sciendo

Research Article

The Argumentation in the University Training from a Humanistic Perspective

Raisa Torres

*PhD in Education, Master in Education, Research Professor,
Universidad Iberoamericana del Ecuador (UNIB.E)*

Andrea Vidanovic

*Master in Educational Research, Research Professor,
Universidad Iberoamericana del Ecuador (UNIB.E)*

Martha Viveros

*Master in Bilingual Teaching: Spanish-English, Research Professor,
Universidad Iberoamericana del Ecuador (UNIB.E)*

Abstract

The argumentation is an inherent activity to the human being, no matter neither the culture nor the level of schooling. It is implemented according to the referential and contextual support in which it was formed. In the teaching field, this argument obtained in a reasoned way is valuable in itself, and constitutes a direct way for the acquisition of knowledge. In this way it is possible to develop critical and reflective thinking of the students. The humanist perspective advocates learning as a planned activity, but by means of the dialogue which seeks to expand the perspectives of meanings, accepts them and it involves the transformation of the world and the development of the students themselves. Starting from these considerations it was decided to analyze their influence on the training process and therefore in the social and personal performance as a fundamental element in the conceptual thinking of the university students. As a result, it was found that developing the argumentative skill of the students is meaningful for their training, so that there must not only be promoted the acquisition of technical knowledge, but also the development of a critical and argumentative thinking. It is concluded that the work of argumentation in educational spaces is still insufficient.

Keywords: humanism, argumentation, humanistic perspective, university training, argumentative skill

1. Introduction

The argumentation is conceived as a skill to be conquered, it has a crucial importance as a method of development of thought in the academic world to which one can add its social implication in every teaching-learning process (Crowell & Kuhn, 2014). The development and stimulation of argumentative competences in education opens the paths for a more humanized class, which enhances the participative attitude of the student, guiding it towards a proactive and exploratory learning based on the new type of relationships, which are established to facilitate the development of the intelligence of the subject through the stimulation of higher mental processes (Arenas, 2014).

It is a complex skill that fits within the higher processes of thought and involves not only retaining a point of view or a concrete idea, but it is to know how to defend it, diverge in a

respectful and reasoned way from the opinions that other people formulate, analyze the information received with flexible and supported judgments and be able to process them by positioning themselves in a motivated manner in the face of disagreements, for this it is necessary to understand the different criteria and edges involved in the conflicts, find and propose alternatives for the explanations and if it is necessary to modify the own representations to help the others change their vision, that is the reason why it is basic for an adequate coexistence in society and it must be an essential didactic objective of the educational field (García A., 2015).

The argumentative competence involves the reasoning, it allows explaining and understand the order of the parts of a process, as well as the relationship that exists between these parts to draw a conclusion. In such a way when arguing an explanation, it is presented the reason of things, justifying them through reasons, to create an own criteria (Crowell & Kuhn, 2014; Cruz, 2015).

In the cognitive approach, argumentation is conceived as a movement that starts from relatively uncontroversial information (the evidence) to an initially more uncertain thought (the conclusion). The relationship between the evidence and the conclusion is not theoretically guaranteed. The idea (proposition, enunciation, thought) that connects the evidence to the conclusion has been called "the guarantee" or the binding premise (Guzmán, Flores, & Tirado, 2012).

According to Means and Voss (1996), the ability to argue proceeds as an intellectual skill of a higher order that is considered a particular process of critical thinking extremely difficult to teach and is highly involved to achieve success in social participation (Romero, 2012).

Studies conducted by Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992), who reformulated the theory of critical analysis, maintain that argumentation requires a controversy generated by the critical discussion of opposing points of view, constituting these central elements of the argumentative process (Carretero, 2015). For these authors, the argument arises when two or more people sustain divergent points of view and intend to reach an agreement and as second and third order it needs to outline the emotional condition of the participants and the circumstances in which the discussion develops by considering these three elements a quite complete framework for the analysis and understanding of the argumentative process.

According to (Leitão, 2006), in a book published on Cognitive Psychology: culture, development and learning; it expresses that the argument is not only evident when one expects to solve opposite points of view, which are formulated explicitly; in the same way it can be presented implicitly before a justification or alternative position. The justification develops when there are elements that show weakness in the opinions; these are relative to the firmness of the alternative opinions.

In the theoretical position of the Pragma-dialectics, according to Obando (2013), adjudges that differences of opinion are solved when barriers are cleared and a good critical discussion is established, so that the treatment of fallacies is addressed as a series of obstacles to the resolution of a dispute, such as communication problems and not simply as errors of reasoning.

In any case, it is based on a conception of argumentation that takes into account the socio-discursive, dialogical and dialectical character, which facilitates the negotiation of points of view based on discrepancies of opinions. These differences come even from various sources such as the written or spoken press and literature, among other forms of dissemination of ideas and not only the participants present in a communicational exchange, where the argument is produced immediately, in this table you can join the so-called internal discourse, where the arguments would be posed to the self (Van Eemeren, Grootendorst, & Snoeck, 1996).

1.1 Research Problem

1.1.1 Researcher's Role

In this research, the researchers maintained a constant communication with the participating professors which facilitated the collection of information and data through the work and academic functions at UTE. It was carried out, through interviews, conversations, anecdotes and opinions described in the course of the semester A-2018. The researchers did not apply any measure of

changes or styles of professor training; they only focused on the conceptualization of the results obtained by the professors to make a theoretical approach between their model of innovation and educational reinforcement.

2. Research Methodology

This research is documentary because it is based on the study of several documents and bibliographic sources according to Baena (2014), it is the search for a specific response from the research of documents such as: books, newspapers, magazines, file documents, movies, videos, television and radio programs, statistics, letters, among others. Moreover, Arias (2012), states that it is a review, systematization, analysis, testing and interpretation of data generated and reported by other researchers in documentary sources, which can be printed or digital.

2.1 Instrument and Procedures

It was carried out a search of several authors and theorists who in recent times have produced significant knowledge in the aspect of humanistic argumentation and education.

2.2 Data Analysis

The information obtained by means of the documentary research, was analyzed and interpreted so that it was possible to get the outcomes.

3. Research Outcomes

3.1 The argumentation: Function and normativity

The different theories of argumentation start from the idea that arguing becomes a natural function of the human being, from which a certain type of normativity arises. However, different approaches and positions have debated this assertion, deploying two problems in the field of the normativity of the functionality and argumentation research (Santibáñez, 2014).

The first of these is the validity of the foundations that the theory of argumentation uses, including the assumption of an agreement understood as an intersubjective agreement between the dialogues to carry out the argumentative dialogue, which leads to assume the dialectical dimension by default; another assumption would be that argumentation prefers the solution of problems or conflicts as a purpose, which leads to the pragmatic aspect, in favor of the social good as a co-substantial element in the argument. From both sides, the elements that govern the normativity of the argumentative activity would be deduced.

The second is the problem of the normativity of argumentation; it is a matter of differentiating what would be the parameter to be considered in order to establish the quality of an argument. When arguing, the subject considers in a manifest or implicit way, which argument can be better, more robust or convenient as determined by the context, to avoid some degree of logical and pragmatic inadequacy. Consequently, precursors to the studies on the functionality of argumentation, such as Van Eemeren & Grootendorst (1992) have made a systematic development, based on the assumption that argumentation is a common practice in the solution of controversies of opinion, which extends from basic elements for the production of good arguments, even reaching to explain the normativity depending on the types of controversies and the use of the essential questions (Walton, Reed, & Macagno, 2008, Van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 1992) .

Other authors, focusing the problem from an opposite point of view of the cognitive proposals as pragmatic, express that the usual prudence when arguing in praxis, has a rather strategic function, since people refuse to participate in a discussion when there is a high probability of finishing defeated. The authors start from the idea that arguing is an activity with high demands and it is not started without a well-determined intention and an appropriate weighting of the consequences, the beneficial and dangerous elements of the discussion in which it is decided to

participate (Paglieri & Castelfranchi, 2010).

Based on this idea, some assumptions focus on the following alternatives: the first is that argumentative activity only places those who argue in the same position as they are exhibited at the beginning of the discussion, so there are no problems in failing. The second option supports the centrality of the dialogical goals as the essential preoccupation of the argumentators when they are involved in a dynamic of argumentation.

The execution of the argumentation can produce negative results, when the discursive situation does not reach agreements because the use of arguments is counterproductive so it affects the final credibility of the conclusion. An action that can increase disagreement, are arguments about emotional frames that generate negative feelings, these end up inducing emotional losses that do not result in benefits for none of the parties.

Well, the argument tries to improve the credibility standards of the conclusion, the agreement or linking of the parties, the emotional value and the social interrelation of the argumentators. It also works as a way to preserve the strategic advantage of the argumentators and the social reputation of each one as a valid source of data and information. Based on this, the theories of argumentation assert that this can only lead to better situations, designated: argumentative optimism, Paglieri and Castelfranchi (2010)

Another negative aspect arises when an argument is inadequate and alert to the counterpart, about content that can increase the force in the opposition while deducting it by themselves. In short, argumentative optimism remains somewhat naive and prevents the analysis of the costs and benefits of making the effort to argue, which is the basic instrumental function of argumentative practice (Paglieri & Castelfranchi, 2010).

In this order of ideas, argumentative instrumentalism mentions that dialogical goals can have an instrumental nature in front of extra-dialogical goals, which comprises some methods within the argumentation as the own decision to argue and the specific movements that are selected in the process itself that are affected by the extra-dialogical goals of the arguer and presents the following characteristics (Santibáñez, 2014): 1 - that the dialogical sub-goals have an instrumental character at the end of the dialogue, 2 - which at the same time is subordinated to the extra-dialogical goal, since it overcomes the immediate dialogue; 3- movements do not always respond to explicit extra-dialogical goals, these movements can be instrumental to other goals different from the argumentative, even contrary to those that motivated him in the first instance.

Hence, the most direct way to define the benefits, costs and dangers in the act of arguing refers to utility. From the fulfillment of the proposed goals -whether they are dialogical or extra-dialogical- the benefits are obtained through the argumentative act: this can be based on convincing the other about a certain opinion to get the listener to execute an action that responds to the interests of the argumentator.

However, in the argumentative process, adjacent to the reputation it can be given positive effects: more reliability and credibility. The negative impact can be presented in cost and danger. The costs refer to the negative effect of the argumentation process, which results from the demonstration between the energetic fatigue of people and the goals defended, excluding the product to be obtained. This includes the direct and opportunity costs, understood as the alternatives that were not chosen. On the other hand, the danger refers to the collateral effects resulting from argumentation as another variable in the negative utility (Santibáñez, 2014).

Moreover, a third option, which is significant for the arguer is the possibility of achieving the extra-dialogical goal that motivated the argumentative endeavor. A key component in this approach is the quality of the alternatives, that is, the assessment of the plurality of arguments from which the extra-dialogical goal could have been achieved. The quality, abundance and diversity of the alternatives are usually the elements to be weighed and compared when the argumentation process is assumed.

In reference to the costs of arguing, Paglieri and Castelfranchi (2010) indicate individual energy, cognitive resources and social exposure, which may increase as the argument continues. This does not happen with the gratifications when arguing, because they differ depending on the resources chosen to be used in the argument, such as persuasion or negotiation. For some authors, if there is a concurrence between benefits curves and costs, then these will exceed the

benefits, from which it is deduced that the utility of the arguer decreases in function with the passage of time.

Continuing with the approaches of these authors, it is added that when making the decision to participate in a dispute, the argumentators evaluate the following variables: expectations about how simple it will be to successfully conclude the argumentative challenge; the estimate about the time used for the debate or discussion, as well as the possible balance between costs and benefits. In their studies they conclude that the estimation of costs when arguing is a substantial issue to be considered, including on the evaluation of benefits and dangers, since the former are immediate and safe, however, the benefits and dangers will be uncertain and deferred. Consequently, the argument can be seen as an optimal strategy, when costs are controlled in the present, otherwise they will become the most relevant variable (Santibáñez, 2014).

Based on the dangers that are part of a discussion, it can be affirmed that, depending on the goals set by the arguer there will be risks that affect most of the discussions. The first thing is that the argument used, decreases against the counter argument, the second is the very high probability that the participants will reach a new disagreement, instead of solving their differences. Paglieri and Castelfranchi (2010) have found four factors capable of increasing the chances of disagreement:

- The more time that the disagreement lasts after the discussion, the longer it will be less tolerated.
- Prolongation of the discussion, to a greater time greater possibilities of not persuading the counterpart.
- The emergence of other reasons that may extend the initial disagreement.
- The social context distinguishes arguing as unwanted practice, if it does not provide solutions to the problem addressed.

An even clearer approach to the functions of argumentative action is that one developed by the informal logic of Walton (2007), which is illustrated as a branch of logic and within its functions, tasks and objectives are: to consolidate informal standards, the interpretation, a set of criteria and procedures for evaluation, analysis, criticism in order to build the foundations of argumentation for everyday discourse. Within its central theoretical elements is the informal model as an alternative to the notion of deductive validity, by placing emphasis on the criteria of relevance, sufficiency and acceptability, in order to evaluate the relationship between certain premises and a conclusion.

On the other hand, the function of argumentation has been considered, in the theory of the semantic blocks of the work about the argumentative semantics by Ducrot and Carel in 2006; as a polyphonic process of enunciation that brings into play the linguistic and semantic details of the "topoi" (common places) that are shared by society. In this theory, the functionality of argumentation is linked to the coordination factor between social processes, which the argumentative activity helps to solve and which distributes natural and linguistic functioning, the places referring to the acceptable and the forbidden.

When referring to words, as an essential element of language, Ducrot (1988) argues that in themselves they have a mainly argumentative value, because not only do they narrate the world, but they favor the elaboration of a logical form of it, in such a way that, through enunciation, "... ordinary language describes reality and makes it a debate between individuals" (p.83).

In favor of understanding the argumentative functional analysis, it is paid attention to the authors Hample, Warner and Young (2009), who affirm that in the argumentation process there are several factors that intervene in the way in which it occurs and in the way in which the participants deploy their resources in it. They propose a functional analysis that involves the communicative factors and their functions within the communicational act of the argumentation, for which it is necessary to observe the expectations, preconceptions, predispositions and meanings linked to the argumentation and how they are structured for each participant.

The first criterion evaluates whether or not there is a relevant and substantive relationship between the premises and the conclusion; sufficiency aims to verify if the premises provide the necessary evidence to arrive at the conclusion meanwhile the acceptability is linked to the evaluation of the character of the premises, if they can be considered deceptive, true or probable.

According to Leitão (2006) the argumentation seen as a unit establishes the assembly between the justified position and a justified opposing idea (which would be the counter-argument)

together with the answer or third position. The devices of interpretation between significant and meanings for each individual benefit the evaluation of the cognitive positions of the speaker and determine a central resource in the construction and deconstruction of knowledge. Several authors agree that the counter-argument is an important semiotic mechanism during knowledge formation, forcing the foundations of each idea into questions (Toulmin, 1958, Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1989).

3.2   The argumentative dimension

According to Larraín et al. (2014), the discussion about the acquisition and putting into play the argumentative skills, should be supported by considering and distinguishing at least three dimensions that are essential: the argumentative structure, the comprehensive-productive dimension and the social dimension.

Argumentative structure: this is fortified throughout the ontogenetic development and its progress can be observed from a justificatory structure to an already dialectical development, which supports the ability to maintain the points of view, elaboration and justification of positions or foundations that contradict it. The result of the investigations around this problem has specified that the children of early age are already able to trace their positions and provide more reasons as the dialogue advances to sustain them and elaborate counter-arguments to defend them. It is this dialectical attribute, according to the available scientific literature about argumentative production, which is the most difficult to achieve (Glassner & Schwarz, 2005).

Comprehensive-productive dimension: in a methodical review of the inquiries in this regard, expresses that children at an early age will be competent to argue and allows realizing that they focus rather on comprehensive skills: they will be able to know and identify the structure of the argument. However, in relation to the productive skill, it is observed that the small ones are apt to produce better the own justifications and defend their points of view (Leitão, 2006). In this sense, during a dispute, young children can provide more reasons that support their own points of view, which they can contribute to support the points of their opponents (Stein & Albro, 2001).

These particular contradictions occur in literature, because some authors argue that children do not reach a counter-argument to an unknown or own opinion very early, as this would be accompanied by a gradual and gradual development of comprehension skills, which implies understanding the weaknesses of an argument. In fact, other authors confirm this deduction and end up concluding that after five years children of both genres manifest difficulties in identifying weaknesses in the opposite arguments (Larraín, Freire, & Olivos, 2014).

Indeed, it has been confirmed that it is at school age that the possibility of understanding the weakness of an opposing argument emerges. In any case, there seems to be no major differences between older children and adults. It is interesting that the latter individuals do not manifest a significant increase in the recognition of their own weaknesses with respect to the opponent's strengths when exercising their argumentative skills (Migdalek, Santibáñez, & Rosemberg, 2014).

In temporal terms, it is mentioned that it is in adolescence when the ability to counter-argue would be in maximum development, but it would not be until adulthood that they will reach their full development. Therefore, comprehensive skills are those that support the development of productive skills. According to the previous reflections, at a taxonomic level it is crucial to differentiate comprehension versus elaboration, which are involved in the different aspects of the ability to argue (Glassner and Schwarz, 2005)

Social dimension: it is essential to distinguish adequately the importance of the social context where the argumentation skills are exercised. The story production is shared with enormous responsibility in the interpersonal contexts, where the cognitive skill is demonstrated; this grounds that the students demonstrate their argumentative skills better than when only one interlocutor intervenes in the proposals and opposes the positions posed. It is in the dialogue in which argumentative resources are co-produced with higher quality, the discussion being based on alternative roles, which contribute to the development of the ability to exchange through successive arguments and counter-arguments by virtue of each party's skills (Rivers, 2013).

3.3 The argumentation and the humanistic formation

The Argumentation plays an essential role in the teaching-learning process and guides educational actions, allowing communication between peers and the educator, in addition, encourages dialogue and requires a collaborative work that facilitates the teacher's task, by its characteristics it enters as an element of mediation and improves the interaction between the elements of the educational teaching process.

In collaborative work, interaction is essential and occurs between a group of individuals who share their different points of view, this action allows the construction of knowledge and the individuals learn more than they would learn on their own (Guitert and Jiménez, 2000). Some studies support that the future of the American economy and education depends considerably on the ability of young people in the popular sectors to commit to work collaboratively and to expose and negotiate differences in the debate for the common good (Thomas & Brown, 2011).

From the constructivism, the learning process constitutes a development for the individual framed in the socio-cultural aspects put into action through the interaction propitiating higher mental activities and critical thinking (Figueroa, Muñoz Correa, Lozano and Zavala, 2017) It is worth highlighting that the environments where collaboration and reciprocity are fostered benefit the construction of knowledge, responsibility in work, respect for different perceptions and the value of argumentation (Lopez and Acuña, 2011). It is necessary to stimulate dialogue and the exercise of argumentation in education, a practice that gives rise to the development and changes in the student's thinking, a result that is obtained when the teacher and the student assume an active and collaborative role in the training process that is critically inserted in diverse subjects. This action allows the human freedom.

This approach refers to the humanism and its practice in university education, Weinberg (2014), defines it as "intellectual freedom and individual expression" that is, the conception of a man as a thinking being, without being dominated by certainties ; humanism represents a "liberation from ignorance" (Nuñez and Aular 2013). Intellectual freedom speaks of a critical and argumentative being before the world and creates a human being who is able to assume their own humanity. Pinzón (2017), states that in order to understand humanism, it must be considered human need, in which the value between the individual and the collective is strengthened.

In this purpose, Gómez (2018) expresses "Humanism is the tendency to situate man," only because he is a man, "at the highest level within immanence" (p.5). This refers to a state belonging to the human inseparable to the essence of man, inherent to any man, this condition motivates encounters and dialogue, with the purpose of carrying out actions to search for new knowledge, which requires the intellectual and creativity abilities to produce new ideas with others, a natural aspect of the human condition (Nuñez and Aular, 2013)

This approach refers to the pedagogy focused on dialogue, an aspect that is addressed by Freire (2005), who highlights the relevance of the word for the development and transformation of man, the words involve reflection and represent liberation. Hence, man from the position of this author does not experience the fear of listening, to face, that he is not afraid of encounters and dialogue with others. In this perspective, the same author states that: "Men do not act in silence, but in words, in work, in action, in reflection" (p.69). Life among humans can not be silent, but dialogical which involves true words accompanied by reflection where men develop and grow with others.

In the natural dialogue or daily dissertations, the subjects make arguments and this happens from an early age. For this reason, academics should recognize that students continually argue and that this linguistic action is an input to be used in the devices and teaching resources to make the learning of this fundamental skill more meaningful (Ducrot, 1988).

By making use of language in meaningful contexts of communication, individuals develop more and more complex thought processes to identify implicit messages or what a certain interlocutor intends to say when writing a text or pronouncing. Consequently, it is not achieved with the strict coding and decoding of a text, since it is understood that verbal communication is constituted by coded elements. However, it is really a product of personal inferences that can lead to very particular conclusions (Project Illinois Early Learning, 2013)

A remarkable study shows that argumentative skill not only occurs gradually, but is multifaceted. This multifaceted development goes beyond the cognitive abilities associated with the production and evaluation of an argument to address metacognitive, epistemological and social dimensions. Moreover, these dimensions involve provisions rather than mere competition and involve values and norms. Sustaining argumentative practice creates a social climate related to this activity and the climate contributes, on the other hand, to the development of individual competence (Kuhn, Zillmer, Crowell, & Zavala, 2013).

The approach adopted by Crowell and Kuhn (2014), admits that in the sociocultural tradition of the proposals of Vygotsky (1983) and Michaels et al. (2008), dialogic argumentation is valued at its roots, from the social practice of everyday conversation, as a starting point and way for the development of individual argumentative reasoning. The authors start from the premise that the most effective means to develop the skill of dialogical argumentation is an intense and sustained practice in the rich environments that this skill requires (Michaels, O'Connor, & Resnick, 2008, Vygotsky, 1983).

The study of argumentation as a social practice involves not only individual skills but the rules that govern the exchange of criteria and verbal interactions in general in a social group, nourished by dialogical argumentation which can show the thoughts of the subjects when expressing their beliefs in argumentative discourse. In this process, there is an affectation and change in those involved, Buber (2015) says: "You affect me as I affect them" (p.16). The interactions fostered in the educational spaces represent a wealth for the individuals allowing the development of superior cognitive abilities.

Besides, these foundations are not disconnected from training with a humanist sense, since cultural mediation, reflective, interpretative, dialogical practice prevails and social action is valued (Pinzón, 2017). Therefore, the exercise of argumentative teaching leads to dialogic discourse, which must be assumed by the teacher when taking into account the opinion of the students, generating hiring processes between the previous idea and the new fact that is obtained from verbal interactions, this is a practice based on social constructivist learning (Mortimer and Scott, 2003)

Other students mention that the skill and practice of commitment to a reasoned discourse is achieved through socialization, that is, through a sustained participation in activities and environments that expect such behavior by providing a reward for such action. In this way, the mind will be willing to privilege reasoned discourse, over other less effective means of communication (Resnick, Michaels, & O'Connor, 2010).

To swam up, the use of reasoned arguments is essential for the success of a democracy, an aspect that educational institutions must develop in citizens to contribute to the construction of a free society, as well as training for their labor insertion.

4. Discussions and Conclusions

4.1 Discussions

The work of the argumentation in the classroom requires a diagnosis that allows knowing the current state of the argumentative skill of the students; this evaluation involves the degree of competence they have when starting their university careers with respect to argumentation everyday; in order to determine the tools they have and arbitrate the most appropriate didactic interventions that favor the gradual mastery of academic argumentation, as well as their motivation for those activities that demand the use of the superior cognitive skills that are needed to argue. Currently there are few studies on this.

In the current research process it has been possible to show that there are few studies associated with this area of knowledge and even more in the educational field. Although attention has begun to focus on how students develop their argumentative skill and therefore how to teach or stimulate them, the development of argumentative skills is emerging as a critical issue in the field of university education, both in the theoretical and in the practical aspects (García A., 2015).

The acquisition of this skill in higher education will be done progressively, coherently and

E-ISSN 2240-0524
ISSN 2239-978X

Journal of Educational and
Social Research

Vol 9 No 3
September 2019

articulated with the initial diagnosis, including the curriculum. At this level of training we will seek to stimulate thought processes which allow expressing points of view, refuting criteria, resizing perspectives during collaborative work by involving their interaction with peers and teachers, as the subject develops in environments that favor this activity.

Related studies show that a considerable number of students who have access to university education do not have neither the writing nor the speaking skills that allow them to carry out the argumentative skill demanded in this education level (Backhoff, Velasco, & Peón, 2013).

In this order of ideas, argumentation represents a style of teaching and practical learning, which promotes the improvement of rational, consistent and lasting student thinking. This construction is done through socialization, which leads to the progress of the academic conditions of the students and the increase in school motivation (Ruiz, Tamayo, & Marquéz, 2015).

Today, in training environments, knowledge is acquired by following a traditional, unidirectional, reproductive paradigm where interaction within the class and the student's role are of little importance. Nevertheless, it is hoped to improve the process which prevails and it is encouraged the dialogue in all dimensions of didactic triangulation among the learner, the educator and knowledge (Aldana, 2014).

Regarding the didactic aspect, it will be useful the selection of methods and psychopedagogical strategies, through which plans can be executed that promote the use of language as a way to exchange meanings, consensus, explanations and clarifications of the several concepts that include teaching (Osborne, 2012; Ruiz, Tamayo, & Marquéz, 2015). This didactic aspect that allows to teach argumentative skills or of critical thought is scarce, the propitious methods to foment the critical discussion are not promoted of sufficient form in the classroom contexts; therefore, the students lack spaces to make use of the word or to express their own reflections (Araminta, Carmona, & La Rosa, 2017, López & Padilla, 2011).

4.2 Conclusions

There are environmental conditions that enrich the argument: the topic to be discussed, the knowledge or expertise of the interlocutors, the objective of the approach, the characteristics of the instructions, knowledge, beliefs, identification and practices that the person possesses in relation to the subject, symmetry relationships, among other elements (Kuhn & Udell, 2003).

The argument is related to the objectives that pursue the formation of responsible individuals, who participate in social decisions through critical thinking (Jiménez, 2012). It favors to the argumentation in the classrooms to contribute to a better learning in the students. It would be a good strategy to be used by the teachers, who can not remain alone in a discourse of good intentions embodied in the official documents of the educational institutions (Cruz, 2015). The identification of the argumentation as an educational objective that can be developed with practice, is a step forward that requires more research on the processes involved in its improvement.

The successful completion of a university career requires the incorporation of necessary discursive knowledge focused on reflection and questioning in the higher education process. This implies active students, main characters of their formation process; in which intellect, affections and emotions intervene.

References

Aldana, E. (2014). La argumentación como estrategia de enseñanza y de aprendizaje de las matemáticas. *Revista Científica. vol 3,no 20*. Retrieved from: http://revistas.udistral.edu.co/ojs/index.php/revcie/issue/view/629

Arenas, M.(2014). El concepto de competencias visto desde las tesis de grado de la Maestría en Educación y Desarrollo Humano de los años 1997 a 1er semestre de 2006 en la Línea de Desarrollo Cognitivo y Emotivo. *Umanizales*. Retrieved from: http://ridum.umanizales.edu.co:8080/xmlui/handle/6789/1195.

Arias, F. (2012). El proyecto de investigación. Caracas: Editorial Episteme. 146 pp.

Backhoff, E., Velasco, V., & Peón, M. (2013). Evaluación de la competencia de expresión escrita argumentativa de estudiantes universitarios. *Revista de la Educación Superior. Vol. XLII (3), No.167*,1-32. Retrieved from: http://publicaciones.anuies.mx/pdfs/revista/Revista167_S5A1ES.pdf

Baena, G. (2014). Metodología de la Investigación. México: Grupo Editorial Patria. 25pp.

Carretero, F. L. (2015). *Argumentación y pragma-dialéctica: Estudios en honor a Frans van Eemeren.* Guadalajara. Mejico: Editorial Universitaria. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=loQHCwAAQBAJ&pg=PT142&lpg=PT142&dq=Van+Eemeren+y+Grootendorst+(1992)&s.

Crowell, A., y Kuhn, D. (2014). Developing Dialogic Argumentation Skills: A 3-year Intervention Study. *Journal of Cognition and Development, 15:2*, 363-381. Retrieved from: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15248372.2012.725187

Cruz, M. d. (2015). *Competencias argumentativas en estudiantes de la educación Superior y su relación con las creencias epistemológicas.* Granada: Tesis publicada. Universidad de Granada.

Ducrot, O., & Carel, M. (2006). *La semántica argumentativa. Una introducción a la teoría de los bloques semánticos.* Buenos Aires: Colihue.

Ducrot, O. (1988). *Polifonía y argumentación.* Cali: Universidad del Valle.

Figueroa, H.; Muñoz, K.; y Vinicio, E. (2017). *Análisis crítico del conductismo y constructivismo como teorías de aprendizaje en educación.* Revista Órbita Pedagógica. Publicación cuatrimestral. Vol 4, Año 2017, No.1

García, A. (2015). Importancia de la competencia argumentativa en el ámbito educativo: una propuesta para su enseñanza aImportancia de la competencia argumentativa en el ámbito educativo: una propuesta para su enseñanza a través del role playing online. *Revista de Educación a Distancia. Número 45. 15-Mar*, Retrieved from: https://revistas.um.es/red/article/view/238191

Glassner, A., y Schwarz, B. (2005). The antilogos ability to evaluate information supporting arguments. In Learning and Instruction. *Learning and Instruction 15(4)*, 353-375. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248498130_The_antilogos_ability_to_evaluate_information_supporting_arguments.

Guitert M., y Jiménez, F. (2000). Trabajo colaborativo en entornos virtuales. Dialnet. Retrieved from:http://www.edu.xunta.gal/centros/cafi/aulavirtual2/pluginfile.php/19775/mod_imscp/content/1/trabajo_cooperativo_entornos_virtuales.pdf

Guzmán , Y., Flores, R., & Tirado. (2012). La evaluación de la competencia argumentativa en foros de discusión en línea a través de rúbricas. *Innovación Educativa, Vol. 12, Nº60,*, 17-40.

Hample, D., Warner, B., & Young, D. (2009). Argumentation. *Springer.23: 21*, 12-37. Retrieved from: http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10503-008-9107-x.

Jiménez, I. V. (2012). La perspectiva de género desde el estudiantado de práctica supervisada de la carrera de orientación en la UNA. *Actualidades investigativas en Educación, Volumen 12, Número 2*. Retrieved from: http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=44723437007

Kuhn, D., & Udell, W. (2003). The development of argument skills. *In Child Development, 74,*, 1245-1260.

Kuhn, D., Zillmer, N., Crowell, A., & Zavala, J. (2013). Developing Norms of Argumentation: Metacognitive, Epistemological, and Social Dimensions of Developing Argumentive Competence. *Cognition and Instruction, 31:4*, 456-496.

Larraín, A., Freire, P., & Olivos, T. (2014). Habilidades de argumentación escrita: Una propuesta de medición para estudiantes de quinto básico. Retrieved from: http://www.psicoperspectivas.cl/index.php/psicoperspectivas/article/viewFile/287/316.

Leitão, S. (2006). *Argumentación infantil: conductas opositivas y anticipación de opoción. En Psicologia Cognitiva: Cultura, Desenvolvimento E Aprendizagem. Cap 9.* Pernambuco: Editora Universitaria UFPE. Retrieved from: https://books.google.com.ec/books?id=PlZjw4xODjsC&pg=PA256&dq=Leitão+(2000),+la+argumentación&h.

López, G., y Acuña S. (2011) Aprendizaje cooperativo en el aula

Means, M., & Voss, J. (1996). Who reasons well? Two studies of informal reasoning among children of different grade, ability, and knowledge levels. *In Cognition and Instruction, 14*, 139-178.

Michaels, S., O'Connor, C., & Resnick, L. (2008). Deliberative discourse idealized and realized: Accountable talk in the classroom and in civic life. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 27*, 283–297.

Migdalek, M., Santibáñez, C., & Rosemberg, C. (2014). Estrategias argumentativas en niños pequeños: Un estudio a partir de las disputas durante el juego en contextos escolares. *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística.* Retrieved from: http://www.scielo.cl/pdf/signos/v47n86/a05.pdf

Obando, L. (2013). Marco epistemológico para el desarrollo de la competencia argumentativa escrita. *Rhec. Vol. 16. Nª16*, 343-368.

Osborne. E., Ruiz, F. J., Tamayo, & Marquéz, C. (2015). La argumentación en clase de ciencias, un modelo para su enseñanza su enseñanzal. *Educ. Pesqui., São Paulo, v. 41, n. 3,* , 629-646. Retrieved from: http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v41n3/1517-9702-ep-41-3-0629.pdf.

Padilla, C. (2009). Argumentación académica: La escritura de ponencias en el marco de una asignatura universitaria. *Actas del XI Congreso Nacional de Lingüística, SAL, Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias.* Universidad Nacional de Santa Fe: H. Manni (Ed.).

Paglieri, F., & Castelfranchi, C. (2010). Why arguing? Towards a costs-benefits analysis of argumentation. *Argument & Computation 1*, 71-91.

Resnick, L., Michaels, S., & O'Connor, C. (2010). *How (well structured) talk builds the mind. From genes to context: New discoveries about learning from educational research and their applications.* New York, NY: Spring. R. Sternberg & D. Preiss (Eds.).

Ríos, L. S. (2013). *La competencia argumentativa en ciencias sociales y humanas : estudio comprensivo.* Retrieved from: http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/Colombia/alianza-cinde-umz/20130404102937/LE: Tesis publicada.

Romero, A. (2012). Del curriculum por objetivos al curriculum por competencias.

Ruiz, F. J., Tamayo, O. E., & Marquéz, C. (2015). La argumentación en clase de ciencias, un modelo para su enseñanza. *Educ. Pesqui., São Paulo, v. 41, n. 3,* 629-646. Retrieved from: http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v41n3/1517-9702-ep-41-3-0629.pdf

Santibáñez, C. (2014). *¿Para qué sirve argumentar? Problematizando teórica y empíricamente el valor y la función de la argumentación. En CLAC (Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación).* Nº58, pp. 63-105.

Stein, N., & Albro, E. (2001). The origins and nature of arguments: Studies in conflict understanding, emotion, and negotiation. *Discourse Processes, 32,* 113-133.

Thomas, D., & Brown, J. (2011). *A new culture of learning: Cultivating the imagination for a world of constant change.* Lexington, KY: CreateSpace.

Torres, R., Carmona M. & La Rosa, D. (2016). *La formación de las competencias argumentativas. Un reto dentro de la enseñanza superior.* Revista Publicando, Nº10-Vol.4, 299-314. En: http://miar.ub.edu/issn/1390-9304

Toulmin, S. (1958). *The uses of arguments.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Eemeren, F., & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication, and fallacies: A pragma-dialectical perspective.* Hillsdale. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Vigotsky, L. (1983). *El desarrollo de los procesos psicológicos superiores.* Barcelona: Crítica.

Walton, D. (2007). *Media Argumentation. Dialectic, Persuasion, and Rhetoric.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.