

What Reading Grid for Argumentative Discourse Would Facilitate the Task of Writing the Critical Report?

Dr. Benradja Rabya ¹

¹: Centre universitaire Morsli Abd Allah, Algeria, benradja.rabya@cu-tipaza.dz

Received: 13 /03/2024, Published: 15/12/2024

Abstract:

This article aims to identify the reading objectives that third-grade secondary school students should achieve while studying liturgical discourse. This study was conducted while writing reports for this type of discourse. We examined the theory of liturgical discourse, the reporting technique, and the reading goals outlined by four authors. Subsequently, we analyzed the objectives set by S. Chartrand (1994). This analysis revealed that the reading objectives described for the four texts authored by S. Chartrand need to align with the technical reporting standards. We propose objectives that illustrate the reader's behavior towards this type of discourse, emphasizing that this behavior should be harmonious and reflect the reporting technique.

Keywords: argumentative discourse; critical account; reader's language behavior in argumentative discourse; analysis of S. Chartrand's reading grid; reading objectives for the critical account of argumentative discourse.

Résumé : L'objet de cet article porte sur la présentation d'une grille de lecture du discours argumentatif que nous avons élaborée pour aider les apprenants de 2^{ème} année secondaire lettres et langues étrangères (2^{ème} A. S L et LG désormais) à réaliser une tâche écrite prévue dans leur programme scolaire et qui porte sur le compte-rendu critique d'un discours argumentatif. Pour ce faire, nous présenterons d'abord les caractéristiques du discours argumentatif, la technique d'expression du compte-rendu critique et les grilles de lecture élaborées par A. Boissinot (1992), J. Dolz (1994), S. Chartrand (1994) et L. Ruiz de Zarobe (2008). Dans un deuxième temps, nous détaillerons la grille de S. Chartrand (1994) que nous avons analysée et nous montrerons en quoi elle est inadaptée à l'activité du compte-rendu critique. Nous terminerons par la présentation d'une grille que nous avons élaborée et qui permet au scripteur de mener à bien la tâche de la technique d'expression.

Mots-clés : discours argumentatif - compte rendu critique - conduite langagière du lecteur du discours argumentatif - analyse de la grille de lecture de S. Chartrand - objectifs de lecture visés durant le compte-rendu critique du discours argumentatif

1 Introduction

This study focuses on the activity of critical reporting. It aims to develop a teaching device intended for 2nd A. SL and LG learners to facilitate the teaching and learning of critical reporting in the context of argumentative discourse. It is important to note that critical reporting is a crucial macro-skill that shapes the learners' exit profile at the end of this level of schooling. The objective is to design a reading grid that outlines the reading objectives that learners must achieve by the end of their engagement with this type of speech, thereby enabling them to produce a critical report.

1.1 Definition of Argumentative Discourse

We present a definition developed after reviewing various works on argumentative discourse, including those of J.-M. Adam (1992, 1999, 2005a, 2005b, and 2011) and S. Chartrand (1994). Argumentative discourse is produced by a speaker who seeks to convince the interlocutor of the relevance of their point of view. To achieve this argumentative goal, the speaker engages in a dialogical approach, presenting arguments that substantiate the validity of the defended position. In this context, the speaker employs various argumentative strategies—such as demonstration, concession, deliberation, justification, and refutation—to accomplish the intended objective.

1.2 Description of the Critical Reporting Activity

The writing activity of the critical report encompasses the understanding, reduction, and reformulation of a source discourse, regardless of its typology (A. Solveig-Lepoivre, 1999). Alongside these three operations, which are mobilized concurrently, the critical report also engages another linguistic operation that influences the positioning of the reader (and the writer of the critical report) regarding the source discourse; this

operation is characterized as criticism. Therefore, this writing activity culminates in realizing an expressive speech act, as D. Vanderveken (1988) and C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni (2005) noted.

The execution of the expressive objective within the critical report of argumentative discourse necessitates that the recipients are made aware of the position adopted by the writer as a reader of the source discourse. Achieving this expressive speech act requires the writer to adhere to a conventional discourse structure. According to A. Solveig Lepoire (1999), C. Charnet & J. Robin-Nipi (1997), and Gh. Cotentin-Rey (1995), the conventional structure of the critical report is organized into three textual parts: (1) the introduction, (2) the informative statement that reports the essential information from the source discourse, and (3) the critique.

The introduction serves as a statement that includes propositions presenting the speaker of the argumentative discourse, the paratextual elements, and the illocutionary aim of the source discourse (macro-speech act). Notably, the illocutionary aim of argumentative discourse is to convince the recipient(s) of the validity of the presented point of view. In addition to the introduction, the second textual part of the critical report consists of an informative statement that delineates the micro-speech acts explaining the argumentative strategies employed by the speaker to achieve their argumentative aim through the presentation of arguments (essential information of the argumentative discourse). The critique, on the other hand, is a commentary section in which the writer of the critical report articulates their position (favorable or unfavorable) regarding the source of the argumentative discourse.

1.2.1 Reading an Argumentative Speech: Brief Description of Some Reading Grids

Several reading grids have been proposed to identify the reading objectives of an argumentative speech. Below, we cite a selection of these grids developed by A. Boissinot (1992), J. Dolz (1994), S. Chartrand (1994), and L. Ruiz de Zarobe (2008).

| Language Conduct of the Reader of an Argumentative Speech | Reading Grid by A. Boissinot (1992) | Reading Grid by J. Dolz (1994) | Reading Grid by S. Chartrand (1994) | Reading Grid by L. Ruiz de Zarobe (2008) |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| Identify the indices of enunciation (participants in the enunciation of the argumentative discourse, indices of subjectivity) | Identify organizational clues (thesis, arguments, thematic progression, and connectors) | Identify the author's position (thesis) | Identify the argumentative structure (thesis, arguments, and conclusion) | |
| Identify lexical clues (linguistic elements explaining the speaker's position) | Identify the arguments and their order. | Identify the prototypical components of argumentative discourse (thesis, arguments, partial conclusions, counter-arguments, and discursive presuppositions) | Identify linguistic elements referring to the author's position. | |
| Identify concessions and strategies. | | Identify communication components (speaker, illocutionary aim, time, and place of utterance and reception) | Identify argumentative strategies (refutation, justification, demonstration, and deliberation) | |

1.2.2 Analysis of the S. Chartrand Reading Grid

Due to space limitations, we will focus our analysis on the reading grid developed by S. Chartrand (1994), which specifically addresses the identification of argumentative strategies. This grid indicates that the argumentative strategies adopted within the argumentative discourse are suggested in textual part no. 02 of the critical report through introductory verbs that refer to the (micro) speech acts highlighting the strategies

employed, ultimately aimed at executing the (macro) speech act of the argumentative discourse. For clarification, to report means to convey information.

From the examination of the table above, it is evident that the S. Chartrand reading grid targets three key reading objectives:

- Identify communication components.
- Identify the prototypical components of argumentative discourse.
- Identify argumentative strategies.

Compared to other grids, it is noteworthy that the identification of paratextual elements and keywords within the argumentative discourse needs to be prioritized. Additionally, we observe the following:

- S. Chartrand (1994) emphasizes the reconstruction of the enunciation situation as the primary reading objective when engaging with this type of discourse. This approach correlates with identifying the illocutionary aim during the reconstruction process.
- Identifying the thesis and arguments constitutes the second objective targeted by S. Chartrand. Although this identification is included in the grid, S. Chartrand posits that achieving this objective is accompanied by recognizing other elements, specifically counter-arguments and discursive presuppositions.
- S. Chartrand asserts that the identification of argumentative strategies follows the identification of the thesis and arguments, which is preceded by identifying the illocutionary aim of the analyzed

discourse.

- A logical progression exists among reading objectives 1, 2, and 3, as established by S. Chartrand. However, it is worth noting that identifying the participants' positions in the enunciation of the argumentative discourse needs to be included in the proposed grid. Nevertheless, understanding this lexicon allows the reader to better comprehend the participants' positions in the discursive activity with an argumentative purpose.

2 Critical Report of an Argumentative Speech: Proposal of a Reading Grid for Argumentative Discourse

As previously analyzed, S. Chartrand's reading grid will not be incorporated into our teaching framework concerning the critical report of argumentative discourse. The realization of the expressive speech act, which is the focus of the critical report on argumentative discourse, necessitates that the writer of the critical report (and the reader of the source discourse) adhere to a conventional discourse plan. This plan is structured into three components: an introduction, an informative statement that conveys information from the source discourse, and a critique of this information (whether in approval or rejection).

Identifying the information that constitutes the discourse of the critical report on argumentative discourse implies that the reading grid designed to describe the linguistic behavior of the reader must encompass reading objectives that facilitate the identification of this information. J. Dolz (1994) posits that the reading objectives of a discourse (regardless of its type) can be defined by the typology of the discourse, the teacher's objectives, or the discourse to be produced from the reading. Concurrently, M. Bianco (2015) and C. Golder and D. Gaonac'h (2015) assert that reading objectives are determined by the activities based on the discourse. The perspectives of these four authors suggest that the reading objectives targeted within a reading grid of argumentative discourse must consider both the source discourse's argumentative typology and the discourse's organization to be produced from this reading, specifically the critical report of the argumentative discourse.

Therefore, the established objectives must encompass the following elements: paratextual elements, the enunciation situation that generated the source argumentative discourse, the illocutionary aim of the source discourse (macro-speech act), the linguistic tools elucidating the discourse situation, essential information, argumentative strategies, micro-speech acts, and the lexicon that highlights the positions of the participants in the discursive activity. The objectives targeted during reading must facilitate the study of argumentative discourse across paratextual, enunciative, structural, lexical, pragmatic, and evaluative dimensions. These six categories form the organizing framework for our proposed reading grid.

The linguistic conduct of the reader of argumentative discourse must encompass the various operations essential for executing the activity of the critical report on an argumentative discourse. Thus, it should enable the identification of necessary elements for composing the critical report discourse, including paratextual elements, the illocutionary aim of the argumentative discourse, arguments (essential information), and the adopted argumentative strategies. Accordingly, the linguistic conduct of the reader of this discourse is

elucidated in the reading grid proposed below. This reading grid is integral to a didactic device aimed at teaching and learning how to write a critical report on argumentative discourse.

Proposed Reading Grid for Argumentative Discourse

- Identify paratextual elements
- Identify the theme
- Identify linguistic tools referring to the theme
- Identify keywords and expressions
- Identify the speaker
- Identify linguistic tools referring to the speaker
- Identify the co-speaker(s)
- Identify linguistic tools referring to the co-speaker(s)
- Identify the thesis
- Identify statements referring to the thesis
- Identify the arguments
- Identify statements referring to the arguments
- Identify the introducers of the arguments
- Identify examples
- Identify linguistic tools introducing the examples
- Identify the optional role of examples in argumentative discourse
- Identify the conclusion
- Identify statements referring to the conclusion
- Identify the articulator introducing the conclusion
- Identify the logical relationship expressed by the articulator announcing the conclusion
- Identify the macro-speech act read
- Identify the type of speech read
- Identify salient information of this type of speech (information ensuring the realization of the macro-act of the speech read)
- Identify the argumentative strategies used in the speech read
- Identify micro-speech acts that highlight the adopted argumentative strategies
- Report to readers on the argumentative strategies used using an opinion verb
- Position oneself favorably or unfavorably about the argumentative speech read:
 1. Present your opinion on the thesis defended by the author or on how the arguments are presented in the source speech.
 2. Support your viewpoint with arguments.
 3. In light of the situation in the reader's country or globally, provide your perspective on the relevance of the thesis of the author of the source speech.
 4. Support your viewpoint with arguments.

We believe that achieving the various reading objectives outlined in our grid would facilitate readers in executing the critical reporting activity of an argumentative speech. While comprehension is necessary for developing this writing activity, it alone cannot guarantee successful completion. In addition to comprehension, the writer must engage in further operations, including the contraction of the source speech and the reformulation of essential information.

3 Presentation of the Reading Objectives Targeted During the Activity of the Critical Report of an Argumentative Speech

This section outlines the linguistic conduct of the reader of argumentative discourse by presenting the information that the reader should grasp upon concluding the observation and reading of the source discourse.

3.1 Presentation of the Reading Objectives Targeted During the Critical Report: Case of Argumentative Discourse

The reading objectives targeted during the analysis of argumentative speech are detailed in the previous sections. To illustrate this, we propose the study of the argumentative speech titled "Protecting Heritage" (see text in appendix), which will be presented to our informants (2nd A. SL and LG learners).

We now provide a concrete application of our reading grid designed to facilitate the understanding of argumentative discourse, resulting in the identification of the following elements:

- **Paratextual Elements:**
 - Title: Protecting Heritage
 - Speaker: A. Benfodda
 - Source: Le courrier de SDH, n° 02
 - Publication Date: March-April 2005
- **Theme:**The theme of the speech is the protection of heritage.
- **Linguistic Elements Referring to the Theme:**Linguistic elements related to the theme include "the safeguarding and enhancement of heritage," "such importance on this subject," and "the safeguarding of the Turkish Baths."
- **Key Words and Expressions:**Key terms include "UNESCO," "a month," "a year," "the safeguarding of heritage," "in all countries," "why does this international institution attach such importance to this subject," "a first response," "cultural," "architectural," "an essential component," "national identity," "best way," and "to know your country."
- **Speaker:**A. Benfodda is the speaker of the analyzed speech. He is a member of the Sidi El Houari Health Association, which published the book from which the text is derived.
- **Linguistic Elements Explaining the Speaker:**The speaker identifies himself in the discourse through the pronoun "we" and the possessive adjective "our," positioning himself as a member of the Sidi El Houari Health Association, which advocates for the protection of heritage.
- **Co-Speaker(s):**The readers are the intended recipients of the discourse.
- **Linguistic Elements Referring to the Co-Speaker(s):**Co-speakers are referred to in the speech by the pronoun "one." This pronoun is used in a rhetorical question where readers wonder why UNESCO places such importance on the protection of heritage: "UNESCO has decreed that one month per year—from April 18 to May 18—will be devoted to the safeguarding and enhancing heritage in all countries. One may wonder why this international institution attaches such importance to this subject."
- **Thesis:**In the studied speech, the thesis is articulated: "It is necessary to protect heritage." The readers must infer this thesis.
- **Statement Referring to the Thesis:**The source discourse implicitly communicates the thesis. It follows a statement where readers question the significance of heritage protection (statement no. 01) and the subsequent arguments presented (statement no. 02). A. Benfodda can only provide the arguments justifying the importance of heritage after the thesis has been suggested in the speech. The implicit thesis is situated between the questioning of its importance and the rationale provided.

To locate the implicit thesis, we analyze the following excerpt from the speech, composed of statements (n° 01 and 02): "UNESCO has decreed that one month per year—from April 18 to May 18—will be devoted to the safeguarding and enhancement of heritage in all countries. One may wonder why this international institution attaches such importance to this subject (statement n° 01). A first answer immediately comes to mind: heritage, whether cultural or architectural, is an essential component of national identity (statement n° 02)." The author sets forth "the first reason justifying the importance of protecting heritage," thereby allowing readers to infer the necessity of its protection.

- **Arguments:**The subject-argumentative presents three arguments to convince readers of the importance of protecting heritage:
 1. Heritage is cultural and architectural.
 2. Heritage is a component of national identity.
 3. It is the best way to know your country.
- **Statements Referring to the Arguments:**Statements that refer to the arguments include: "Heritage, whether cultural or architectural, is a component of national identity" (arguments no. 01 and 02) and "Isn't the best way to know your country to discover it through the buildings that have marked its different periods?" (argument no. 03).
- **Introducers of the Arguments:**It is noted that there is an absence of argument introducers (such as first, then, moreover, finally) in the analyzed discourse.
- **Examples:**The examples used by the subject-argumentator (A. Benfodda) serve to illustrate the three arguments presented. They include: "But heritage also relates to music, theater, crafts, painting, books..." (examples for the first argument) and "It is the link that cements different

generations together and makes us who we are today, with a culture, traditions, and values that are specific to us and distinguish us from others" (examples for the second argument).

- **Example Introducers:** Examples typically include introducers such as "for example." However, A. Benfodda does not employ example introducers to illustrate the three arguments.
- **Optional Role of Examples in the Read Speech:** The optional role of examples in the argumentative discourse is indicated by the omission of discursive elements referencing the examples, highlighting that these examples serve as supplementary information.
- **Conclusion:** Typically, the conclusion is found at the end of an argumentative speech, following the thesis presentation and supporting arguments. In the text analyzed, there is a noted absence of a conclusion.
- **Statement Referring to the Conclusion:** The absence of a conclusion in the speech results in the non-existence of this type of statement within the discourse.
- **Logical articulator Introducing the Conclusion:** In the examined discourse, no logical articulator is introducing the conclusion (e.g., "then," "thus," or "therefore") due to the lack of a conclusion.
- **Logical Relationship Expressed by the Articulator Announcing the Conclusion:** As we have established the absence of a conclusion and its accompanying logical articulator, identifying the logical relationship is not feasible. Generally, in argumentative discourse, the logical relationship conveyed by the logical articulator that introduces the conclusion is typically one of consequence.
- **(Macro) Act Referred to in the Speech:** The macro-speech act aimed in the analyzed speech is to convince readers of the importance of protecting heritage.
- **Information Necessary for Carrying Out the (Macro) Speech Act Referred to in the Speech:** The information required to achieve the argumentative aim of the speech—namely, to convince readers of the importance of protecting heritage—includes the three arguments presented: heritage is cultural and architectural, it is a component of national identity, and it is the best way to know one's country.
- **Argumentative Strategies Adopted by the Speaker to Execute the (Macro) Act of the Targeted Speech:** The speaker employs justification to persuade readers of the importance of protecting heritage. This strategy is implemented through an explanatory approach wherein the subject-argumentative seeks to achieve the illocutionary aim of the discourse. A. Benfodda presents reasons that elucidate the significance of heritage by offering two definitions: one lexical (defining heritage in terms of culture and architecture) and the other essentialist (explaining heritage through its intrinsic characteristics) (see C. Plantin, 2016). The lexical definition is illustrated by "whether cultural or architectural," while the essentialist definition is provided by "but heritage also relates to music, theater, crafts, painting, books..."

In the discourse analyzed, the speaker's use of justification occurs after readers have questioned the significance of protecting heritage. This inquiry reveals readers' need to understand the various forms of heritage. Thus, convincing readers of the necessity of heritage protection necessitates an explanation: "How can heritage be understood?" Readers will recognize its importance by comprehending it. Readers will recognize its importance in the diverse aspects of heritage within a society; heritage ultimately leads to arguments justifying its protection. Adopting the argumentative strategy of justification throughout the analyzed discourse aims to persuade readers of the necessity of heritage preservation.

- **Report to Readers on the Argumentative Strategy(ies) Used Using an Opinion Verb:** To report on the justificatory strategy employed by A. Benfodda, it is essential to outline the various stages structuring the explanatory approach adopted by the subject-argumentation in the discourse. The justificatory process followed by the speaker is organized into two stages: defining heritage (as culture and architecture) and justifying its importance by asserting that it is a constituent of national identity and represents a country.
- **Identify the Type of Speech Read:** The speech presented is argumentative.
- **Take a Favorable or Unfavorable Position concerning the Source Speech:**
 1. Present your opinion on the thesis the speaker defended or how the arguments are presented in the source speech.
 2. Support your viewpoint with arguments.
 3. In light of the situation in the reader's country or globally, provide your perspective on the relevance of the thesis defended by the speaker in the source speech.
 4. Support your viewpoint with arguments.

- **Complete the Proposed Gap Speech to Summarize the Argumentative Speech Read:** Performing this activity reminds readers of the principles that govern summary writing (volume, adherence to the enunciative system, order of information in the source speech, reformulation, conciseness). Recalling the guidelines for summarization will facilitate a comparison between this writing technique and that of the critical report. The distinction between these two writing techniques is integral to the writing activity. Concurrently, we conceptualize both activities within a didactic framework to teach and learn the critical report activity to third-year secondary school students in literature and foreign languages. As a reminder, this article aims to present our reading grid designed to facilitate the completion of the critical report activity by learners at this educational level.

Suggested Incomplete Text:

"UNESCO devotes a month in to the protection of heritage. One may wonder why this institution gives great to this subject. The first answer is the heritage of the culture or architecture of a country. It is a of national identity. It is also the best way to one's country."

4 Conclusion

The grid we have developed serves as a preliminary framework that must be refined based on observations collected during subsequent experiments. These experiments will reveal which aspects of the grid require revision—whether through reformulation, modification, deletion, or adding new elements.

Bibliography

Books:

- ADAM, Jean-Michel. (2011). *Textual Linguistics* (3rd ed.). Paris: Armand Colin. p. 320.
1. (2005a). *Texts: Types and Prototypes* (4th ed.). Paris: Armand Colin. p. 223.
 2. (2005b). *Textual Linguistics: Introduction to the Textual Analysis of Discourses*. Paris: Armand Colin. p. 234.
 3. (1999). *Textual Linguistics: From Discourse Genres to Texts*. Paris: Nathan. p. 208.
 4. (1992). *Texts: Types and Prototypes*. Paris: Nathan. p. 223.
 5. (1990). *Elements of Textual Linguistics*. Brussels-Liège: Mardaga. p. 265.
- ADAM, Jean-Michel, & BONHOMME, Marc. (2003). *Advertising Argumentation*. Paris: Nathan. p. 238.
- AMOSSY, Ruth. (2000). *Argumentation in Discourse*. Paris: Nathan University. p. 247.
- BIANCO, Maryse. (2015). *From Oral Language to Understanding Writing*. Grenoble: Presses Universitaires de Grenoble. p. 308.
- GRIZE, Jean-Blaise. (1997). *Logic and Language*. Paris: Ophrys. p. 153.
- BOISSINOT, Alain. (1992). *Argumentative Texts*. CRDP of Toulouse: Bertrand-Lacoste. p. 175.
- CHARNET, Claire, & ROBIN-NIPI, Jacqueline. (1997). *Writing a Summary, a Report, a Synthesis*. Paris: Hachette Livre. p. 95.
- COTENTIN-REY, Ghislaine. (1995). *The Summary, the Report, and the Synthesis*. Paris: Éditions CLE International. p. 159.
- GOLDER, Caroline, & GAONAC'H, Daniel. (2015). *Reading and Understanding*. Paris: Hachette Livre. p. 216.
- KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, Catherine. (2005). *Speech Acts in Discourse: Theories and Functioning*. Paris: Armand Colin. p. 200.
- PLANTIN, Christian. (2016). *Dictionary of Argumentation*. Lyon: ENS Éditions. p. 634.
- REBOUL, Anne, & MOESCHLER, Jacques. (1998). *Pragmatics of Discourse: From the Interpretation of the Statement to the Interpretation of Discourse*. Paris: Armand Colin. p. 220.
- VANDERVEKEN, Daniel. (1988). *Speech Acts*. Liège: Pierre Mardaga. p. 226.

Review Articles:

- Chartrand, S. (1994). "Teaching the Comprehension and Production of Written Argumentative Texts in Secondary School." *Revue Enjeux*, n° 33, Namur, pp. 35-47.
- Dolz, J. (1994). "Writing Argumentative Texts: A Tool for Learning to Read." *Revue Lidil*, n° 10, Grenoble, pp. 103-119.
- Ruiz de Zarobe, L. (2008). "Written Comprehension of Argumentative Text in French as a Foreign Language." *Revue Travaux de Didactique du FLE*, n° 60, Montpellier, pp. 165-183.
- Solveig-Lepoire, A. (1999). "Writing Reports: Articulation of the Cognitive and the Linguistic." *Revue Mélanges Crapel*, n° 24, Nancy, pp. 135-156.

Course of Study:

National Commission for Programs. (2008). *Second-Year French Programs in Literature and Philosophy/Literature and Foreign Languages*. Algiers: National Office of School Publications, pp. 6-15.

Appendix

Protecting Heritage

UNESCO has decreed that one month per year—from April 18 to May 18—will be dedicated to preserving and enhancing heritage in all countries. One may wonder why this international institution attaches such importance to this subject. The first answer that immediately comes to mind is that cultural or architectural heritage is an essential component of national identity. The link cements different generations and makes us who we are today, with a culture, traditions, and values that are specific to us and distinguish us from others. However, while recognizing the unique genius of each person and its particular contribution to human civilization.

Our association was founded around preserving the Turkish Baths, the colonial hospital, and monuments dating from the 18th and 19th centuries. We are sensitive to all actions that challenge the customary indifference towards the historical remains of our city of Oran—not only during this heritage month but permanently. An authentic protection culture for these common goods must be initiated and sustained, particularly among young people. A new behavior is possible when schools and associations invest sustainably in this cause. Isn't the best way to know your country to discover it through the buildings that have marked its various historical periods? Furthermore, heritage encompasses music, theater, crafts, painting, and books—illustrating the importance it should inspire!

A. Benfodda, SDH Mail, March-April 2005, n° 2.