

Argumentation and Language (2018/02/05-06)

USI Università della Svizzera italiana (Lugano)
Main building (Palazzo bianco), Room 321

1) 2018/02/05

- 09:30-13:00 Corpus Data and Tools for Argumentation Analysis
- 13:00-14:30 *Lunch*
- 14:30-16:00 Corpus Data and Tools for Argumentation Analysis
- 16:00-18:00 Cognitive Pragmatic Tools for the Analysis of Argumentation

2) 2018/02/06

- 08:30-10:30 Cognitive Pragmatic Tools for the Analysis of Argumentation
- 10:30-12:00 Argumentation and Rhetoric in Interaction
- 12:00-13:30 *Lunch*
- 13:30-17:00 Argumentation and Rhetoric in Interaction

Corpus Data and Tools for Argumentation Analysis

Elena Musi - Columbia University

The first workshop aims at providing those means needed to investigate research questions centered around argumentation through corpus-based analysis. In other words, you will learn how to empirically test/ ground your theoretically-based hypotheses. The workshop will be structured in three parts.

In the first part, the main notions of corpus linguistics will be introduced (e.g. corpus based vs. corpus driven analyses; balanced and representative samples; text genres; relative vs. absolute frequencies; collocations) and their relevance for the study of argumentative discourse will be discussed. Drawing from Plato's metaphor of language as a living body, it will be shown how syntactic, semantic and pragmatic dimensions need to be combined for a throughout analysis of argumentative discourse. Examples will be picked from a variety of text genres.

The second part will offer an overview of existing resources for the study of argumentation ranging from open source corpora to tools for corpus analysis. Special attention will be devoted to annotation processes. Different annotation schemas will be presented and empirically compared depending on the students' requests.

In the third part, we will interactively analyze a case study taken from the subreddit *Changemyview*. This forum constitutes an interesting environment for the study of persuasive argumentative discourse: users award a so-called "delta point" to other users that managed to change their point of view. We will critically discuss the analytic design proposed by different groups of students to put into practice what learnt during the workshop.

Cognitive Pragmatic Tools for the Analysis of Argumentation

Steve Oswald - University of Fribourg

Our second workshop will address the relationship between comprehension and argumentation, and more specifically the relationship between pragmatic inference and argumentative inference.

When people argue, cognitive processes like verbal comprehension and argument evaluation are at play. Building on the idea that before one can judge whether s/he agrees with a speaker, one first needs to understand the (explicit and implicit) content of their utterance, this course is meant to approach argumentative practices through the issue of *meaning*.

A significant part of the workshop will thus be devoted to approaching these cognitive processes in order to shed light on the following questions: how do people understand each other, in particular when *implicit* meaning is involved in the communicative event? How, as analysts, can we provide plausible interpretations of the argumentative material that has been left implicit by the speakers, in order to reduce the risk of over- or misinterpretations? Why and how can what we understand from a verbal message play a role in whether we are persuaded by it or not?

The workshop is accordingly divided in two: in the first, methodological, part, the model we will work with will be introduced and precise guidelines for argumentative reconstruction will be offered. In the second part, the issue of rhetorical effectiveness (or persuasiveness) will be approached within the very same framework, but this time to discuss whether in a given context an argument is likely to persuade or not, given its linguistic wording and the assumed cognitive environment of its audience.

Argumentation and Rhetoric in Interaction

Jérôme Jacquin – University of Lausanne

Grounded in a descriptive and language-oriented approach to argumentation, the third workshop aims at introducing the participants to the study of argumentation and rhetoric in oral interaction.

First, a definition of interaction will be given and discussed and the theoretical and methodological consequences for the study of argumentative and rhetorical practices will be drawn. Second, such a framework will be applied respectively to argumentation in interaction and to rhetoric in interaction, with a focus on professional and institutional contexts (media talk, politics, workplace meetings). Many examples documenting different speech settings will be used.

On the *Argumentation* side, we will define the notions of argumentative “situation”, “roles”, and “positions”, by focusing on how disagreement is expressed and negotiated in oral interaction through the incremental introduction of arguments by the participants. On the *Rhetoric* side, we will revisit classical notions such as rhetorical genres (judicial, deliberative, epideictic), steps (inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, actio) and proofs (ethos, logos, pathos) in light of the particularities of oral interaction.

We will finish the third part with a role-playing game where groups of students will receive the first part of a real argumentative sequence (i.e. speech of the proponent) and will have to imagine the best possible counter-argumentation (i.e. speech of the opponent) in the specific context. Propositions by the students will be analyzed and compared with what the real opponents actually said.