Argumentative skills in scholar digital contexts of superior level

Habilidades argumentativas en contextos digitales escolares de nivel superior

Julieta Arisbe López Vázquez
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (ENES Morelia). Morelia, México
jlopez@enesmorelia.unam.mx

Carlos González Di Pierro
Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo. Morelia, México
carlos.dipierro@umich.mx

Bernardo Enrique Pérez Álvarez
Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo. Morelia, México
bernardo.perez@umich.mx

Abstract
The aim of this work is to describe a set of strategies of appropriation of arguments in the dialogic processes of checking information and its recovery in specific written texts. The study is based in the description and analysis of the requested texts to three groups of college students in the area of Humanities in a mexican university, developed in the frame of the online courses through the educative platform of Google (G-Suite), with the purpose of watching the increasing of complexity of tasks in writing and its linkage with the exploitation of voices that show the arguments of an academic text. The results show that these procedures are not completely progressives nor homogenous but they present different grades of complexity that can be analyzed since three axes of development: 1) the adequacy of the dialogicity to the sphere of academic writing, 2) the improvement of the argumental precision based on the processes of comparison and 3) the development of critical thinking to achieve an own declarative ranking in the texts.
Key words: academic writing, digital platforms of teaching, argumentative poliphony.

Resumen
El objetivo de este trabajo es describir un conjunto de estrategias de apropiación de argumentos en los procesos dialógicos de revisión de información y su recuperación en textos escritos específicos. El estudio se basa en la descripción y análisis de textos solicitados a tres grupos de estudiantes universitarios del área de Humanidades en una universidad mexicana, desarrollados en el marco de cursos en línea a través de la plataforma educativa de *Google (G-Suite)*, con la finalidad de observar el aumento de complejidad de tareas de escritura y su vinculación con el aprovechamiento de voces que muestran los argumentos de un texto académico. Los resultados muestran que estos procesos no son completamente progresivos ni homogéneos, sino que presentan diferentes grados de complejidad desde los que se pueden analizar, cuando menos, tres ejes de desarrollo: 1) la adecuación de la dialogicidad al ámbito de la escritura académica, 2) el mejoramiento de la precisión argumental a partir de procesos de comparación y 3) el desarrollo de pensamiento crítico para lograr un posicionamiento enunciativo propio en los textos.
Palabras clave*: escritura académica, plataformas digitales de enseñanza, polifonía argumentativa.

1. Introduction

The development of the argumentative skills in the actual academical contexts (scholar) shouldn't be limited to exercises of confrontation of opposite postures, the organization of logic, demonstrable and verifiable arguments and to accomplish a structure (hypothesis, arguments, conclusions) that allows the exchange between the proposer and the opponent.

The argumentative text presupposes the existence of a proposer and an opponent who can be individual or collective and of an exercise of dialogicity, understood as the collective practice that allows and validates the existence of that argumentative discursive practice in a specific social context. In this environment where the argumentation is validated pro or con of opinions commonly admitted. The opinions in favor of the doxas, of what is admitted by the community, don't require any argumentation, meanwhile, the others do. (Portolés, 2014).

So it is considered an element in common, even though, is not fundamental of the argumentative interactions: the third one, which doesn't participate in the interaction but will accept or not the conclusion and can be affected by that.

We need to recover that, for the different theoretical postures of argumentation, each one of the elements that constitute the argumentative process acquires different levels of relevance, even though they share elements like the referencial function and one deep structure where they can produce the signification and the sense (Anscombre & Kleiber, 2001). However, it doesn't often manifest the process in the argumentative chain where the meaning and the referrer are identified (Gutiérrez Ordoñez, 1981); which implies the difficulty for the user to identify the argumentative content. In this matter, Escandell Vidal (2004) proposes that, justly, these relationships are the ones that allow to establish a categorization of these theoretical postures.

In this matter there are postures like the Pragma-dialectic (Van Eemereen & Houtlosser, 2003) that propose the functionality and the socialization as fundamental elements of the argumentation; so, it is considered that the argumentation is a set of linguistic acts with an specific function in a discursive context that suppose the interaction among the participants in specific contexts.

Traditionally, these elements constitute the point of agreement, the initial point of argumentation (Van Eemereen & Grootendorts, 2011); however, from our perspective, the argumentative act is built with a set of interactions of dialogic character that are part of the process and, in general terms, constitute an informative third. That's why three big theoretical approximations discuss, actually, the argumentation: the Analytical Practice of Toulmin (2003) Rhetorics of Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1989) and the quoted Dialectics of Van Eemeren, the last one is taken as point of reference due as its posture in the criteria of validity of an argument are framed with the rational conduct of the speech when it comes about of solving conflicts.

For the dialectics is essential to quickly identify the argumentative maneuvers and the algid points that could be preventing the solution of the conflict, hence, is a fundamental thing to find the right path to solve it through external rules, because defending the intra and interdiscursive elements wouldn't be enough for the solution of the conflict.

Now, in the present, the different argumentative processes that are done in academic and scholar ambits are under the digital phenomena that has been assimilated to the habits of people in all the social groups and the different social environments. So, the major part of the participants of the academic discursive processes is immersed in great volumes of information and, at the same time, can participate actively in multiple discussions through social media.

If information availability stimulates the exchange and the enrichment of ideas, this connectivity demands also a new relation with the information and the sources. Generally, it is assumed and taught that the information and documentation needed to generate the valid

reasons that will become arguments are originated in confident and verifiable sources; however we haven't generated the strategies that allow us, in the new situation of connectivity, to discern, to choose and to rank the information.

It's our posture that the argumentative act is composed beside of a set of dialogical interactions of the argumentative person with the information previous to the argumentative act and those interactions are not limited to the documental usual practices like consulting books, now they are given through the social media, publications online and the digital world in general.

This informative availability and connectivity facilitates the processes of dialogicity with different possibilities of discursive practices in which the argumentative person interacts with other argumentative people, with different groups, among groups and, in general, with the different cultural sectors and even with different cultures.

So, the dialogical relationships between the person and the information are not limited to the traditional interaction among people in the traditional contexts of the educational and cultural scopes; it's assumed as a dialogue so the argumentative person is not always prepared with sets of different representations (Hermans, 2001; Ferreira, Salgado & Cunha, 2006; Bakthin, 2008) that can contribute or not to satisfy the informative necessity.

Now, the potential of approximation to these informative interactions as dialogical processes resides in assuming this process like a device that can build cultural interaction and promote processes of discursive changes as well as social ones. For these interactions to work as devices, the user, the potential argumentative person, should be able to have the skills that allow him to understand, to discern, to select and to segment the informative volumes available. That is why, it is pertinent that teachers question themselves about their own digital skills to interact dialogically with the information and, above all, the possibilities of training these skills, understanding that the argumentative act is the final part of a dialogic process compound of previous interactions and if we don't have these mechanisms, probably we'll find acritical, incoherent and contradictory reproductions of informational sets.

The aim of this work is to describe a set of strategies of appropriation of arguments in the dialogical processes of revision of information and its recovery in specific written texts, so it can be observed the augmentation in complexity in tasks of handwriting and its linkage with the exploitation of voices that show the arguments of an academic text. These processes are not completely progressive nor homogeneous, they present different grades of complexity which can be analyzed some axis of development like the estrangement of the oral character of communication to approach to one written, the recognition of the voices that are summoned in a text with resources of quotation and referred discourse as well as the development of a critical perspective in tasks such as reading and comparison of arguments.

Argumentative process and discursive genre

Under a didactic perspective like the one we adopted in this study, the students argue better and establish pragma-dialectic linguistic relationships more cohesive and coherent when they are invited to use critic points of view in the discussions because they have the conscience of participating actively in the exchange of ideas, even when it's done by handwriting. That is why we must procure that the argumentative work is done constantly in class, at class work and homework, overall in the assignments in the area of Humanities, like the ones that are here analyzed, the improvement of the argumentative skills of the students passes by the constant practice and the use of different situations of communication. For van Eemeren (1996) "the argumentative competence is a complex disposition whose mastery is gradual and relative to a situation of precise communication and can only be evaluated correctly in function of the inherent mechanisms of a communicative context" (p.13).

It's important to stand out that an analysis of the argumentative process like the one we are doing in this investigations, can't be conceived without the concept of discursive genre and with some criteria of distinction among them like Martínez Solís (2015) says: "the use of language is framed in the discursive genre. When we learn to talk, we do it through the model of the discursive genre of usual and social of our environment shows us" (p.37).

Each discursive genre is inevitably bound to certain social practices and if we consider that our society has become even more complex, the communicative practices have suffered a series of pretty drastic changes, making that the uses of language have been modifying in a considerable manner. The selection of words to use in order to argue in certain texts will depende of the argumentative strategy, topics, people and other situations of communication that we always need to consider (López, 2020), but without losing of view that a discursive genre contains different situations of enunciation that determine the textual forms of sentences in specific.

These investigations show that the students lack an appropriate training to distinguish discursive genres with the conscience that each genre requires not only a different language, but also other types of semantic, morphologic, syntactic and declarative constructions. To understand well that is not the same to argue in declarative situations like the journalistic genre, the critic comment, a political speech, a religious one, a thesis, a report, etc., even though it could be a formal argument written in all the cases.

And the same happens with the different areas of knowledge. With the different academic texts, like the ones we describe here, the student must have clearly that each discipline has a situation of enunciation that requires textual constructions in specific. It's not the same to make a text of geography that is one of biology, economics, history, architecture or physics even though we can call them all, for example, thesis, report, investigation or final investigation to the final work that they will present to obtain the grade.

We can talk about macro and micro structures of the situations of enunciation and communication that will be the ones that determine the lexical and discursive selection to write the argumentative text. In virtue that the discursive genre is bound to the social practice as we already said, there will be others like human practices, collectivities where other genres are practiced more than others or, perhaps, other genres can emerge (the virtual chats) or disappear or stop being functional for those communities (the post office).

As we will see in the examples of the analysis, the students of today realize that these social-communicative changes exist but it is difficult to distinguish them when it's time to argue and put that into the different texts. "The discursive genre is related with the grades of complexity of societies because it synthesizes the relation between social practice and use of language in a specific situation and it is related with the evolution itself of societies and language" (Martínez Solís, 2015: 50). For this author, the discursive genres are materialized through the sentence itself and the typical form in relation to the topic, style and types of organization.

These dynamic characteristics of the discursive genres that can be studied among different texts as well as in the synchronic and diachronic axis, prove that the learning and domain of the argumentative skills for the construction of academic text must be adapted to this procedural character of adjustment to the dialogic communicative necessities (Linell 2001), but also to the adoption of discursive strategies that can recover the discursive knowledge of the one who writes. It's here where the dialogical process of building argumentative texts in the scholar ambit must integrate the work with different types of materials in a process of exchange between the reader and the multimodal texts whom he is exposed to in the process of thinking and study.

If each dialogical process with the information is unique, it is pertinent to check some common characteristics in every process. In the first place, this process should facilitate the confrontation of reality of the argumentative person with other perspectives; it's the possibility

to explore the reality from the point of view of different perspectives that generate uncertainty given the relationship between the information that we have and the informative possibilities that the informative person will face.

Other of the informational abilities that should be able to develop in this process is the questioning or reaffirmation of the point of view since which the argumentative person will build his argumentative chain. This is the initial point of reference where the argumentative person will choose and, in his case, will validate points of view different from his own.

From a dialogical process it is possible to comprehend and apprehend a different point of view and also through the questioning that can solidify one's own point of view. The questioning, like prototypic dialogical activity, allows also, to find meeting points with opposite postures or in its case, to clarify the points of disagreement.

The informative dialogical process doesn't imply, from our perspective, the need of assuming the posture of the other but neither does the dialogical traditional process where there is a fight between two opposite positions where there is a winner and a loser. It's, by the contrary, an exercise of knowledge of the different postures that will allow to validate the information and, in its case, to locate its strength to incorporate it to the argumentative chain.

The dialogicity contributes to the development of knowledge in a way that doesn't imply the passive acceptance of each perspective and source because its aim is not to come to a consensus but to establish the conditions of dissent.

2. Method

This paper reports three specific activities done with groups of students of college level in the area of Humanities in a public university in Mexico. The first group of work corresponds to the first semester of college, meaning, a set of people that barely initiates with their education at this level and with the exposition to specialized materials in an area of knowledge; the second, of third semester, that has already studied introductory subjects, including investigation techniques for the academic writing in their area of study; finally, a group of seventh semester, when it starts the elaboration of protocols for final works to obtain the grade.

It's important to say that the three subjects in which the reported activities were done, were taught totally online, there was no face-to-face class attendance. The platform G-Suite of Google was used through the institutional contract of the university which facilitated the storage of information and the use of different tools in only one environment of work. "Classroom" classes were created, joined by video conferences in Google Meet where all the classes took place and allowed the communication through the "board" of "Classroom" for sending emails of announcements, indications of homework and others and also it created directly the email and whatsapp as support.

The reported activities were programmed in the homework space of the mentioned platform of Classroom, where it is possible to leave written indications of the activities to do, dates of delivery and the possibility to check the delivered works through the use of "Documents" or "Drive Presentations shared with the class". This resource allowed that the delivered works could beed checked and corrected online and automatically, warn each student that his homework had been checked and also, given suggestion of correction. These corrections can be inserted directly in the document as suggestions or through the option of adding comments in specific parts or general comments. The use of these resources allowed, in some cases, the corrections to improve the work which facilitated the interaction related to the document of work. In this way, it was possible to develop a phase of checking the written texts in dialogical way, in some cases, between teacher and student, in other cases, among groups of students.

This method of work corresponds with the perspective proposed by Grésillon and Perrin (2014), in the sense of focussing attention on the methodological resources that allow to study

the production of texts in real conditions of writing with specific purposes of communicative character. In our case, the requested written works were scholar activities of learning as evidence for evaluation and not as writing exercises in specific courses about writing or academic redaction. The used platform allowed to keep the record of the different phases of the writing process (versions of the document kept automatically by Drive) as well as it allowed the collaborative work, meaning, the method that corresponds with the attention in the material product, as well in the social character of writing (Grésillon & Perrin 2014: 89-94).

The activities of the first and second groups that are reported in this study correspond to the semester from August 2021 to February 2022 and August 2020 to February 2021, respectively.

Methodological description of the activity of group 1

In order to analyze the argumentative skills and development of critical thinking of a group of 20 students of the subject "Workshop of Investigation 1" of the program Philosophy Bachelor's Degree, we design an activity in base of the model of the Enunciative Social Dynamic (ESD) of Martínez Solís (2013) which parts of the conception of the Discursive Genre from the enunciative-social focus of Charaudeau (2002).

Essentially, in this model, the sentence is seen as a form of dynamic and complex form of a dialogue which is determined in its function by the notion of context, so the ESD defends the communion between the Situation of Communication and the Enunciation cause both of them are part of the same context. This happens inside the sentence itself and explains the importance of how the uses of language determine the social practices and introduce the speaker to explain himself the all-around communicative phenomena (Martínez Solís, 2015).

We chose this perspective, according to the author, because the social enunciative dynamic is "the fundamental base of every discourse: a pedagogic discourse, an advertising discourse, a legal discourse" (Martínez Solís, 2015:66). Each discourse would be framed in a social contract too large that we can identify but also distinguish. Any example of these type of discourses builds a situation of enunciation very particular where the forms of manifestation that each text or sentence take, face each other.

The activity consisted in request time to the group to read the text "Strategies of approaching to the reading of philosophical texts at college" from Pérez Álvarez (2015) and to write a work in a way of critical report of consistent reading of describing the text, developing the main ideas for them and writing a critical opinion about it. The requested extension was a minimum of three and a maximum of four pages.

It is important to say that this subject was taught during the semester period from August 2021 to February 2022, it was taught entirely online, there were no face-to-face classes. A class was created in "Classroom" which is one of the tools of G-Suite, Google's virtual educational platform, all classes were also given, using Google Meet, as well as email and whatsapp as communication support.

The objective of the work was that from the writings, we could identify a series of structures inherent to the argumentative process of the students, based on the criteria of the theory of ESD, mainly (Martínez Solís, 2013) but also in more specific principles established by López (2020) in his text *Writing the arguments*.

Methodological description of the activity of group 2

In order to carry out an activity from a selection of information from a set of sources, a second activity was carried out with a group of 16 students in the third semester of college. The group was provided with an organizational chart with information regarding a topic to be developed

over a bimester (eight sessions of two hours of work). The organizational chart (fig. 1) integrates ideas contained in a set of three theoretical readings that were previously provided to students.

The indication given was as follows:

> MIRROR TASK:
> 1. Write down in the margins of the diagram in which reading is found the information that synthesizes each box of the conceptual map, and
> 2. Write down in the margin of the reading (in the corresponding paragraph) the key word found in the boxes of the scheme.
> To carry out the task, they must have at hand both the table and the different readings, to recognize with their notes, underlines of the reading, etc., to which parts this division corresponds. Not all the ideas are in all the readings, since the scheme is a synthesis of the four readings. (The indication was provided to the entire group through the Classroom board).

In this way, it was possible to recover a set of information from three written sources, provided as part of the reading material for the course, through a graphic organizer that strengthens the panoramic view of the field of study, while allowing the recovery of specific arguments of different parts of the text from their comparison with the other texts.

In this way, it was possible to recover a set of information from three written sources, provided as part of the reading material for the course, through a graphic organizer that strengthens the panoramic view of the field of study, while allowing the recovery of specific arguments of different parts of the text from their comparison with the other texts.

Methodological description of the activity of group 3

The third activity, developed by a group of 24 students of seventh semester, consisted in the elaboration of a comparative table taking as a source a first text that was previously read and commented on during two work sessions of two hours each. After reading and analyzing the material in group during the two work sessions, the group had a set of notes from the reading and group interaction.

The next indication was that, in teams of three or four people, they were given the task of looking for two additional sources of information on the same topic covered in the reading and the class sessions, in order to make a comparative table between the three sources of information available. In this way, the initial commented reading served as a primary source to weigh the topic, and indirectly the quality of two additional sources of additional information, regardless of whether they were videos, articles or some other information source, but with the expectation that it would have to do with the content of the initial source as a search and comparison parameter.

3. Results

The results obtained are presented in this section according to the activities requested of each group, in order to observe the particular characteristics that allow comparing the written texts between each group, as well as between the three study groups and among them. In this way, both specific intertextual characteristics and axis of articulation of the different phases of advance in the development of argumentative skills can be described.

Group 1

As we pointed out earlier, for Martínez the three great approaches to argumentation (practical analytics, rhetorics and pragmatic-dialectics) can be inserted in the process of enunciative dynamics, seeing the discourse from its dialogical dimension, so that the first important issue to make the analysis was to keep these three perspectives in mind. The dialogical process conceived within the communicative action is extremely dynamic, there will be times when it privileges the rational and others in which ethics or sensitivity are the ones that stand out in the communicative situation.

In virtue of the fact that it is a homogeneous group (the first year students of the Philosophy Bachelor's Degree) and that the discursive genre could be said to be the same for all cases (the critical reading report), the forms in which the argumentative dynamic is manifested will continue to be subject (dependent) on the type of interaction of those involved in the ESD: the hierarchical relationship and the level of closeness, the intrinsic conception of that discursive genre held by the writer and, finally, the very social practice in which the activity is inserted.

On the other hand, for López (2020) an adequate analysis of argumentative writing in college students would have as minimum elements for its analysis the answer to very specific questions, such as why it is argued in writing, to whom the argumentative text is addressed and who is the one who should argue. Then, analyze the structures and strategies used in the argumentation such as the selected lexicon, the syntactic expression in general, the connectors and markers used, the arrangement of the arguments and the management of presuppositions and points of agreement.

Let's look at the following examples[1]:

> *Example 1.*
>
> The author navigates through the dissertation of a point, although the trade can be "a   model of life, a *modus operandi* and/or an ethical dimension" where, from analogical structures and boundaries, he approaches to the horizons of understanding the implications of what is assumed in everything of the framework of the philosopher for a career and a profession.
> What a task is the one that the author sets himself, to make a reading of the variables that intervene in the process of teaching philosophy that is not to teach philosophizing, conceptions separated by an epistemic conceptual ocean that the author demarcates with chronic ability, on the other hand, to identify the variables and invariables that intervene in this process of making an analysis.
> The author insists that philosophy is not taught but to philosophize, the text navigates conceptually without being delimited with greater certainty but already started, beginning from the sense of teaching to philosophize. Rolando Picos proposes that learning to philosophize is: "could be learning conceptual content for being inventive and attitudinal philosophical".
>
> *Example 2.*
>
> I complement this idea with what, personally, I see as an example and problematic along with situations like this: it is true that one is not taught anything if it is not through experience, one does not walk until one tries to move with movements

---

[1] The transcripts have been faithfully taken from the works that were uploaded to the "classroom" platform, hence spelling, lexical, and syntactic errors, as well as cohesion and coherence, are maintained.

that, gradually, end up putting you on your feet; you don't speak without babbling until you decode the language. But, beyond achieving the "basic goals" of walking or talking, it doesn't specialize more. Not knowing how to walk can take you to be part of an Olympic race, not knowing how to speak can make you unleash monologues. Just as experience allows the basic approach to these activities, perseverance and progression allow each of them to specialize and refine themselves. Just as an athlete practices until he is in perfect shape, a reader should read until he has the vocabulary and aptitude to understand "technical" or more specialized texts.

In the case of philosophy, the first thing that is suggested is to identify texts referring to the subject, appealing to the characteristics that differentiate it from any literary text. These characteristics are regular in most philosophical works, although they have a great ideological diversity, and they are: the definition and elaboration of concepts, the confrontation of theses and arguments between other philosophers and an argumentation process based on the same concepts of the text.

In both texts, as with the rest of the samples, it can be clearly identified the intention to establish a critical opinion of the article read, as requested. In (1) even an assessment is made in his argument about the difficult task undertaken by the author because a core part is to propose strategies to adequately write philosophical texts and uses verbal forms as discourse markers: "the author insists"; "the text navigates" or "the author delimits".

In (2) it can be seen how the communicative interaction between writer and reader occurs in a clearer way since it is not only reported through the referred discourse as it is done in (1), but detects a more accentuated intentionality of expressing one's own opinion.

A very interesting question is precisely that of the referred discourse, since it is a structure that "offers clues to identify the type of relationship that is established between the speakers: between the speaker responsible of the sentence that reports and the speaker responsible of the sentence reported " (Martinez Solis, 2015:87). The textual polyphony is on manifest, there is no single subject of enunciation, as Ducrot (1990) points out, the speaker and the enunciators are two discursive subjects that do not coincide with the empirical author of the discourse. In example (3) we can see how in the first part, the student does not use any element to establish that it is a reading report, of a referred discourse, even when what he develops there are concepts of the author and not of the student; while in the second paragraph, he uses very few markers of referred discourse, with only two or three pronominal references. We can affirm that this text is not fulfilling with one of the requirements made by the teacher:

Example 3.
From the most basic level of education, a relationship between language and students is carried out, it is obvious that this is done in order to improve their reading and writing skills, basic subjects are taken and they become more complex over time. It is not until high school that more specific subjects begin to be taken, focused precisely on these acquired skills.

It is important to mention that during reading, we are given certain concepts focused on the area of philosophical reading, we are told about specific characteristics of the philosophical text, comparisons of it with the scientific text and rules to follow to capture more information of these texts, as well as habits and customs when reading, which will make us perfectionate the information collected, and therefore, as with the passage of time, the practice of these rules and customs

will give us the skills to develop our own criteria, as well as, develop ourselves in philosophy.

The same happens with example (4), in this part, the student at no moment uses indirect discourse to make his reading report. This text also has a special feature in its enunciation: it is written in second person, which is not at all common in an academic text like this, in fact, among the recommendations and guidelines that are usually given to students for writing their works, it's the fact that they do not use the second person to express their arguments:

Example 4.
When you know the word Philosophy many things related to it come to mind, but if we analyze things well there are very few people who know how to start in Philosophy, it is not like you grab a book and understand how things are going. No. There are books that give you a brief introduction to it, the idea that teachers tell us which books are a good start with is essential since many who start in the career did not take any subject related to it, as long as you start with the correct steps you will not have problem with things in the future that you can't understand.
Philosophy is present in many books, from a scientific one to a comedy one, we are always in interaction, but we do not realize it since we have never dedicated the time to analyze, argue or question those words, or at least not most people. Besides that, starting in this world can make things easier in the future. Being able to understand each of the texts, understand them or simply know the main idea will help you in everyday life.
If you give a group of kids a book on some topic and have them read it, the majority of them will find a different main idea or even some of them would not be able to understand the text, so forming students with the ability to know the characteristics of the texts to create valid arguments is great. In the same way, the greater your love for reading, your vocabulary could become perfect, following the grammatical rules when creating a text.

One last example to illustrate this plurality of voices that can exist in an argumentative text, we see in example(4), where the student, unlike the previous example, presents the author of the text as responsible for the enunciation, as it must be in a reading report of these characteristics, especially in the part where they were asked to develop and explain what the author proposes, because where they are asked to give their critical opinion, it is expected that the responsible of the enunciation is the student himself. With a free indirect style and without the need to attribute precise words, we consider that it is possible to identify the author as responsible for that enunciation, as well as what the student understood about it. You can appreciate the textual cohesion since somehow, the segments make sense and lead us to conclusions in the order in which they are enunciated.

Example 5.
As a preamble, the author states that the aim of his work is to show a reading strategy that allows the college students to have the necessary skills for the proper reading of a "philosophical text".
He tells us that philosophy works fundamentally through texts and writings. He considers that it's important to have the understanding and production capacity of those who study this subject.

He even shares what could be understood as "philosophical texts" with the intention of showing the particular characteristics that it has, unlike other texts, which could well be literary.

To achieve the goal, it is based on Van Dijk's theory, a field work of a high school of the University of Guadalajara, among others, the above can be seen in the development of reading.

A deeper review of the texts selected for this research includes, as we pointed out previously, the aspects related to the linguistic expression, the structure and the disposition of the arguments. This means analyzing, among other things, what were the linguistic elements on which the argumentative strategy was based, the use of connectors and chosen markers and the layout of the arguments. In the analyzed writings, the latter is still very weak. Students do not have enough practice to join arguments, find weak and strong ones, order them, rank them, enunciate them. There were few texts that followed, for example, this apparently simple principle of argumentation: "between the introduction and the conclusions the arguer or argumentative person has, to the extent that the type of text allows it, the possibility of establishing his own argumentative chain and disposing of the arguments in the most productive way" (López, 2020:106). However, the use they make of certain linguistic figures as discourse markers to modalize the speech is interesting, which, in some way, constitutes an argumentative orientation. As we will see in the following examples, they are used as discourse markers to attenuate or intensify their sentences since verbal forms, adverbials, conjunctions, phraseologisms or lexical changes.

> *Example 6.*
> After having read and reread the text, I realized that it could also be applied not only to high school students as mentioned there, but also to those who are in high school and even to those who are in junior high or have just started their career of philosophy since it is very easy to understand and each of the points that explains on are quite clear and effective when reading and analyzing a text of philosophical nature.
> Honestly, it never ceases to cross my mind how vast the "tools" that specifies are, such as making some annotations about what has just been read in a paragraph or making synoptic tables and things like that, but the one that I liked the most and I found the most useful of all was to provide the meaning of certain special concepts that are used within the text and that the definition of these is the one interpreted by the author.

In (6) the student, to make us understand that he knew the subject and he is in a position to issue a critical opinion, begins that paragraph by saying *After having read and reread the text, I could tell*, alluding that he "soaked up" of the topic, so that he can issue his criticism. Later on, he uses the adverb *sincerely* to begin another part of his argument, intending to diminish objectivity a bit and guiding us to process his statement again as a critical opinion that does not have a significant load of truth, since it is common for us to use that expression when pragmatically, we want to play down what he said and, on the contrary, trying to be courteous: "Did you see the movie I recommended?"; "I honestly didn't like it."

> *Example 7.*
> I was very shocked by the fact that he gave us that says that, in Mexico, half of the population when they finish high school does not understand what they read, this

> is very sad since there are some teachers who are more interested in having you learning the date of birth of Benito Juárez than instilling in you love of reading or teaching you strategies to understand what you are reading. He also talks about the importance of understanding the texts since philosophy is based on the texts and it is extremely necessary to understand them and know how to write them. I also really liked how they teach us to define what a philosophical text is as not just any text is a philosophical text, because philosophy goes beyond everything.
>
> He also mentions something very important about how to characterize a philosophical text in which he says: it must be framed within a more general scope, characterized by its expository nature. This, what I understand, is that it refers to the fact that it must communicate to us through the use of verifiable arguments and facts of a topic of interest and that it requires a good level of objectivity in the narration and that they differ from historical and literary texts. I am fascinated by a phrase that is what makes you understand what a philosophical text is, but at the same time what philosophy is: philosophy is not limited to giving input definitions to create the theoretical framework from which an investigation is carried out Rather, it submits the concepts to a process of discussion. That little sentence says everything, also another feature is that, when reading a text, you must see that it is within other texts with quotes from Aristotle, Socrates, etc.

In this example, we can also appreciate different structures used to intensify or attenuate the discourse and the arguments. Expressions such as *caught my attention... I also liked it a lot... a sentence fascinated me...* are intended for the reader to be certain that for the student the text is not simply good or adequate, but that for him it was excellent, since that twice uses the adverb a lot, or for greater clarity, there is the use of *fascinated*. Contrasting these constructions with those in other works, we will see that it is not so common that they have to add the adverb of quantity to expressions such as "I liked it" or "it caught my attention" and much less the use of a verb such as "fascinate" instead of liking or pleasing.

Group 2

A central challenge in the development of argumentative skills today is to develop the ability to select information. Access to information from different platforms and presentations, through oral, written or multimodal channels, makes it necessary to design strategies that allow developing the ability to select information from reliable, well-founded sources and with data obtained with rigorous work methodologies. For this work, we start from the idea that dialogicity constitutes a regulating parameter of the selection of sources, in the sense that, the better the quality of the initial sources of information for approaching a topic, the better selection criteria will be developed of information, to the extent that the initial parameter established by a first type of source text constitutes an evaluation criterion for the search for new sources of information.

Below are some examples obtained as a result of activity 2 indicated in the method section:

> *Example 8.*
> Bakhtin was a Russian literary theorist who debated art and literature for several years. Many of his studies have been questioned, challenged and analyzed. Nowadays, when you go to school and enter a literature class, it is normal that you hear his name and explanations of what he did.

In this essay I will review the chapter; *The problem of discursive genres*, from the book, *Aesthetics of verbal creation.*

The organization of this text will be as follows: I will address the first sub-topic of the chapter (*Problem statement and definition of discursive genres*), followed by an example extracted from the text, *Discursive traditions and linguistic change*, by Johannes Kabatek. My intention is to show that some concepts studied by Bakhtin can contribute to other studies. Putting together ideas that can better explain both proposals.

Bakhtin is responsible for developing the modes of communication of the human being, these modes can be oral and written.

The first theme in the chapter is; *Statement of the problem and definition of the discursive genres.*

In this example, the use of the empathic second person can be observed, as was already shown in example 4 of group 1. However, it can be distinguished that in this case, it only appears in the second part of the first paragraph of the text, which corresponds to the beginning of the written work delivered. Once you get into the topic, you can see how the use of the grammatical person changes to appear a particular posture in the form of the first person: *I will review, my intention*; as well as the impersonal use to show the information of other authors, corresponding to two of the sources of information consulted. That is, the level of dialogicity of the text corresponds to the circulation of information from the sources consulted and valued from the perspective of the person who writes, but a mark of dialogicity typical of non-academic oral discourse still prevails, which presupposes an interlocutor to which the text can appeal in the form of the second person.

Example 9.

In this way, it can be seen that the general form of this writing is of an obituary, a non-literary text that tends to relate more to the journalistic field. In this, the author's voice is presented as that of a critic making a review.

In contrast, the text also develops elements that can justify this work belonging to the literary narrative genre. According to Ochs (2008: 277) the element that all narrative texts share is that they present a "temporary transition from one state of affairs to another" (2008: 278), it is the sequence of two or more clauses ordered within a chronological framework. A narrative can be just a chronicle of events or it can also seek to contextualize them. The chronicle of events can refer to them in any way of measuring time that is relevant to human thought (Ochs, 2008: 278).

In this example, from the group of third semester and with the same task to perform, it can be seen that there is a tendency to neutralize the personalization traits coming from the voices that are put into dialogue, turning the text into an analytical comparison between different ideas, with the use of quotes to strengthen the point of view that the author of the text wants to highlight.

A fundamental aspect in the acquisition of argumentative skills lies in the possibility of building a dynamic and panoramic view of the problems discussed in dialogical situations, since it allows the recovery of arguments of various types and linking them to a particular perspective for the construction of the argument.

This ability can be developed from comparison and contrast processes that, on the one hand, require direct and specific observation of texts (written or multimodal), and on the other,

specific comparison tasks that develop the ability to adopt points of view wider and with panoramic view.

In example 10, it can be seen that the text itself begins a section indicating that it will make a comparison between two authors discussed in class as part of the reading materials, which should then be used for the analysis of examples. The author of the text, however, does not limit herself to express the differences between the two authors, but she manages to frame the comparison in the axis of a specific discussion about literary genres, which allows her to later recover the "arguments" put forward by authors to which she refers to recover them as part of her own text, which gives her the necessary dialogicity to build a point of view from the recovery of arguments:

> *Example 10.*
> **Differences between the text of Glownski and Charaudeau.**
> Is it possible to hold on to tradition?
> The issue of genres is regularly addressed in the literary tradition; these have been reduced to be simply lyrical, epic and dramatic. For a long period of time, authors were given an indicator that determined what was required for a work to be led to a specific typology. Are genres something irrefutable or something that is constantly evolving?
> In Glowsnki's work we can find several arguments that question genres, but it is not that they are misclassified, but rather that they cannot be completely limited, since they are constantly evolving. It is the tradition; the construction of an impressive historical journey for the investigation of the literariness of the texts, although it might seem that in the author's thought there is a rejection of tradition, it is quite the opposite, since it is not that there is a notorious repercussion to this, Michal justifies not a radical rejection of the structure of genres, but only a balanced and justifiable display of their value. (Glownsky, 1989)
> On the other hand, there is Patrick's inclination towards tradition, which, unlike Glownski, says that he seeks to completely detach himself from it, given that he finds little engagement with these components. The orientation of Charaudeau's work is subject to a diversity of criteria and connection with space. Genres are always inscribed in a social relationship that varies over time, always subject to historical change. (Charaudeau, 2004)

Although the text already summons the necessary authorized voices for taking a position from the comparison of the arguments, it can still be observed that it does not have the domain of academic writing in the way of referring to the authors, since it uses both the last names as proper names to introduce citations, although the references in parentheses correspond to the usual rule of this type of writing.

It can also be pointed out that, although there is already a dialogicity in the text that calls for a set of arguments, there is no deepening of them, nor a foundation of an own posture. In this sense, it is possible to affirm that the author of the text has not yet opted for a clear personal position. However, in contrast to the works of group 1, from the first semester, it is observed that there is a maturation in relation to the value of the arguments collected, and leaving one's own voice still waiting for a posture to be taken.

Group 3

In the review of the materials of the third group, corresponding to the seventh semester of the degree, a greater mastery of academic writing can be recognized, with a clear dialogue in which the voices that provide the arguments that are discussed are summoned, at the same time that an enunciative voice appears, typical of those who elaborate the written text to make a posture. Even, as can be seen in the following example, the position of the writer already appears with an exemplification of the discussed topic, and not only as a reproduction of the learned arguments with the consulted texts:

> *Example 11.*
> The purpose of this analysis is to compare, according to the topics covered in class, the theoretical foundations of structural and prototype semantics. Taking into account the modifications made at first to this work, a comparative table is added where the theoretical supports are contrasted.
> The work presents the analysis of a word that, as can be seen, was analyzed from both perspectives. According to the work carried out, it leans more towards structural semantics, but that decision will be explained at the end of the work based on the theoretical foundations presented below.
> Within lexical semantics are structural semantics and prototype semantics. The following table compares their theoretical postulates:

Table 1
Comparison between structural and prototype semantics

STRUCTURAL SEMANTICS	PROTOTYPE SEMANTICS
Prototypes generate a direct cognitive referentiality.	Functional structures can be maintained for a long time.
The categories are organized in hierarchical structures determined by intercategorial discrimination relationships.	Significance relationships are structurable; designation relationships are not.
On the perceptual level, the cognitive representation generates a rapid identification of the category.	The structures of the expression correspond to the signifiers in general, more than the signifiers than the lexemes.
Field values are set to divide the substance from the sign content.	In this theory, the most representative members of each class are called prototypes.

The comparative table allows, in addition, to synthetically recover the basic postulates of the compared theories, which constitutes a way for the recovery of arguments already with a condensation process typical of a semantic processing that allows to obtain a macrostructure formulated as a macroproposition (Van Dijk 1980). In turn, these macropropositions are contrasted with the condensed

arguments of a second reading, in order to achieve a particular position in the written text, which, as we already pointed out, allowed the incorporation of examples that serve as argumentative reinforcements.

It should not be forgotten that this activity was carried out in groups of three to four people, which also makes it possible to highlight the dialogic nature not only of the written text with its source texts, but also the dialogic interaction between the editors of the written work, who had to select the information, condense it to incorporate it into the comparative table, in addition to develop the exemplification of its particular posture through the analysis of one case.

In the example 12, it can be seen that the dialogicity of the text has already been adjusted to the usual parameters of academic writing. In the introduction to the comparative table, it is observed how the different texts consulted are introduced with the specific purpose of explaining three semantic theories.

In the part of the fragment that is shown in the comparative table, the authors of the consulted texts appear in the first column (only part of the table is included here for space reasons), and then, three columns with the keywords that guide the condensation of arguments already indicated, and in this case are reproduced inside the box:

Example 12.

Comparison of explanations of propositional meaning from the perspective of formal semantics and cognitive semantics.
When talking about semantics it is important to say that over the years there have been several theories and models to explain the functioning of meanings and their application in the sentence and the statement, among the developed theories we will address the cognitive and the formal ones, these two theories explain the functioning of meanings through different perspectives, the cognitive one is based more on psychosocial aspects, while the formal one makes logical constructions. For this, we consult the reading *Foundations of compositional semantics* (2004) by M. Escandell Vidal because it addresses aspects and perceptions from the field of formal semantics. We also use the reading of Cesar Gonzales Ochoa: *Chomsky and formal languages* (2009), because it gives us an overview of Chomsky's position regarding formal semantics. In the same way, we use the reading *Semantics in cognitive grammar* (1993) by Ricardo Maldonado, since it presents us with the semantic analysis of cognitive grammar based on Ronald Langacker's theory. For that, the present work will make a comparison table between both theories: cognitive and formal, in order to definitively observe the contrast between both perspectives. In the table below, the name of the author with cognitive theory is used in blue, and the author who deals with propositional theory is used in red. Likewise, the topics to be explained are found at the top of the table.

Table 2
Comparison between authors

Analysis			
Name/Topic	Semantic Structures	Objective reality	Proposition Values

Ricardo Maldonado	They are predications that are characterized in relation to cognitive domains.	Same basic situation, however, they differ in the mode of conceptualization. The speaker responds to, observes, or conceptualizes the same referential phenomenon in different ways. 1. The road goes down Popocatepetl to the city center. 2. The road goes up from the city center to Popocatepetl.	Both in the morphemes and in the syntactic constructions, an important load of meaning is recognized.
Escandell	It's an abstract syntactic object, the sentences are products from the rules of grammar, therefore, they must be written according to the syntactic structure. These can be from a syntactic point of view, affirmative or negative, passive or active, etc. **Example** a) Andrés is a history teacher. b) Andrés is not a history teacher.	They imply the same proposition, for which they differ from being true because they share the same truth conditions, which helps to have a correspondence between the expression and the state of affairs (truth). **Example** a) John won the car. b) The car was won by Juan. c) What Juan won was the car. d) It was Juan who won the car. e) Juan, the car, was won by him.	It is the abstract semantic object, meaning, that they are descriptions of the state of affairs and that they constitute the type of entities to which truth values can be assigned, such as the characteristic function of possible worlds that give truth values. For example, enunciative sentences, declarative sentences, etc. On the other hand, there are the contingent, necessary and possible propositions. *Contingent:* proposition whose truth can be named after performing a check, whether or not it corresponds to the states of affairs that it specifies. *Necessary:* this does not occupy a check, that is, it receives the same truth value in all possible worlds. *Possible:* this proposition can vary; true or false, at least in one world.

Discussion

In general, it can be seen that there is a process of acquiring argumentative skills that college students have not always developed sufficiently; with the data shown, it can be seen that in most of the cases they are not experienced arguers and, furthermore, not all skills are developed at the same level and in synchrony, but skills are developed over time in different ways. Thus, in many cases these novice arguers do not establish the process of dialogicity from the recognition of a perspective different from the one they hold; but on the contrary, it assumes the owner of the subject (teacher, tutor, monitor) as the opponent and, consequently, the intentionality of the text changes: it is not intended to satisfy the argumentative process and to establish a strong argumentative chain, but, by the contrary, to satisfy the opponent. Thus, in many cases, the argumentative process is broken and the exercise may be unsuccessful.

However, it is also possible to observe that there are relevant differences between the argumentative writings of the first semester and seventh semester college students. These differences can be recognized in different axes that articulate written argumentation skills in the academic field: 1) the adaptation of dialogicity to the field of academic writing, 2) the improvement of argument precision from comparison processes and 3) the development of critical thinking to achieve an enunciative position of their own in the texts.

The adaptation of dialogicity to the field of academic writing can be observed in the changes of person marks, which go from the empathic narrative (Siewierska 2004) to the impersonal use to refer to the ideas of others, as well as the use of the first person when an enunciative position is acquired before the arguments shown in the text. In addition, progress is being made in standardizing the way of quoting and referencing, which goes beyond a formality of quotation systems, but also constitutes an argumentative resource (Carranza Gutiérrez and Pérez Alvarez 2021).

It is also possible to recognize an advance in the precision with which arguments are retrieved in the texts, particularly, from the comparison among sources of information. The results of the activities show how each writer must retrieve general and specific information from topics shown with keywords, and which are then expressed in synthetic propositions that not only retrieve the main ideas of a text, but also the retrieved ideas are in correlation with comparable insights from other sources of information. The information available so far indicates that the use of resources such as graphic organizers to guide these tasks favors these processes, but these possibilities still need to be further explored with new methodological designs, for example, under the parameters proposed by Prior and Thorne (2014).

On the other hand, it was also possible to recognize the appearance of their own voice in some written works, which increase in number and expository quality in the seventh semester works. While in the critical reading reports of the first semester, the opinions expressed do not show an argumentative solidity expressed in the generic standard of the requested academic text, since in some cases they are limited to giving a general opinion about what has been learned or the interest that the text has awake, or opinions are expressed without recognizing the argumentative structure of confrontation and appearance of the opponent in the structure of the writing. Already, in the third semester an improvement in the written texts is beginning to be observed, which shows an advance in the recovery of arguments and in their use for the dialogical organization of the text in the argumentative confrontation. In the texts of the seventh semester, an improvement is observed in the domain of textual dialogicity at the moment of building a thematic development, giving voice to the different texts summoned for the recovery of arguments, following the norms of academic writing, at the same time that the enunciator of the text is positioned to show his own position in the argument construction. This advance must still be studied in order to analyze the contribution of the specialized reading experience in

specific areas of knowledge, which has already been described in a general way by various studies (for example, Jakobs and Perrin 2010).

The results of this work allow us to reinforce the idea of continuing to advance in the consolidation of a dialogical model for the understanding of language in general (Linell 2001), against a monological and individual conception focused on the informativeness of a text. In particular, in the writing processes, the current results lead us to propose a new methodological review of the strategies used, in order to reinforce the dialogic, procedural and social character of the writing activity (Prior and Thorne 2014, Grésillon & Perrin 2014).

These lines of work require new studies with more specific methodological resources, which allow defining with greater precision how the processes of appropriation of arguments take place, and how the resources to put different voices in the text into circulation are improved. And beyond these specific tasks, there are also open questions regarding the ability to select sources, what are the criteria that regulate access to quality information on the web, etc. that require the development of other types of informational capacities.

Funding

5. References

Anscombre, J.C. y Kleiber, G. (2001). *Problemas de semántica y referencia./ Problèmes de sémantique et référence.* Donaire, M. L. (coord..). Vicerrectorado de Extensión Universitaria y Servicios Universitarios de la Universidad de Oviedo.

Bajtin, M.M. (2003). El problema de los géneros discursivos. En *Estética de la creación verbal* (pp. 248-293). Siglo XXI.

Bakhtin, M. (2008). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four essays*. University of Texas Press.

Carranza Gutiérrez, A. M., & Pérez Alvarez, B. (2021). El alcance argumentativo del sistema de citas y referencias en las habilidades de escritura académica de universitarios. *Educatio Siglo XXI, 39*(2), 277–300. https://doi.org/10.6018/educatio.406581

Charaudeau, P. (2002). A communicative conception of discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 4(3), 301–318. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456020040030301

Charaudeau, P. (2012). Los géneros: una perspectiva sociocomunicativa. En Shiro, M. Charaudeau, P. y Granato, L. (eds.). *Los géneros discursivos desde múltiples perspectivas: teorías y análisis*. Iberoamericana Vervuert.

Ducrot, O. (1990). *Polifonía y argumentación.* Escuela de Ciencias del Lenguaje, Universidad del Valle.

Escandell Vidal, V. (2004). *Fundamentos de semántica composicional*. Ariel.

Ferreira, T., Salgado, J. y Cunha, C. (2006) Ambiguity and the dialogical self: In search for a dialogical psychology, *Studies in Psychology*, *27*(1), 19-32, DOI: 10.1174/021093906776173216

Grésillon, A. & Perrin, D. (2014). Methodology: From speaking about writing to tracking text production. En E.M. Jakobs & D. Perrin (eds.), *Handbook of Writing and Text Production* (pp. 79-111). Walter de Gruyter.

Gutiérrez Ordóñez, S. (1981). *Lingüística y semántica: aproximación funcional*. Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2001) The Dialogical Self: Toward a Theory of Personal and Cultural Positioning, *Culture & Psychology*, *7*(3), 243-281. DOI: 10.1177/1354067X0173001

Jakobs. E.M. & Perrin, D. (2010). Training of writing and reading. En G. Rickheit & H. Strohner (eds.), *Handbook of Communication Competence* (pp. 359-393). Mouton de Gruyter.

Linell, P. (2001). *Approaching Dialogue*. John Benjamins.

López Vázquez, J. A. (2020). Escribir los argumentos En García Velázquez, L.M. y López Vázquez, J.A. (eds.) *Pensamiento crítico para el aprendizaje*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Escuela Nacional de Estudios Superiores

Martínez Solís, M. C. (2013). Los géneros discursivos desde una perspectiva socio-enunciativa: la noción de contexto integrado, *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios del Discurso, 13*(2), 21-40.

Martínez Solís, M. C. (2015). *La argumentación en la enunciación.* Universidad del Valle.

Montes, R. G. y Charaudeau, P. (2009). *El "tercero": fondo y figura de las personas del discurso*. Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla.

Perelman, Ch. y Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1989). *Tratado de la argumentación. La nueva retórica*. Gredos.

Pérez Álvarez, B.. (2015). Estrategia de acercamiento a la lectura de textos filosóficos em el nível medio superior. En R. Garcés (ed.), *Didáctica de la filosofía* (pp. 203-218). Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo.

Portolés, J. (2014) Argumentar por escrito. En E. Montolío (Ed.), *Manual de escritura académica y profesional* (Vol. II, pp. 235-284). Ariel Letras.

Prior, P. y Thorne, S.L. (2014). Research paradigms: Beyond product, process and social activity. En E.M. Jakobs & D. Perrin (eds.), *Handbook of Writing and Text Production* (pp. 31-54). Walter de Gruyter.

Raible, W. (1988). ¿Qué son los géneros?. En M. A. Garrido Gallardo (ed.). *Teoría de los géneros literarios* (pp. 303-339). Arco Libros.

Siewierska, A. (2004). *Person*. Cambridge University Press.

Toulmin, S. (2003). *Los usos de la argumentación*. Península.

Van Dijk, T. (1980). *Texto y Contexto*. Cátedra.

Van Eemeren, F. H & Grootendorst, R. (1996). *La nouvelle dialectique*. Éditions Kimé. Paris.

Van Eemeren, F. H & Grootendorst, R. (2011). *Argumentación, comunicación y falacias*. Ediciones de la Universidad Católica de Chile.

Van Eemeren, F. H & Houtlosser, R. (2003). The Development of the Pragmadialectical Approach to Argumentation. *Argumentation* 17, 387-403.