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| --- |
| STUDY PROGRAMME: Phonetics |
| Level and Year[[1]](#footnote-1): Graduate studies - rhetoric |
| Course Title: Rhetorical Argumentation |
| Course Description:The purpose of this course is to develop ability to use arguments in public discourse, to use legitimate arguments in public discussions. Students learn argument schemes, learn to differ strong from weak arguments, legitimate arguments from fallacies. Further on, they develop skills in assessing and evaluating arguments. The final goal of this course is to teach students to be independent argumentation teachers i.e. to gain knowledge on argumentation which enables them to teach others in argumentation skills.  |
| Semester[[2]](#footnote-2): winter |
| Lecturer(s)/Teacher(s): Gabrijela Kišiček |
| Teaching Language (regular)[[3]](#footnote-3): Croatian |
| Teaching Methods (regular):[[4]](#footnote-4) Seminars |
| Teaching: | Weekly (hours) | Semester (hours) |
| Lectures: |  |  |
| Exercises: |  |  |
| Seminars: | 4 | 60 |
| ECTS: |
| Teaching language and level[[5]](#footnote-5) for guest (exchange) students: English B2 |
| Teaching Methods[[6]](#footnote-6) for guest (exchange) students: L2 |
| Evaluation Methods[[7]](#footnote-7) and Grading[[8]](#footnote-8): Class attendance and activity in argumentation analysis of different discourses, presentation of one argumentation theory topic, written exam, seminar paper |
| Learning Outcomes:1. Differentiating approaches to argumentation (rhetorical, logical, pragmadialectical, multimodal)
2. critical argumentation analysis of public discourse
3. argument assessment and evaluation of different argumentative discourses
4. planning and structuring argumentation teaching
5. creating exercises for argumentation evaluation
6. recognizing and naming different argument schemes
7. recognizing and naming different argumentation fallacies
 |
| Literature:Compulsory reading:1. Aristotel (1989). Retorika. Zagreb: Naprijed.
2. Fahenstock, J., Secor, M. (1990). A Rhetoric of Argument. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.
3. Freeley, Austin J. (1996). Argumentation and Debate. International Thomson Publishing Comp.
4. Perelman, C. i Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. Notre Dame-London: University of Notre Dame Press.
5. Škarić, I. (2011). Argumentacija. Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus.
6. Tindale, C. (2007). Fallacies and Argument Appraisal. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Toulmin, S. E. (1969). The Uses of Argument. Cambridge University Press.
8. Walton, D. (2006). Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Additional reading:1. Aristotle (1991). On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse. George A. Kennedy (Ed. and Trans.) New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
2. Copi, I., Cohen, C. (1990). Introduction to Logic. New York: Macmillan.
3. Eemeren, F. H. van et al. (1996). Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory. A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments, Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.
4. Eemeren, F. H. van; R. Grootendorst (1992). Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies. A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Hillsdale, NJ
5. Groarke, L., Tindale, Ch. (2013). Good Reasoning Matters! A Constructive Approach to Critical Thinking. (5th Ed.) Oxford University Press, Ontario.
6. Hansen, H., Pitno, R. (ed.) (1995). Fallacies: Classical and Contemporary Readings. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania University Park.
7. Petrović, G. (2005). Logika. Zagreb: Element.
8. Reboul, O. (1991). Introduction to rhetoric. Theory and practice. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France
9. Tindale, Ch. W. (1999). Acts of Arguing. A Rhetorical Model of Argument. State University od New York Press.
10. Tindale, Ch. W. (2004). Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
11. Schopenhauer, A. (2002). Eristička dijalektika. Split: Marijan tisak.
12. Walton, D. (2007). Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion, and Rhetoric. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
13. Walton, D. (1989). Informal Logic: A handbook for critical argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Walton, D. (2004). Relevance in Argumentation. London: LEA Publishers.
15. Weston, A. (1992). A rulebook for Arguments. Indianapolis / Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
 |

1. BA, MA, PhD; 2nd year … [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Winter, Summer, Academic Year [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Teaching language according to the regular programme (e.g. Croatian, French, Slovenian…) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Direct instructions: teaching through lectures/seminars/exercises and teacher-led demonstrations in the classroom; Presentations; Classroom discussion; E-Learning (Omega, etc.); Fieldwork; Other (specify) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. According to CEFR (e.g. English B2, German C1…) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. **Language options for guest (exchange) students):**

L1 - All teaching activities will be held in regular teaching language. However, guest (exchange) students will have the opportunity to attend additional consultations with the lecturer and teaching assistants in foreign language (indicated as teaching language for guest (exchange) students), to help master the course materials. Additionally, the lecturer will refer guest (exchange) students to the corresponding literature in foreign language, as well as give them the possibility of taking the associated exams in foreign language.

L2 - All teaching activities will be held in regular teaching language only. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Class attendance, Essay, Preliminary exam, Seminar paper, Practical work, Written exam, Oral Exam, Other (specify) [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Standard - the institutional grading system (5 Excellent; 4 Very good; 3 Good; 2 Sufficient; 1 Fail)

Additional:

RA - Regular Attendance (No ECTS credits awarded for course attendance only)

C - Completed (Student has completed proscribed obligations/no ECTS credits awarded)

C+ – Completed + ECTS (Student has completed proscribed obligations + ECTS credits awarded) [↑](#footnote-ref-8)