

## SYLLABUS – A COURSE DESCRIPTION

### I. General information

1. Course name: Debating and argumentation
2. Course code: DEB
3. Course type (compulsory or optional): compulsory
4. Study programme name: Language, Mind, Technology
5. Cycle of studies (1st or 2nd cycle of studies or full master's programme): 2nd
6. Educational profile (general academic profile or practical profile): academic
7. Year of studies (if relevant): II
8. Type of classes and number of contact hours (e.g. lectures: 15 hours; practical classes: 30 hours):  
Classes, 30 h
9. Number of ECTS credits: 3
10. Name, surname, academic degree/title of the course lecturer/other teaching staff: dr Joanna Śmiecińska, smiejo@amu.edu.pl
11. Language of classes: English
12. Online learning – yes (partly – online / fully – online) / no: no

### II. Detailed information

1. Course aim (aims):
  1. to provide knowledge about the history of debate and its significance for the civil society
  2. to provide knowledge about the principles of correct argumentation, basic logical fallacies and debate formats
  3. to facilitate the skills necessary to prepare and present arguments in written and oral form, including effective search for data and sources
  4. to develop skills necessary to plan and conduct a debate on a chosen linguistic or social topic
  5. to improve the students' group work skills.
  
2. Pre-requisites in terms of knowledge, skills and social competences (if relevant): English skills at B2/C1 level, Bachelor's degree completion
  
2. Course learning outcomes (EU) in terms of knowledge, skills and social competences and their reference to study programme learning outcomes (EK):

Course learning outcome symbol (EU)	On successful completion of this course, a student will be able to:	Reference to study programme learning outcomes (EK)
DEB_01	knows the history of debate and its significance for the civil society	K_W06, K_U01, K_K01, K_K03, K_K04, K_K09
DEB_02	is familiar with the principles of proper argumentation, debate formats; and is able to identify basic logical fallacies	K_W06, K_U01, K_K01, K_K03, K_K04, K_K09
DEB_03	can write down and present arguments for a debate based on reliable scientific data and sources from the field of linguistics or other disciplines	K_W03, K_W06, K_U01, K_U02, K_U05, K_U06, K_U09, K_U10, K_U12, K_U19 K_K01, K_K03, K_K04, K_K09
DEB_04	can prepare and conduct a full debate on a chosen linguistic or social topic, working as a team member and respecting the culture of the discussion	K_U01, K_U02, K_U05, K_U06, K_U09, K_U10, K_U12, K_U19

		K_K01, K_K03, K_K04, K_K09
--	--	-------------------------------

#### 4. Learning content with reference to course learning outcomes (EU)

Course learning content:	Course learning outcome symbol (EU)
The history of debate; debate as an element of the civil society	DEB_01
Propositions and their classification	DEB_02, DEB_03, DEB_04
Evidence and data in a debate	DEB_02, DEB_03, DEB_04
Warrants and the Toulmin Model	DEB_02, DEB_03, DEB_04
Types of arguments	DEB_02, DEB_03, DEB_04
Formal and informal logical fallacies	DEB_02, DEB_03, DEB_04
The Oxford Union debate format	DEB_01, DEB_02, DEB_03,
Carl Popper debate format	DEB_01, DEB_02, DEB_03,
Searching for data and resources	DEB_03, DEB_04
Student debate sessions	DEB_02, DEB_03, DEB_04

#### 5. Reading list:

Pirie, Madsen, 2006. *How to win every argument; the use and abuse of logic*, Bloomsbury Academic

Squirrel, Tim, *British Parliamentary Debating for Beginners*, Edinburgh University Debates Union

Zompetti, Joseph P. 2008. *Discovering the World Through Debate: A Practical Guide to Educational Debate for Debaters, Coaches and Judges*. International Debate Education Association

Hurley, Patrick. 2011. *A concise introduction to logic*. Cengage Learning

### III. Additional information

1. Teaching and learning methods and activities to enable students to achieve the intended course learning outcomes (please indicate the appropriate methods and activities with a tick and/or suggest different methods)

Teaching and learning methods and activities	X
Lecture with a multimedia presentation	X
Interactive lecture	X
Problem – based lecture	
Discussions	X
Text-based work	X
Case study work	
Problem-based learning	
Educational simulation/game	X
Task – solving learning (eg. calculation, artistic, practical tasks)	X
Experiential work	X
Laboratory work	
Scientific inquiry method	
Workshop method	X
Project work	
Demonstration and observation	
Sound and/or video demonstration	X

Creative methods (eg. brainstorming, SWOT analysis, decision tree method, snowball technique, concept maps)	X
Group work	X
Other (please specify) -	
...	

2. Assessment methods to test if learning outcomes have been achieved (please indicate with a tick the appropriate methods for each LO and/or suggest different methods)

Assessment methods	Course learning outcome symbol				
	DEB_1	DEB_2	DEB_3	DEB_4	
Written exam					
Oral exam					
Open book exam					
Written test	v	v	v		
Oral test			v	v	
Multiple choice test	v	v	v	v	
Project	v	v	v	v	
Essay					
Report	v	v	v	v	
Multimedia presentation	v	v	v	v	
Practical exam (performance observation)					
Portfolio					
Other (please specify) -					
...					

3. Student workload and ECTS credits

Activity types		Mean number of hours spent on each activity type
Contact hours with the teacher as specified in the study programme		30
Independent study*	Preparation for classes	15
	Reading for classes	10
	Essay / report / presentation / demonstration preparation, etc.	5
	Project preparation	10
	Term paper preparation	
	Exam preparation	5
	Other (please specify) -	
	...	
Total hours		75
Total ECTS credits for the course		3

\* please indicate the appropriate activity types and/or suggest different activities

4. Assessment criteria in accordance with AMU in Poznan's grading system:

very good (5.0): average grades for written and oral assignments of 92-100%, active in-class participation and very good team work

good plus (4.5): average grades for written and oral assignments of 84-91%, active participation, good team work

good (4.0): average grades for written and oral assignments of 76-83%, fairly active participation, good team work

satisfactory plus (3.5): average grades for written and oral assignments of 68-75%, sufficient participation and satisfactory team work

sufficient (3.0): average grades for written and oral assignments of 60-67%. sporadic participation, satisfactory teamwork

unsatisfactory (2.0): the average grade for written and oral assignments of 0-59%, (almost) no in-class participation, inadequate team work