

ECA 2025 Summer School in Poznań

Book of Abstracts

Prof. Dawn Archer, MMU

Manipulating reality paradigms

In this first of two sessions, we'll explore reality paradigms: namely, the truth filters that individuals see through, draw from, and rely upon when making sense of the world, thereby colouring their worldview (Archer 2002, 2011, 2020). In particular, we'll investigate how such perceptual lenses (including our own) can be manipulated by others – for altruistic purposes, egoistic purposes and even deceptive purposes (Archer 2020, 2025, forthcoming). Together, we will work through, and discuss, crisis negotiation data, Trump-related data, and a TV interview where the interviewee was later found to be involved in the disappearance of two little girls.

References

Archer, D. (forthcoming). "When you report fake news which CNN does a lot you are the enemy of the people': Trump's attempts to influence/manipulate audience members' reality paradigms'. In: E. Lombardi Vallauri, D. Cimmino, G. Giunta and G. Mannaioli (eds.). *Implicit Manipulation in Public Discourse: Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. Mouton Series in Pragmatics.

Archer, D. (2025). 'Using corpus-assisted approaches to explore UK police crisis negotiation'. In: G. Brookes, N. Curry, and R. Love (eds.). *Applications of Corpus Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.191-206.

Archer, D. (2020). 'The value of facework in crisis negotiation: with a focus on barricade situations'. In: D. Archer, K. Granger and P. Jagodzinski. *Politeness in Professional Contexts*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp.300-322.

Archer, D. (2011). Libeling Oscar Wilde: The Case of Regina vs. John Sholto Douglas. *Journal of Politeness Research*. 7(1): 73-99. DOI: [10.1515/jplr.2011.004](https://doi.org/10.1515/jplr.2011.004).

Archer, D. (2002). "'Can innocent people be guilty?'. A sociopragmatic analysis of examination transcripts from the Salem Witchcraft Trials'. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics*. 3(1): 1-30.

Im/politeness

In the second of our two sessions together, we'll explore im/politeness as well as facework more generally – including my own facework models (Archer, 2015; Archer and Willcox, 2018). After a brief reminder of the three waves of im/politeness research to date, we will work through a variety of datasets – including (but not limited to) Trump and Biden squaring off as presidential candidates, Trump's use of compliments (as well as insults) and famous scenes from *Love Actually* and *Bohemian Rhapsody*.

References

Archer, D. (2015). 'Slurs, insults, (backhanded) compliments and other strategic facework moves'. *Language Sciences* 52: 82-97

Archer & P. Willcox (2018). 'The faces at play in performance appraisals: with a focus upon a UK retail organisation'. *Journal of Politeness Research* 14(2): 261-286.

Dr Claudia Coppola, USI

Argumentation and emotions: a pragmatic account

In the first theoretical session, we will give a short overview of how the relationship between language and emotions was dealt with starting from ancient rhetoric to contemporary linguistics and discourse studies. We will then focus on the argumentative dimension by looking at whether and how emotions can play a role in the reasoning process.

Based on that, in a hands-on session we will refer to recent pragmatic accounts of argumentation (e.g. Argumentum Model of Topics, Rigotti & Greco 2019) to carry out practical qualitative analysis of emotions in argumentation in real-life textual data by looking at different dimensions, such as lexical triggers, modality, speech acts, implicit meanings and agentivity.

Rigotti, E., & Greco, S. (2019). *Inference in Argumentation: A Topics-Based Approach to Argument Schemes* (Vol. 34). Springer International Publishing.

Prof. Jean Goodwin, NCSU

Add argumentation metadiscourse to your methods toolkit!

Summary: Since the pragmatic turn, argumentation theorists have understood argumentation as something people do. In these sessions, I want to take this idea a step further: argumentation is something that people know they are doing, and they frequently express that practical knowledge as they are doing it. Attention to such talk about talk—such argumentation metadiscourse—is vital for empirical analysis of natural language argumentation; at least, this is what the normative pragmatic approach to argumentation theory holds. After a brief introduction to the theory of metadiscourse, relying especially on the work of US Communication scholar Robert T. Craig, we'll explore some existing empirical work, including on key terms like "argument" and "issue." We'll try applying the concepts to actual argumentative discourse, including corpora brought in by Summer School participants. And we'll consider what argumentation metadiscourse means for argumentation theory. What if argumentation theory is nothing more than an attempt to make more fully explicit the practical knowledge arguers express in their everyday metadiscourse?

Dr Barbara Konat, UAM

Emotional Argumentation in Context: A Pragmatic and Corpus-Based Approach

This session addresses the role of emotions in everyday argumentative practices including methods from cognitive science, computational linguistics, and corpus pragmatics. Working with authentic argumentative discourse, especially online discussions, we will explore how emotional appeals are realized linguistically and pragmatically, and how they function in context to fulfill rhetorical and interactional goals. The session introduces a framework for identifying and analyzing emotional argumentation in naturally occurring texts, including criteria for distinguishing between emotional expression and elicitation for strategic gain. Participants will engage in hands-on annotation and qualitative analysis exercises based on pre-selected corpus excerpts. The goal is to demonstrate how corpus methods can inform the theoretical modeling of emotions in natural language argumentation.

Prof. Dorota Leszczyńska-Jasion, UAM

What Do Logical Theories of Questions Have to Offer to Argumentation Theory?

As a formal logician, I take logic to be concerned with the structure of the world as it is perceived through the lens of our languages and other cognitive tools. In this sense, logic is fundamentally about cognition, including the structures of argumentation. Although logic

provides highly abstract models, ones often far removed from real-life argumentative practices, these models remain epistemically valuable.

In my talk, I will introduce the basic tools of the logic of questions, with a particular focus on inferential erotetic logic. The following topics will be discussed:

- basic terminology: interrogatives and questions, types of questions and answers, presuppositions of questions,
- logical accounts of the syntax of questions (T. Kubiński, N. Belnap, and contemporary frameworks such as inferential erotetic logic and inquisitive semantics),
- Hamblin's postulates (Hamblin, 1958),
- relations between questions,
- and, last but not least, questions as premises and/or conclusions of reasoning.

In the final part, I will consider logical tools currently available for modeling such reasoning.

Dr Jennifer Schumann, UoF

Experimental Methods in Argumentation

In recent years, experimental methods have become increasingly important for investigating argumentative phenomena, complementing more traditional theoretical and qualitative approaches. This workshop provides students with essential knowledge and skills required to conduct experimental research, by discussing an overview of the key components involved in conducting experimental studies. It is structured into four main parts that aim to equip participants with a comprehensive understanding of the elements that are essential for conducting experimental research in argumentation:

Part 1: Experimental Studies in Argumentation and a Sample Study

Part 2: Fundamentals of Experimental Studies

Part 3: Designing Materials

Part 4: Data Analysis and Interpretation

In the first part, we will explore recent experimental work in the field of argumentation, illustrating the potential of this approach and the diversity of existing studies. A sample study will be presented to clarify the core ideas behind experimental research.

Part two focuses on foundational concepts: the kinds of research questions that can be addressed experimentally, the different types of experimental designs, tools for building experiments, platforms for data collection, and key principles to keep in mind when designing a study.

In the third part of the workshop, participants will engage in hands-on group work. They will develop research questions and testable hypotheses based on a given topic and collaboratively design a few sample items. This practical segment aims to deepen participants' understanding of the choices and constraints involved in preparing experimental materials.

Finally, the fourth and last part will address how to analyze data and discuss strategies for interpreting experimental results in light of broader research aims.

Prof. Cristian Santibanez, UCSC

1. **"Emotions and Argumentation: Rhetorical and Cognitive Perspectives"**: This talk analyzes two main insights for understanding the role of emotions in argumentative activity: the rhetorical and cognitive perspectives. The goal is to provide an overview using practical examples to consider how the traditional rhetorical perspective has viewed emotions and the elements that the cognitive perspective can add to the traditional view. To achieve this goal, we will examine the specific characteristics of both approaches and, more importantly, their similarities and differences. The authors whose work will be discussed include Aristotle, Perelman, and Olbrechts-Tyteca; Tindale; and Barrett, Ben-Ze'ev, and Thagard, among others.
2. **"On Hamblin's Account of Emotion and the Problem of the Reconstruction of Emotional Arguments"**: In his posthumous monograph, which seems to be a collection of unfinished thoughts, Hamblin (2017) proposes a suggestive analysis of emotions. In the first pages of Chapter 5, the author, like many others, laments the conceptual void that has existed in the generation of a model, a mechanisable approximation, of emotions. He begins by stressing the importance of interjections, those linguistic constructions that communicate many things at once, but which are sometimes unclassifiable (or easily dismissed) by standard grammatical theories. He notes that "A large proportion of Darwin's list of emotions can be covered in some way or other by means of this expanded list of interjections. However, the question arises whether the list is really as wide as we want it to be. The word emotion may itself be a little narrow here: feeling is broader. I can feel conspicuous, confident, inadequate, friendly and various other things but I would not say that I can have emotions of

conspicuousness and so on, though these feelings clearly border on emotions and ought to be considered... I also have desires, wants and wishes. And I feel pain, which is like an emotion but different. Finally, let us consider what would rather be called attitudes: the principal attitudes are various kinds and shades of approval or disapproval, but I can also take up a hostile, distant, friendly, menacing or equivocal attitude. Emotions, feelings, desires and attitudes overlap to some extent, and we should be interested in the widest field, at least until we discover distinctions. (69) This invitation to make distinctions, after his analysis of the interjections that communicate emotions in language, allows him to offer the first distinction between expressing an emotion and describing an emotion. The explanation of the distinction follows the following path: when we say I feel sorry, we communicate a statement with which the listener can agree or disagree, saying something I don't believe you; but if instead of that someone says Oooow (or something similar), which communicates the same meaning as the statement, the listener can accuse the speaker of pretending, but cannot say that a truth or a lie was being told. The difference for Hamblin is dialectical. With the statement the speaker is committed to an indicative expression, while with Oooow, the commitment acquired has a different nature. In this talk, we will reflect on Hamblin's analytical proposal regarding emotion in terms of what kind of argumentative commitments speakers and listeners acquire once an emotional communication is expressed. By analyzing the kinds of commitments that interlocutors acquire in this context, the dialectical profiles of this kind of dialogue should be reconsidered, which is the second aim of this presentation. Finally, I will present a way to reconstruct emotive argumentative dialogues once emotive expressions have been dialectically challenged. In order to reconstruct emotional arguments, or arguments expressed emotionally according to Hamblin's theory, the basic Krabbe's dialogue profile proposal will be used.

Prof. Mariusz Urbański, UAM

Errors in reasoning: a framework; or: the hunter-gatherer story

Since the end of the 20th century, we have witnessed a practical, or cognitive, turn in logic. Drawing on enormous achievements brought about by the mathematical turn that started more than a hundred years ago, logic has returned to its Aristotelian roots as an instrument by which we come to know anything. The re-forged alliance between logic – now well-equipped with sophisticated formal tools – and psychology results in more and more substantial developments in human reasoning and problem-solving studies. To reap the fruits of this Alliance, we need to be aware that it leads to a shift in the focal points of interest

of such studies and the expansion of their methodological repertoire. In this talk, I argue that the practical turn in logic results in the concept of error becoming crucial for formal modelling of human reasoning processes. My auxiliary claims are that the prescriptive perspective, which considers human limitations in information processing, becomes the most interesting vantage point for such research, and that the triangulation of formal methods, quantitative approach and qualitative analyses becomes the most effective methodology in formal modelling studies.

Prof. Jean Wagemans, UvA

Identifying Argument Types in the Wild: The ATIP and the Periodic Table of Arguments

This lecture introduces students to the Periodic Table of Arguments (PTA) with a special focus on the Argument Type Identification Procedure (ATIP). Whereas most textbooks present arguments in clean, schematic form, real-world discourse poses much greater analytical challenges. The ATIP provides a systematic, step-by-step method for classifying arguments encountered in authentic texts and interactions within the PTA framework. In this session, students will learn how the PTA conceptualizes argument types, how the ATIP guides analysts through identifying them in practice, and how this process supports subsequent evaluation of argumentative quality. Through a combination of theoretical explanations and hands-on exercises with real-world examples, participants will gain a solid understanding of how to apply the PTA and ATIP in their own research on argumentation.