement.

For example:

Hearing aids help most people.

Another variant is the reservation, which may give the possibility of the claim being incorrect.

Unless there is evidence to the contrary, hearing aids do no harm to ears.

Qualifiers and reservations are much used by advertisers who are constrained not to lie. Thus they slip 'usually', 'virtually', 'unless' and so on into their claims.

Rebuttal

Despite the careful construction of the argument, there may still be counter-arguments that can be used. These may be rebutted either through a continued dialogue, or by pre-empting the counter-argument by giving the rebuttal during the initial presentation of the argument.

For example:

There is a support desk that deals with technical problems.

Any rebuttal is an argument in itself, and thus may include a claim, warrant, backing and so on. It also, of course can have a rebuttal. Thus if you are presenting an argument, you can seek to understand both possible rebuttals and also rebuttals to the rebuttals.

Three ways to persuade

Ethos

Ethos uses trust, and focuses first on the speaker, and is dependent upon the speaker's

Reputation

The reputation of a person depends on their past, and what is known and spoken about them. Note that, although there is usually a close relationship between reputation and reality, this is not always so. Politicians, for example, guard their reputation carefully, yet many still have skeletons in the closet.

Leveraging reputation often means reminding others of your illustrious past, perhaps through stories of your successes, of how you have helped others and been able to see the truth where others have not.

Credibility

Credibility, depends both on expertise and how this is portrayed. If you want people to believe you, you must first show that you believe yourself.

To use credibility, position yourself as an expert. Talk as if you cannot be challenged. Show how others look up to you. Use powerful gesture, eye contact and so on to position yourself as a leader.

Pathos

Pathos appeals to the emotions of the listener, seeking to excite them or otherwise arouse their interest. An effective way of arousing passions is in appeal to values. Tell stories of poor values, for example where innocent people are harmed. Use Ethos to show your own values and how you put others before yourself. You can also work with their goals and interests or even challenge their beliefs.

Language has a significant effect on emotion, and key words (fire, child, anger, smooth, etc.) can trigger senses and feelings.

Logos

Logos focuses first on the argument, using cool logic and rational explanation, as well as demonstrable evidence.

Evidence

Science and scientific proof are based on the use of empirical evidence. If you argue without evidence, a scientist would dismiss your argument as metaphysical (literally, outside the physical world).

Evidence cannot be refuted, as courts of law seek to demonstrate. If you show, then it is very difficult to deny without calling into question the validity of the evidence produced.

Evidence can include statistics, pictures and recounted experience (especially first hand). Pathos may also be evoked when giving evidence as you give it an emotional spin. Ethos is also important to establish the credibility of the witness.

Reason

Reason uses rational points that call on accepted truths and proven theories. Where evidence does not exist, reason may still prevail. A common tool in reasoning is to link two items together, for example by cause and effect.

Reasoning often uses syllogisms that include a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion based on the combination of the two premises.

This information comes from a website on argument. Their information on syllogisms and on fallacies is pretty good, too: <http://changingminds.org/disciplines/argument/argument.htm>