COURSE DATA

DATA SUBJECT

Code: 33271
Name: Logic and argumentation theory
Cycle: Undergraduate Studies
ECTS Credits: 6
Academic year: 2025-26

STUDY (S)

Degree	Center	Acad. year	Period
1012 - Degree in Philosophy	Facultat de Filosofia i Ciències de l'Educació	2	Second quarter

SUBJECT-MATTER

Degree	Subject-matter	Character
1012 - Degree in Philosophy	Logic and theory of argumentation	COMPULSORY

COORDINATION

ALMAGRO HOLGADO MANUEL

BARAVALLE LORENZO

PEREZ GONZALEZ SAUL

SUMMARY

The course will deepen into the nature of logic and the theories about the analysis and evaluation of arguments, taking into consideration the three classical perspectives on argumentation (logic, dialectic and rhetoric), and their relationship with philosophy and other areas of knowledge.

PREVIOUS KNOWLEDGE

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER SUBJECTS OF THE SAME DEGREE

There are no specified enrollment restrictions with other subjects of the curriculum.

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Knowledge of elementary logic.

COMPETENCES / LEARNING OUTCOMES

-

Acquire a basic knowledge of the problems, texts and methods that philosophy has developed throughout its history and recognise possible androcentric biases.

Acquire the capacity to pose and solve problems, as well as to make decisions, in a limited time.

Appreciate autonomy and independence of judgement.

Be able to apply knowledge to practice.

Be able to apply knowledge to work in a professional manner and have competences for preparing and defending arguments and for solving problems within the field of study.

Be able to convey information, ideas, problems and solutions to others (experts or not).

Be competent in the philosophical study of particular areas of research and human praxis, such as mind, knowledge, language, technology, science, society, culture, ethics, politics, law, religion, literature, arts and aesthetics, avoiding androcentric biases.

Have critical and self-critical capacity.

Identify and evaluate clearly and rigorously the arguments presented either in texts or orally.

Identify the fundamental issues that underlie any type of debate.

Know how to work in a team avoiding gender discrimination.

Recognise human fallibility.

Students must have developed the learning skills needed to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.

Students must have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually in their field of study) to make judgements that take relevant social, scientific or ethical issues into consideration.

DESCRIPTION OF CONTENTS

1. ARGUMENTATION AND ARGUMENTATION THEORY

Argumentation and arguing. Thesis, reasons and guarantees. Origin and resurgence of the Theory of Argumentation. New perspectives in the Theory of Argumentation.

2. AMPLIATIVE ARGUMENTS

Basic notions of inductive logic and probability. The role of evidence in ampliative arguments. Argumentation and decision-making.

3. TYPES AND PHASES OF ARGUMENTATIVE DIALOGUE

Types of argumentative dialogue. Phases of dialogue. Persuasive dialogue.

4. ANALYSIS, RECONSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION OF ARGUMENTS

Characterisation and structure of an argument. Identification and reconstruction of arguments. Basic notions for argument evaluation: truth, validity and justification.

5. FALLACIES

Definition of fallacy. Classification, types and examples of fallacies.

6. VISUAL ARGUMENTATION

Visual arguments. Use of non-verbal argumentation in various fields.

7. ARGUMENTATION AND SCIENCE

Argumentation in science. Rhetoric of science.

8. ARGUMENTATION AND MANIPULATION

Dog whistles. Silencing. Political polarisation.

WORKLOAD

PRESENCIAL ACTIVITIES

Activity	Hours
Tutorials	5,00
Theory	30,00
Classroom practices	15,00
Total hours	**50,00**

NON PRESENCIAL ACTIVITIES

Activity	Hours
Attendance at other activities	5,00
Individual or group project	20,00
Independent study and work	20,00
Preparation of lessons	25,00
Preparation for assessment activities	20,00
Resolution of case studies	10,00
Total hours	**100,00**

TEACHING METHODOLOGY

1. Lectures (with the possible participation of students). Methodology of teaching and learning: teacher's presentation, with possible participation of students.

2. Practical classes (with the participation of students, and where the aim is to link theory to practice: case studies and simulations, problem solving, analysis of texts and documents). Methodology of teaching and learning: Participation of students under the guidance of the teacher.

3. Tutoring (individual or collective). Methodology of teaching and learning: Personal interview or electronic consultation (through virtual classroom, e-mail, blogs, etc.).

4. Complementary activities: attending conferences, courses and other cultural, academic or scientific activities related to the field of study. Methodology of teaching and learning: Exhibition of those involved with possible participation of the attendees, and memory or report by the students.

5. Study, preparation and testing tasks. Methodology of teaching and learning: Self-study.

EVALUATION

The grade for the course is established as follows:

- *Final written exam*. It may consist of long answer questions, short answer questions, exercises or a combination of several types. It will count for between 70% and 80% of the grade. In order to pass the course, it will be necessary to obtain at least 40% of the maximum mark assigned to this test.

- *Exercises or text commentaries carried out by the students* (to check some of the competences to be achieved by the student). These will count for between 20% and 30% of the grade.

Fraudulent conduct in assessment tests and plagiarism in assessment work will be considered in accordance with the UV Assessment and Grading Regulations (ACGUV 108/2017) and the Protocol for Action against Fraudulent Practices (ACGUV 123/2020).

The use of technologies (including AI) to create assessment materials without prior and express authorization from the teaching staff will prevent them from being considered as self-authored and will be treated according to current regulations and the UV Code of
Coexistence and Good Practices (ACGUV 300/2023, DOGV, no. 9747/18.12.2023).

REFERENCES

[Basic references]

- Badesa, C., Jané, I. y Jansana, R. (2007). Elementos de lógica formal. Barcelona: Ariel, 2a edición.
- Bordes, M. (2011). Las trampas de Circe: falacias lógicas y argumentación informal. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Copi, I., Cohen, C., McMahon, K. (2016) Introduction to logic. Routledge. [Trad. cast. Copi, I., Cohen, C. Introducción a la lógica. Limusa Wiley, 2011.]
- Gascón, J. Á.. (2024). Manual de Argumentación. El Ámbito de lo Razonable. Plaza y Valdés.
- Hacking, I. (2001). An introduction to probability and inductive logic. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perelman, Ch. y Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1994). Tratado de la argumentación: la nueva retórica. Madrid: Gredos.
- Toulmin, S. (2007). Los usos de la argumentación. Barcelona: Península.
- Van Eemeren, F. H. y Grootendorst, R. (2002). Argumentación, comunicación y falacias. Una perspectiva pragma-dialéctica. Santiago (Chile): Ed. Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Van Eemeren, F. H. y Grootendorst, R. (2011). Una teoría sistemática de la argumentación. La perspectiva pragmadialéctica. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Vega, L. (2003). Si de argumentar se trata. Barcelona: Montesinos.

- Vega Reñón, Luis (ed.). (2022). La Teoría de la Argumentación en sus Textos. Una Antología. Lima: Palestra.
- Vega, L. y Olmos, P. (Eds.) (2011). Compendio de lógica, argumentación y retórica. Madrid: Trotta.
- Walton, D. (2008). Informal logic. A pragmatic approach. CUP.

[Complementary references]

- Aristóteles (1982, 1988). Tratados de lógica (Organon). Madrid: Gredos, 2 vols.
- Aristóteles (1990). Retórica. Madrid: Gredos.
- Clark, Michael (2002) Paradoxes from A to Z, Routledge. [Trad. cast. El gran libro de las paradojas. De la A a la Z, Gredos, Madrid, 2009.]
- Doury, M. y Moirand, S. (Eds.) (2008). La argumentación hoy: encuentro entre perspectivas teóricas. Barcelona: Montesinos.
- Fahnestock, J. (1999). Rhetorical figures in science. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frogel, S. (2005). The Rhetoric of Philosophy. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Govier, T. (1999). The Philosophy of the Argument. Newport News, VA: Vale Press.
- Johnstone Jr., H. W. (1978). Validity and Rhetoric in Philosophical Argument. University Park, PA: The Dialogue Press of Man & World.
- Marraud, H. (2013). ¿Es lógic@?: Análisis y evaluación de argumentos. Madrid: Cátedra.
- Toulmin, S. T. y Rieke, R. y Janik, A. (2018). Una introducción al razonamiento. Lima: Palestra.
- Van Eemeren, F. H. (2012). Maniobras estratégicas en el discurso argumentativo. Madrid: Plaza y Valdés y CSIC.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R. y Snoeck Henkemans, F. (2006). Argumentación. Análisis, evaluación, presentación. Buenos Aires: Biblos.
- Vega, L. (2013). La fauna de las falacias. Madrid: Trotta.
- Vega, L. y Bolado, G. (Eds.) (2011). La argumentación en el discurso público. Cantabria: Parlamento de Cantabria.
- Walton, D. N. (2006). Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation. Cambridge: CUP.