



From a Philosophical Argument to the Academic Paper

Instructors: María del Rosario Martínez Ordaz,
José Emmanuel Mendoza Bock.
{martinezordazm , jemendozabock}@gmail.com

Total hours: 40 hrs.

General objective:

The objective of this course is to offer a brief introduction of the use of a tool of philosophical analysis (*Booklog Order of Thought*) that will be useful for her in the writing and review of academic papers and abstracts.

Individual objectives:

We expect the students to (i) comprehend seven key concepts in the methodology of philosophical research (theme, problem hypothesis, background, argument, example, and counterexample) and (ii) that she learns to use them in the writing and review of academic abstracts and papers.

1. Description of the course

The clear and succinct communication of ideas is vital in academic research, including Philosophy. It is expected that the different products of philosophical research show virtues such as order, clarity, profoundness, and simplicity —among others. In this course, we present the methodological tools that will be helpful to the philosophy student to present her ideas in an orderly and precise way both in academic papers and abstracts. The tools we introduce come from the literature on creative and critical thinking ([1] [2]) and on the applications of informal logic and argument theory to philosophical work ([6] [7]).

In this course we want each student to find the method which allows her with ease to order, structure, and regulate her academic texts so they are precise, clear and profound. One of the tools we will present is the *Booklog Order of Thought*. This booklog is made from seven key questions corresponding to seven key concepts in the methodology of philosophical research: theme, problem, hypothesis, background, argument, example, and counterexample ([1] [3] [4]). The comprehension of these seven questions and their corresponding concepts will help the student to order her ideas and writing. At the same time, it will allow her to make better reviews of abstracts and academic papers.

The proposed course is divided into four different stages:

- The first part of this course will be theoretical and will involve the presentation of a series of methodological guides that allow the student to order and structure her philosophical thinking ([1], [2], [3], [4]), as well as guiding her in the evaluation and

reconstruction of arguments ([6], [7], [8], [9]). The second part will focus on writing and organizing and reviewing academic papers and abstracts.

- The second part of the course will be both theoretical and practically oriented. In this stage, the student will be introduced to the practices of responding to CFPs and writing abstracts for conferences. In addition, the students will organize together an internal workshop in which each of them will present their work (the talks will be the ones described in the abstracts written for this course).
- The third part of the course will help students to familiarize with the procedures associated with both writing academic articles and submitting them to international journals.
- The fourth stage will be practically oriented and will consist of exercises for peer-reviewing academic articles.

The final products of this course will be an academic (extended) abstract and a final draft of an academic article (previously reviewed by the other two students).

2. Course work

- [1] Academic abstracts (20%): Each student will submit an abstract (500 words maximum) two weeks before the internal workshop takes place.
- [2] Presentation in the internal workshop (30%): Attendance and participation in all sessions are also expected.
- [3] A full draft of an academic paper (25%): Each student will submit a draft of an academic paper (9000 words maximum) two weeks before the internal workshop takes place
- [4] An extensive revision of another student's academic paper (25%): Each student will review another student's draft of an academic paper.

3. Tentative schedule

Session	Subjects	Hours
STAGE 1 1, 2 (October)	Philosophical thesis and arguments (a) Which are the key elements of the methodology of philosophical research? (a.1) Theme (a.2) Problem (a.3) Hypothesis (a.4) Background (a.5) Argument	8 hours

- (a.6) Example
- (a.7) Counterexample

(b) Evaluation of philosophical problems and hypotheses.

(b.1) Clarity, simplicity, scope.

(c) Evaluation of arguments, examples, and counter-examples.

(c.1) Relevance, scope.

STAGE 2

3, 4
(December-
January)

Academic Abstracts (theoretical)

- (a) Booklog OT. 3 hours
 - (a.1.) Theme, problem, hypothesis, background, argument, example and counterexample.
- (b) Academic Abstract
 - (b.1) Why write academic abstracts?
 - (b.2) Parts of the academic abstract.
 - (b.2.1) Hypothesis, background, justification-argument, counterexample.
- (c) Review of academic abstracts.

Internal workshop (practical)

- (a) Organization 2 hours
- (b) Presentation 12 hours

STAGE 3

5, 6
[May]

From abstracts to full papers (theoretical) 4 hours

- (a) Academic abstracts
- (b) Academic article
 - (b.1) Parts of an academic article
 - (b.2) Some complications.
 - (b.2.1.) Different types of philosophical theses.
 - (b.2.2.) Examples vs case studies.

From abstracts to full papers (practical) 4 hours

STAGE 4

5, 6 [May]	Peer-reviewed papers (theoretical) (a) Referee reports (a.1.) What to look for. (a.2.) How to evaluate (b) Corrections (b.1) Examples	2 hours

	Peer-reviewing papers (practical)	5 hours

Total hours: 40

4. References

- [1] Arieta Pensado, F. (2001): "Metacognición: Metafilosofía y Epistemología", *Ergo Nueva Época, Revista de Filosofía*, No. 11, March, México: Universidad Veracruzana pp. 7-29.
- [2] ----- (2011) "La Metodología Orden de Pensamiento y el Juego de Ajedrez: Una Analogía", *Ergo Nueva Época, Revista de Filosofía*, No. 26, March, México: Universidad Veracruzana pp. 55-64.
- [3] Campirán Salazar, A. (1999): "Enseñar a Pensar", in Morado, R. (ed.), *La Razón Comunicada*, Torres Asociados, UX and FF-UV: México. pp. 93-102.
- [4]----- (2008): "Pensamiento crítico: habilidades, actitudes y conocimientos que lo desarrollan de manera competente". *Revista Praxis*, Year 10, No. 13. Facultad de Psicología, Chile: Universidad Diego Portales. p. 55-70.
- [5] Cornman, J. W., Lehrer, K., Pappas, G.S. (2012): *Introducción a los problemas y argumentos filosóficos*, Trad. Gabriela Castillo Espejel, Elizabeth Corral Peña and Claudia Martínez Urrea, Colección Filosofía Contemporánea, Instituto de Investigaciones Filosóficas-UNAM, México, 2012.
- [6] Govier, T. (2018): *Problems in Argument Analysis and Evaluation*, Windsor Studies in Argumentation Volume 6.
- [7] Fogelin, R. J., & Duggan, T. J. (1987): *Fallacies. Argumentation*, 1(3), 255-262.
- [8] Sinnott-Armstrong, W. (2018). *Think Again: How to Reason and Argue*. Oxford University Press.
- [9] Sinnott-Armstrong, W., Fogelin R. J. (2015): *Understanding Arguments: An Introduction to Informal Logic*, CENGAGE Learning.

Internal workshop

<http://www.filosoficas.unam.mx/sitio/del-argumento-filosofico-al-articulo-academico>

← → C No es seguro www.filosoficas.unam.mx/sitio/del-argumento-filosofico-al-articulo-academico

🔍 ☆

Inicio ▶ Estudiantes

Del argumento filosófico al artículo académico



28 de enero 2018 // Aula Luis Villoro [📄 Resúmenes]

- 11:20- Cristian Alejandro Gutiérrez Ramírez | "¿Es el teorema de la recursión transfinita un teorema fundamental en teoría de conjuntos?"
12:40

- 12:40- Erick Gabriel Jiménez Rodríguez | "Externismo e internismo en semántica: Algunas consideraciones a favor del externismo en filosofía del lenguaje"
14:00

- 16:00- Juan Miguel López Munive | "Sobre la pluralidad de lógicas"
17:20

- 17:20- Axel Tovar Carmona | "Sobre las explicaciones reductivas y no-reductivas de la conciencia"
18:40

- 18:40- Lenin Eduardo Vázquez Toledo | "Una solución al problema de las inferencias mixtas del pluralismo ontológico"
20:00

29 de enero 2018 // Aula Fernando Salmerón [📄 Resúmenes]

- 10:00- Oscar Antonio Monroy Pérez | "Un principio de parsimonia ideológica para argumentar en metafísica"
11:20

- 11:20- Luis Gerardo Vargas Villalobos | "Objeciones al marco bidimensional"
12:40

- 12:40- Luis Fernando Taboada Hernández | "Razones normativas en el constructivismo kantiano"
14:00

- 16:00- Miguel Ángel Téllez Campos | "Flagrancia: un caso práctico de indeterminación en el Derecho"
17:20

- 17:20- Alberto García Hernández | "La Analogía Darwiniana de Popper"
18:40

