

CATALOG INFORMATION

Dept and Nbr: SPCH 3A Title: INTRO TO ARGUMENTATION
Full Title: Introduction to Argumentation
Last Reviewed: 10/8/2018

Units		Course Hours per Week		Nbr of Weeks	Course Hours Total	
Maximum	3.00	Lecture Scheduled	3.00	17.5	Lecture Scheduled	52.50
Minimum	3.00	Lab Scheduled	0	17.5	Lab Scheduled	0
		Contact DHR	0		Contact DHR	0
		Contact Total	3.00		Contact Total	52.50
		Non-contact DHR	0		Non-contact DHR	0

Total Out of Class Hours: 105.00

Total Student Learning Hours: 157.50

Title 5 Category: AA Degree Applicable
Grading: Grade or P/NP
Repeatability: 00 - Two Repeats if Grade was D, F, NC, or NP
Also Listed As:
Formerly:

Catalog Description:
The study of argumentation, including methods of analysis, research, detecting fallacies of reasoning, use and tests of evidence, refutation and debate as a practical application of these principles.

Prerequisites/Corequisites:

Recommended Preparation:
Eligibility for ENGL 1A or equivalent

Limits on Enrollment:

Schedule of Classes Information:
Description: The study of argumentation, including methods of analysis, research, detecting fallacies of reasoning, use and tests of evidence, refutation and debate as a practical application of these principles. (Grade or P/NP)
Prerequisites/Corequisites:
Recommended: Eligibility for ENGL 1A or equivalent
Limits on Enrollment:

Transfer Credit: CSU;UC.

Repeatability: Two Repeats if Grade was D, F, NC, or NP

ARTICULATION, MAJOR, and CERTIFICATION INFORMATION:

AS Degree:	Area		Effective:	Inactive:
	B	Communication and Analytical Thinking	Fall 1981	

CSU GE:	Transfer Area		Effective:	Inactive:
	A3	Critical Thinking	Fall 1981	

IGETC:	Transfer Area		Effective:	Inactive:
---------------	----------------------	--	------------	-----------

CSU Transfer:	Transferable	Effective:	Fall 1981	Inactive:
----------------------	--------------	------------	-----------	-----------

UC Transfer:	Transferable	Effective:	Fall 1981	Inactive:
---------------------	--------------	------------	-----------	-----------

CID:

CID Descriptor: COMM 120 Argumentation or Argumentation and Debate

SRJC Equivalent Course(s): COMM9 OR COMM3

Certificate/Major Applicable:

Both Certificate and Major Applicable

COURSE CONTENT

Outcomes and Objectives:

Upon completion of this course, the student will be able to:

1. Identify the basic logical precepts and traditions of argumentation in the Western rhetorical tradition.
2. Recognize, identify and construct the three traditional types of propositions of fact, value and policy.
3. List and explain the traditional prima facie elements for propositions of fact, value and policy.
4. List and explain the strategies for supporting and opposing debate resolutions.
5. List and explain the techniques of refutation.
6. Identify and utilize the principles of effective and efficient research in preparing arguments to support or oppose a debate resolution.
7. Identify different types of evidence that may be used to support arguments.
8. Compare and contrast inductive and deductive reasoning.
9. Compare and contrast different patterns of reasoning including example, analogy, causal and sign reasoning.
10. Recognize and identify logical fallacies.
11. Demonstrate the use of outlining to construct cases that support or oppose a debate resolution.
12. Participate in in-class oral debates emphasizing the employing the argumentation principles.
13. Identify competing paradigms for evaluating a debate.
14. Critique a debate, either oral or written, and provide a ballot stating reasons for a decision in accordance with accepted evaluation.

Topics and Scope:

- I. Introduction to the Course
 - A. The relationship between argument and critical thinking
 - B. The role of critical thinking in life, politics, professions and education
 - C. Argumentation and epistemology
 - D. The roles and responsibilities of arguers
- II. The Nature of Argumentation: From Arguing to Debating
 - A. The meaning of argumentation
 - B. The basic unit of rhetorical argument: the enthymeme
 - C. The relationship of debate to argumentation
 - D. The world of debate
- III. The Reasonable Person Model: Addressing Our Rational Selves
 - A. Defining the "reasonable person"
 - B. The parties to a debate
 - C. The role of debate in problem solving
 - D. The ethics of debate
- IV. The Resolution: The Focus of a Debate
 - A. The burden of proof
 - B. Presumption
 - C. The standard of proof
 - D. A burden of proof
 - E. The burden of refutation/rejoinder
- V. The Requirements for a Properly Constructed Debate Resolution
 - A. One central idea
 - B. Controversy
 - C. Neutral terminology
 - D. The burden of proof properly placed
- VI. The Importance of Definitions
 - A. Types of definitions
 - B. Standards for evaluating competing definitions
- VII. Traditional Prima Facie Requirements for Resolutions
 - A. Resolutions of fact
 - B. Resolutions of value
 - C. Resolutions of policy
- VIII. Affirmative Strategies in Debate
 - A. Needs analysis
 - B. Comparative advantage
 - C. Alternative justification
 - D. Goals/criteria
- IX. Negative Strategies in Debate
 - A. Topicality
 - B. Defense of the status quo
 - C. Minor repair
 - D. Counter policies
 - E. Reliance on presumption
 - F. Disadvantages
- X. Critical Thinking
 - A. The Toulmin model
 - B. Fallacies of reasoning
 - C. Syllogisms
 - D. Inductive reasoning

- E. Deductive reasoning
- F. Determining valid and invalid arguments
- XI. The Role of Research in Support of Claims
 - A. The need for evidence
 - B. The evaluation of evidence
 - C. The application of evidence
 - D. Conducting basic research
- XII. Evaluating The Debate
 - A. The role of the critic
 - B. Judging paradigms
 - C. Providing constructive feedback

Assignment:

1. Homework typically includes:
 - a. reading assignments averaging 1-2 chapters per week.
 - b. monitoring current events and being prepared to discuss in class.
 - c. problem solving typically includes:
 1. evaluating categorical, hypothetical and disjunctive syllogisms for validity;
 2. fixing invalid syllogisms;
 3. identifying fallacies in arguments;
 4. identifying the problem with (and fixing) incorrectly phrased resolutions.
2. Writing assignment (approximately 1000-2000 words) options typically include:
 - a. writing and rewriting resolutions to be used for debates.
 - b. writing opening cases (500-1000 words) for class debates.
 - c. writing short evaluations (50-200 words) of class debates.
 - d. writing a short essay (750-1000 words) evaluating a debate viewed outside of class.
3. In-class work typically consists of:
 - a. skills demonstration: three to five oral debates that demonstrate proficiency in constructing supportive arguments, refuting opposing arguments, asking and answering questions, utilizing evidence, avoiding and detecting fallacies, organizing ideas, managing time, and understanding and correctly applying appropriate debate theory.
 - b. group exercises.
4. Field work may include:
 - a. critiques and evaluations of live presentations.
 - b. critiques and evaluations of live debates.
5. Formal assessments typically include:
 - a. midterm exams
 - b. final exams
 - c. quizzes.

Methods of Evaluation/Basis of Grade:

Writing: Assessment tools that demonstrate writing skills and/or require students to select, organize and explain ideas in writing.

Written homework, Term papers, Series of short essays, 1,000-2,000 words combined

Writing
10 - 20%

Problem Solving: Assessment tools, other than exams, that demonstrate competence in computational or non-computational problem solving skills.

Homework problems

Problem solving
5 - 10%

Skill Demonstrations: All skill-based and physical demonstrations used for assessment purposes including skill performance exams.

Performance exams, Oral presentations/debates

Skill Demonstrations
30 - 60%

Exams: All forms of formal testing, other than skill performance exams.

Multiple choice, True/false, Matching items, Completion, Essays

Exams
20 - 40%

Other: Includes any assessment tools that do not logically fit into the above categories.

Class attendance and participation in discussions and group exercises

Other Category
5 - 10%

Representative Textbooks and Materials:

Argumentation and Debate. Freeley, Austin and Steinberg, David L. Cengage Learning: 2008

Burden of Proof: An Introduction to Argument and Guide to Parliamentary Debate. Crossman, Mark. Wadsworth Cengage Learning: 2005

Critical Thinking Through Debate. Corcoran, Joseph; Nelson, Mark; and Perella, Jack. Kendall/Hunt: 2005