

CATALOG INFORMATION

Dept and Nbr: COMM 3            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    | 4            | 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:        SPCH 3A

**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:**

|                   |             |                                       |            |           |
|-------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------|-----------|
| <b>AS Degree:</b> | <b>Area</b> |                                       | Effective: | Inactive: |
|                   | B           | Communication and Analytical Thinking | Fall 1981  |           |

|                |                      |                   |            |           |
|----------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------|-----------|
| <b>CSU GE:</b> | <b>Transfer Area</b> |                   | Effective: | Inactive: |
|                | A3                   | Critical Thinking | Fall 1981  |           |

|               |                      |  |            |           |
|---------------|----------------------|--|------------|-----------|
| <b>IGETC:</b> | <b>Transfer Area</b> |  | Effective: | Inactive: |
|---------------|----------------------|--|------------|-----------|

|                      |              |            |           |           |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>CSU Transfer:</b> | Transferable | Effective: | Fall 1981 | Inactive: |
|----------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|

|                     |              |            |           |           |
|---------------------|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| <b>UC Transfer:</b> | 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**

### **Student Learning Outcomes:**

At the conclusion of this course, the student should be able to:

1. Analyze the core elements of a proposition and develop relevant arguments for and against the proposition.
2. Engage in formal debates utilizing sound reasoning, clear organization and effective delivery.
3. Critically evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of arguments raised for either side in a debate.

### **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. Regular reading assignments from course texts and supplementary materials (20-25 pages/week)
2. Homework assignments covering material from the textbook and/or class discussions and lectures
3. Exams (2 - 20)
4. Writing assignment (minimum 500-2000 words) options typically include:
  - a. writing and rewriting resolutions to be used for debates
  - b. writing opening cases for class debates
  - c. writing short evaluations of class debates
  - d. writing a short essay evaluating a debate viewed outside of class
5. In-class work consists of:
  - a. skills demonstration: Minimum of two 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 & mock debates.

### **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<br>10 - 20% |
|---------------------|

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

Homework problems

Problem solving  
0 - 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  
0 - 10%

### **Representative Textbooks and Materials:**

Argumentation and Debate: A Public-Speaking Approach. Remland, Martin and Kay, Neal and Brown, Tim. Kendall Hunt. 2014 (classic)

Argumentation and Debate. 13th ed. Freeley, Austin and Steinberg, David. Cengage Learning. 2014 (classic)

Critical Thinking and Communication: The Use of Reason in Argument. 7th ed. Inch, Edward and Tudor, Kristen. Pearson. 2014 (classic)

Critical Thinking Through Debate. 2nd ed. Corcoran, Joseph and Nelson, Mark. Kendall/Hunt. 2013 (classic)