

Researched Argument

First Draft and Peer Review Due: Mar. 27

Second Draft and Peer Review Due: Apr. 1

Final Draft Due: Apr. 3

The researched argument will have four parts. Since we are using rhetorical theory and genre for the framing of this class, you will want to use the genre typically expected within these communities. Though there are obvious deviations from this format, many research communities (including rhetoric and composition) use the IMRaD format. This stands for Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion. We will work on all of these parts separately and they will have different due dates, but below is an outline of what is included in each part.

General Guidelines: The paper will probably be about 11-12 pages without appendices and works cited/references. Submit your document as a word document named: Lastname-FinalPaper-Draft,Peer,Final.

Introduction: (Hint: It is easiest to write your Introduction *last!*)

Your introduction will start out by introducing me to your topic. This part will help orient me as a reader to your research topic, give me a brief overview of the background and keywords, and then you will outline what you did and your results. This is much shorter than your literature review and does not go into the same depth. The introduction can come in many forms, so it might be a good idea to look in [Stylus](#) to see how other people have done their introductions.

Things that you might include:

1. You will want to establish some kind of **exigence** for your essay and provide your reader a *brief background* on your topic and question. This is not as thorough as your literature review, but simply helps to orient your reader to the general field. This is a good place to introduce a few keywords that you might define in more detail in your literature review.
2. Tell your reader what your research question was and **why** your research is important too. Tell me why I should care enough to keep reading.
3. You can also tell the reader what you will do in your paper. This can be as simple as “First, I will outline the previous literature.” Then tell the reader what you did to conduct your research.
4. Tell the reader what you found from your research. What is your claim? (Remember, we have said that claims are arguable and supported by evidence)

Literature Review: Once you have completed this initial introduction, you will give your reader an overview of what has already been said. This is where you will put your revised literature review. At this point, you have already written (and hopefully revised) your literature review but remember that it includes:

1. An **introduction** that defines or identifies the general topic, issue, or area of concern, thus providing the context for reviewing the literature. (**Tell me what your theoretical framework is in the introduction**). Think back to John Swales CARS model here →

<https://www.umass.edu/writingcenter/creating-research-space>. This is the **exigency** part. Tell me why your topic is important or relevant.

2. A **synthesis** of other people's research on the topic, explaining what is known about it. This is where you use your AB sources, and others you may have since found, to describe the "conversations."

(Remember a synthesis is a *weaving* together of sources to highlight the main points that you want readers to take away). **Connect this part back to your writing studies framework.**

3. A **statement** that **establishes a gap** and provides the transition to your own study and your research questions that will come in the rest of your paper. This is where you will need to **establish your gap** for your own research, describing what is missing, what is controversial, what is not yet known, or what needs to be resolved in the discussion. Here is where you say, "That is what we know about topic X. What we don't know is..."
4. Your research question, and how it seeks to address this gap.
5. A Works Cited or References page (depending on whether you have chosen to use MLA or APA) **with in-text citations.**

Methods: this portion tells the reader *how* you conducted your research.

What did you do to answer your research question and how does it answer your research question? Take a look back at *Easy Writer* for this part. Did you use ethnography? Case studies? Surveys? Interviews? Archival Research? Textual Analysis? **Why did you choose these methods and how did you do conduct your research? What are the benefits and pitfalls of your methods?**

Your methods section will tell your reader what you did and why. You are not analyzing anything at this point but telling your audience how you collected your evidence. This section will include:

1. **Your data collection methods.** First, tell the reader how you selected your methods. Next, the reader also needs to know how you selected your **unit of analysis** (primary sources). Why these documents, or why these participants? Don't forget to include any necessary contextualizing information about these documents and participants. What are their histories and what was the cultural climate in which you analyzed them?
2. **Describe what you did to collect your data.** If you sent out a survey, how did you send it out? How did you contact your interviewees? How did you choose which posts you analyzed?
 - a. **What questions did you ask in your survey or interview? Why were those questions appropriate?**
 - b. **If you analyzed documents, what document did you analyze? How many? When and how did you access them? WHY did you choose those documents?**
3. **Describe *how* you analyzed your data** (You will tell the reader *what* you made from this analysis later in the discussion section). Tell me how you coded your data here. What were your categories and how did you choose them?

4. **Be transparent and honest; note any limitations to your methods or to your research.** Was your sample size really small? Did your position or your role as a researcher affect the way that you interpreted the results in any way and did you have any stakes in the study? As a researcher, I appreciate honesty and transparency above all else here. If your research was a total flop; fine. Tell me why and what you would do differently.

Results:

WHAT did you find? What is your EVIDENCE?

This part is a straight-forward summary of what you found. You are not telling me your interpretation of your findings yet. This part will vary based on the type of research that you conducted (textual or interview) but this is the **evidence** that you will use to support your claim that you made up in the introduction.

Part of this part of the research process is narrowing down what is important for me to know as a reader. Don't tell me every tangential detail. What is IMPORTANT?

The results will not include all of these features but could include:

1. Commonalities you found
2. Differences that you found
3. Patterns that you found
4. Any coding that you conducted
5. Charts/graphs/visuals
6. Images or screenshots (CITED!)

Discussion: This is the part of the paper where you tell the reader how you interpreted the data. What do the results that you just told your reader about in the results section *mean*?

You will interpret your results through the framework that you laid out for me in the Literature Review.

This is where you will conduct your analysis. Remember, **analysis** is how you break something down to make your argument. Tell the reader how you are understanding and making sense of the information that you collected. You will also connect your interpretations back to your research question and the ongoing research conversation that you overviewed for the reader in the Literature Review. The discussion should include:

1. Your interpretation/analysis of the results. **This is your claim.**
2. How these interpretations extend the conversation and secondary sources that you outlined in your literature review including your framework. This doesn't have to be big, but tell me WHY it is important in the context that you just laid out for me.
3. **Restate your claim.** Since your interpretation of your results are serving as your evidence for your claim that you made in the initial part of the paper, you will want to connect this evidence back to your claim!
4. Wrap up your research article with what is still missing from your study; what could future researchers examine? You might link this back to your limitations that you outlined in your methods section. Include a short conclusion statement summarizing what you want

the reader to take away from your research article. Remind the reader why your research is important.

Appendices and Works Cited/References: These will be included on a separate page in your chosen citation style (MLA or APA styles. I suggest looking considering what citation style your major uses).

We will talk about appendices in class but remember that these will include things like your data for your results. They might include your survey or interview questions, your coding results, or anything else that represents your data.

For an example of an APA paper with appendices, go to ->

https://owl.english.purdue.edu/media/pdf/20090212013008_560.pdf

Remember to include in-text citations throughout your paper as well.

We will talk about citations in class, but I suggest going to the OWL Purdue's Website for help.

For MLA, go to -> <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/747/01/>

For APA, go to -> <https://owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01/>

For more examples of some of the previous research projects that students have completed, visit Stylus at

<http://writingandrhetoric.cah.ucf.edu/stylus/issues.php>.

This Researched Argument paper meets the outcomes listed on UCF's ENC 1102 webpage by encouraging you to synthesize sources and understand the intertextual nature of texts (outcome 1). It promotes inquiry-based research as you outline your own methods that you used to answer your questions (outcome 2). It will help you organize your own data to

interpret it for a given community (outcome 3) and it will encourage you to reflect on your own conceptions of writing (outcome 4).

I will grade you based on the following criteria:

Criteria	Pts
Follows Assignment instructions	10.0 pts
Organized as the assignment requires	10.0 pts
Unity -Focuses on a specific purpose for a defined audience -Defines a topic leading to a clearly stated thesis -Analyzes and synthesizes evidence around thesis throughout the text	10.0 pts

<p>Development</p> <p>-Provides adequate and relevant supporting information gathered from the critical readings and/or secondary sources -Shows careful research and use of trustworthy sources -Integrates the student's ideas of others to draw conclusions and build arguments -Paraphrases, summarizes, and quotes sources effectively -Documents all sources appropriately in-text and in a reference listing such as Works Cited when quoted, paraphrased, summarized, or otherwise used for information</p>	10.0 pts
<p>Conventions of Academic Writing</p> <p>-Uses sentence structure, tone, voice, and vocabulary appropriate for academic writing - Has been proofread and edited carefully to reflect Standard English considerations -Is formatted according to MLA, APA, or other standards of the assignment</p>	10.0 pts
<p>Coherence</p> <p>-Presents effective transitions between paragraphs and between sentences - Uses clear prose including sentence-level such as variation, rhythm, vocabulary, and phrasing</p>	10.0 pts

<p>Evidence</p> <p>-Develops points thoroughly with specific and concrete (ex: quotes, data, statistics) -Engages with an appropriate number of reliable, college-level support -Integrates evidence from outside sources smoothly and with precise documentation</p>	15.0 pts
<p>Clarity Accuracy Precision Relevance Depth Breadth Logical progression Seamless Coherence</p>	10.0 pts
<p>Analysis</p> <p>-Integrates the sources from your literature review into your analysis of your data -Tells me how your data fits into, troubles, or contradicts your literature review -Demonstrates and Tells me how your research fills the "gap" or "niche" that you identified earlier.</p>	15.0 pts

100 Points