

## COMM 242H, Argumentation, Spring, 2008

Alan Sillars

LA 345, 243-4463

e-mail: alan.sillars@mso.umt.edu

office hours: Mon. 1:10-3; Fri. 9-11 or by appointment (use email please)

### **In a Nutshell**

This course is designed to increase critical understanding of arguments and skill at argumentation. You will develop and practice argumentation skills through in-class debates and other assignments.

### **Course Goals and Philosophy**

Argumentation occurs any time that people exchange reasons for adopting actions, beliefs, or values. Of course, argumentation comes into play whenever we talk about politics; for example, what we should do about Iraq, health care, the environment, or the cost of education. In this class we will spend most of our time talking about political argument. However, the same basic process of argumentation applies when we exchange opinions and make decisions with other people at home, at school, in the community, or at work. Argumentation skills can help you participate more competently in the exchange of ideas and collective decision making in all facets life.

Although many people shy away from argument because they find it uncomfortable or distasteful, being able to think critically about arguments and engage in constructive, issue-oriented debate is essential in order to make wise, well-informed collective decisions. Much of the argumentation that we see in politics and other areas of public life does not help us make good decisions, nor does it promote understanding of complex issues. For example, the arguments that we hear in political advertisements, public forums, or on the Oval are often exaggerated, tangential, unsupported, and based on personal attacks. In studying and practicing argumentation, we try to hold ourselves to a higher standard. A good argument should bring two sides closer together, not drive them further apart.

One misconception about argumentation is that it is mostly about how to persuade other people; in other words, how to “win” arguments. It is important to learn to speak and write persuasively so that other people will consider your ideas. However, the main reason that we study argumentation is to make debate and decision making more informed, rational, and constructive.

### **Objectives**

Early in the course we will work on analyzing arguments. This part of the course is designed to strengthen critical and analytic thinking. Later in the course, debates will be used to teach construction and refutation of arguments.

Specifically, in this course we will work on:

- learning to recognize the basic structure of complex, policy arguments;
- critiquing different types of arguments;
- critiquing evidence and employing evidence appropriately;
- identifying the critical points of contention in a controversy and addressing these points systematically;
- anticipating and responding effectively to counter-arguments; and
- adapting to the flow of argument in a live debate.

You will learn to analyze arguments through class discussions focused on sample arguments, editorials, advertisements, and current controversies. You will also occasionally critique the speeches and debates of other students. You will learn to construct and refute arguments through debates and other assignments.

### **Course requirements**

1. Exam. There will be one exam in mid-semester covering readings and material covered in class. The exam will assess understanding of basic concepts and perspectives on argumentation, as well as the ability to analyze and critique example arguments.
2. Debates. Everyone will participate in 4 in-class debates. You will sign up for two main debate topics – one for the panel debate and another for the cross-examination debates (which you will do twice). To prepare for debates on your main topic you will need to research the topic in depth. The remaining debate will cover a campus issue and will require only a small amount of out-of-class preparation.
3. Other assignments. When we get to the first debate (called a “panel” debate), you will turn in a *speech outline* and set of *evidence cards* after you are done speaking. A major part of your grade for the panel debate will be based on the outline and evidence cards. You will submit an *argumentative brief* before the cross-examination debate and evidence cards once you are done speaking. A brief is a condensed summary of the issues and key arguments associated with the topic.
4. Regular attendance and participation. Steady attendance is a requirement of the course. Regular attendance and participation are necessary to prepare for the debates and to have an attentive audience when people are speaking. Please arrange work schedules and other obligations so that they do not compete with the class. More than two absences will lower your grade, with an additional grade reduction for each additional absence. For example, three absences will lower a “B” to a “B-,” four absences will lower a “B” to a “C+,” and so forth. In addition, you have to be in class on any day when you are scheduled to speak in order to get credit. Of course, I will show flexibility toward someone who misses multiple days for reasons that are truly unavoidable, such as an extended illness or family emergency. Please contact me by email if such a situation arises.

The maximum points for each assignment is:

70 points -- Panel debate (including outline and note cards)

20 points – Practice debate

30 points – Argumentative brief

40 points -- Cross-examination debate #1

40 points -- Cross-examination debate #2

100 points - Exam

15 points extra credit for attending the Aber Day Debate Tournament sponsored by the UM Forensics Team (date to be announce).

There are a total of 300 possible points. Grades will be assigned using the +/- system.

### **Readings**

All readings are on electronic reserve at the Mansfield Library. Read these in the order listed. There is no text to buy for this course.

“The nature of arguments,” from Rieke, R. D., Sillars, M. O., & Peterson, T. R. (2005). *Argumentation and critical decision making* (pp. 97-113). NY: Longman.

“Understanding fallacies,” from Inch, E. S., Warnick, B., & Endres, D. (2006). *Critical thinking and communication* (pp. 78-96). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

“Evaluating evidence,” from Herrick, J. A. (2007). *Argumentation: Understanding and shaping arguments* (pp. 71-81). State College, PA: Strata Publishing.

“Locating and Evaluating Sources of Evidence,” from Herrick (pp. 85-96).

“Arguing about policies,” from Inch, Warnick, & Endres (pp. 245-273).

### **Academic Misconduct:**

Academic misconduct includes cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication of research. In this course the main problem lies with plagiarism, for example, basing a speech entirely on an article taken from the internet. We will address this when we discuss evidence.

Depending on the severity of the violation, plagiarism will result in an “F” on the assignment, failure of the course, and/or recommendation of a University sanction.

**Class Schedule (subject to revision):**

Date	Topic and Assignments
Ja. 23	Introduction and selection of debate topics
Ja. 25,30 Fe. 1	Structure of arguments
Fe. 6,8,13	Evaluation of arguments
Fe. 15,20,22	Case construction and debate preparations
Fe. 27,29 Mar. 5	Panel debates
Mar. 7,12	Refutation
Mar. 14	Exam
Mar. 19	Demonstration debate by members of UM Forensics Team (tentative)
Mar. 22	Debate preparations
Mar. 26,28	Spring Break
Ap. 2, 4	Practice debates (campus issues).
Ap. 9,11,16 18,23,25,30 May 2, 7 (3:20)	Cross-examination debates