**SOCIAL LITERACY : EXERCISES**

Module (title and number): ***intercultural dialogue: EXERCISE N° 1***

1. Module (title and number):
2. Exercise name: **WELCOMING PEOPLE**
3. Purpose:

Providing information and guideline for public staff in charge of welcoming different categories of people (administration, schools, welfare associations, etc…)

The various tasks falling to this staff require:
- The knowledge of the techniques of individual and collective oral conversations,
- A developed ability to listen
- The clarity and the precision in the choice of the vocabulary according to the information to be communicated
- The solid construction of arguments during contradictory situations
- The conviction in the message to be transferred

1. Duration/Time frame: 60 mn
2. Participants:

All public staff, team workers

1. Group size:

6/8 people

1. Material:

Paper, paper-board

1. Methods:

Individual work, exchanges and discussions.

To do it, the participants will have to be able :
- To deal with all the possible situations in front of miscellaneous publics, during meetings when the oral exchanges will take place
- To adapt to their interlocutors with the registers of adequate languages
- To master the technical knowledge of the information to be spread
- To find the tone, the attitude and the right words adapted to phone conversations and "personally"
- To make a real diagnosis of the needs by using various supports (ex: questioning for profiles, past, current professional experiences, and projects, personnal situations, etc...)

1. Description:

We try to understand of what an argument refers to, so you will be able to discover more easily ideas to support your point of view, and you will distinguish better the weaknesses in the opposite reasonings

The role of the argumentation :
- It is neither a subtlety nor a demonstration
- it is necessary even in technical and scientific discussions (a constant effort must be made to convince the addressee)
- Is it thus necessary to prove everything? (It will however be necessary to plan strong argumentations for what will most probably be disputed)

It is about a more or less clarified reasoning by which the interlocutor tries hard to persuade his addressee, to make him(her) acquire or modify an opinion, to make him(her) undertake or modify or change or modify an action

A small outfit of arguments:
- The analogy: comparison, image, metaphor. Indeed, we often use a similarity of reports to explain a functioning or a situation to convince more easily the other person
- The example: model, illustration, generalization, induction (a hard-hitting example will sometimes be a serious argument)

How to develop an argument ?
- Define the objective with clarity : what we want to prove, to obtain
- Think about the addressee: group or individual in favorable or hostile priori, the circumstances which influence him(it) at this very moment, etc..
- Think of the material conditions of the argumentation: time(weather) which you will have, place, etc. (for an oral intervention)
- Choose a general tone: rigor, precision,

- Use the gross material which you have: facts, given techniques, statistics …
- Choose the best place of an argumentations and adapt it to the particular situation : the relative importance of each of them, the place to be attributed in the foreground, as an additional help.

Applications :

" ***We are convinced that new technologies can contribute widely to the improvement of the future mankind "***

***Give all your points of view, and try to convince your colleagues***

REFUTATION :

The refutation in the first sense of the term (take the argument and destroy it) requires a keen mind, especially in the fast exchanges of a discussion or a debate. The good "jousters" planned the arguments of the opponent and the modes of refutation, as well as a good player of bridge or chess tries to guess the intentions and the possibilities, to plan the parades.
We indicate by refutation, the whole argumentation which is developed against an idea or a project.

1) WHAT TARGETS TO AIM?

The objective is the opposite argumentation :
We set against an argument, another belonging argument:
- To the same type : in a cause, we set an other cause..
- Of a different type : to an idea dealing with quantity results, we shall object quality results, if a theory is recommended for its efficiency, we shall substitute a preferable theory elaborated on a legal point of view.
We try hard to destroy the argument itself : it is necessary for example to break the relation (or link) of cause (to show that the argument A was never able to produce the situation B)
We look for the weak points:
We dispute the value of the analogy or the example, the relation of cause, the definition, the validity of the approach, the deduction made.

The refutation in the first sense of the term (take the argument and destroy it) requires a keen mind, especially in the fast exchanges of a discussion or a debate. The good "jousters" planned the arguments of the opponent and the modes of refutation, as well as a good player of bridge or chess tries to guess the intentions and the possibilities, to plan the parades.

***Applications :***

***"“What is your opinion about the speed limits wanted by the national government "***

***Give all your points of view, and try to convince your colleagues***

1. Advice for Trainer :

Verify that all the participant make the effort to argue their point of view without forgetting that the target group may be different (cultural differences, foreign language, low or high education, etc…)

1. Source/Literature ;
2. Handouts : a guideline to be able to make an interlocutor make a decision and behave according to it.
3. Contributor (partner): INSUP