

19 April

From reconstructive analysis to identifying prototypical argumentative patterns
Frans H. van Eemeren, University of Amsterdam & Leiden University

The course is aimed at providing an introduction into the reconstructive analysis and evaluation of argumentative discourse from the perspective of the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation. By explaining the insights from argumentation theory that are crucial to the analysis and evaluation of argumentative discourse an adequate basis will be created for dealing systematically with argumentative discourse and identifying prototypical argumentative patterns. In this endeavour the following topics will be treated:

- *Argumentation theory as a discipline*

Introduction of argumentation theory, its crucial concepts and research program.

- *Meta-theoretical principles*

Discussion of the meta-theoretical principles of functionalization, socialization, externalization and dialectification

- *A model of a critical discussion*

Description of the model of a critical discussion aimed at resolving a difference of opinion on the merits, its constitutive stages and the speech acts constituting constructive argumentative moves in the various stages.

- *Critical discussion and the identification of fallacies*

Introduction of the rules for critical discussion, the code of conduct for reasonable argumentative discourse and definition of the fallacies as violations of the code of conduct.

- *Analysis as resolution-oriented reconstruction*

Explanation of the reconstruction transformations carried out in a theoretically-motivated argumentative discourse leading to an Analytic Overview that is an adequate point of departure for a fair evaluation. Exemplary analysis of a specific case (part I).

- *Strategic manoeuvring in argumentative discourse*

Extending the theoretical framework for maintaining reasonableness of the standard theory by integrating the rhetorical dimension of aiming for effectiveness into the theorizing. Exemplary analysis of a specific case (part II).

- *Communicative activity types and argumentative characterizations*

Focusing on the variety of argumentative practices that can be distinguished in the various domains of argumentative reality and the different kinds of institutional preconditions that are in these practices imposed on the argumentative discourse.

- *Prototypical argumentative patterns*

Identification of the (basic and extended) prototypical argumentative patterns coming into being in the various communicative activity types as a result of complying with the institutional preconditions and introduction of the stereotypical argumentative patterns as a new topic of research.

20 April

Applied Linguistics and real-world contexts

Alison Sealey, University of Lancaster

In these two sessions, we shall get to know each other through a brief exchange of details of the research we are currently conducting. We shall explore a range of contrasting theoretical positions on the nature of the relationship between language/discourse and reality, and the relevance of these to the participants' own research projects. More specifically, we shall consider concepts about the different kinds of entities that are the focus of participants' interest, how these may be defined and categorized, and the role of language in the research process. The sessions will be interactive, comprising a combination of input, small group and whole-group discussion, and activities around texts and data.

In terms of theoretical knowledge, the session will help to develop participants' awareness of alternative conceptions of 'language(s)', 'reality' and taxonomic categories, as well as contrasting perspectives on how these relate to each other and how they can be known. In terms of practical skills, the session will include demonstrations of data analysis using applied linguistic methods, and opportunities for participants to carry out some analyses of their own, with the aim of developing their confidence in relevant theory and applying the concepts explored to their own academic practice.

21 April

Collaborative Trajectories across the Research-Practice Continuum and Translationality in Applied Linguistics Research

Srikant Sarangi, University of Aalborg

Engagement with real-world problems to ‘make a difference’ is a widely-held assumption in many domains of Applied Linguistics research. This is nowhere more distinctly visible than in the study of professional practice in institutional settings – in education, healthcare, social welfare, mediation, law, media, corporate sectors, journalism, information technology, interpreting etc. Given the inherent complexity of real-world phenomena in many institutional settings, collaboration with professional practitioners at the stages of study design (including negotiation of access to data sites) and interpretation of data and its dissemination must be a precondition for bridging the translational gap.

I identify both challenges and affordances in bridging what I see as a two-fold translational gap: (i) the historical disconnect between pure and applied research, including the ‘first-find-then-apply’ mentality; and (ii) the epistemological and ontological divides as manifest in different ‘interpretive repertoires’ inhabited by researchers (as outsiders) and practitioners (as insiders).

In outlining four different research paradigms – pure, applied, consultancy and consultative – my focus remains on the consultative mode which foregrounds two-way collaboration between researchers and practitioners, albeit socialised into different ‘communities of practice’. In capturing this collaboration process via the marriage metaphor, I suggest a conceptual framework with the label ‘community of interests’, which concerns scenarios in which one crosses different communities of practice with ‘shared interests’ rather than ‘shared practices/discourses’. Through illustrative exemplars taken from a number of healthcare sites, I propose at least six parameters (e.g. affordable presence, reciprocity of perspectives, joint problematisation, thick participation, collaborative interpretation and provision of hot feedback) through which translational research can be productively construed as a mutually enriching agenda in the research-practice continuum to optimise impact. In conclusion, I want to raise the issue of ‘reflexivity in professional practice’ vis-à-vis ‘researcher-as-stranger’ – which not only applies to the professional practitioners we choose to study but also extends to our own professional practice as applied linguists.