

Contents

Conference Organization	v
Preface	ix
Keynote Speakers	xi
I Long papers	1
Argumentative Design and Polylogue	3
<i>Mark Aakhus</i>	
Revisiting Apologie de la Polémique: Coexistence in Dissent and its “Felicity Conditions”	17
<i>Ruth Amossy</i>	
What is Wrong with Deductivism?	31
<i>Lilian Bermejo-Luque</i>	
Is There an Informal Logic Approach to Argument?	47
<i>J. Anthony Blair</i>	
Commentary on Blair’s Is there an informal logic approach to argument?	67
<i>Paula Olmos</i>	
Structural Differences Between Practical and Cognitive Presumptions	73
<i>Petar Bodlović</i>	
Commentary on Bodlović Structural Differences Between Practical and Cognitive Presumptions	95
<i>James B. Freeman</i>	
Reliability of Argument Mapping	101
<i>Sebastian Cacean</i>	
Commentary on Cacean’s Reliability of Argument Mapping	125
<i>Roosmaryn Pilgram</i>	

Critical discussion for sub-optimal settings	129
<i>Diego Castro</i>	
Comments on Diego Castro’s “Critical Discussion in Sub-Optimal Settings”	149
<i>David Godden</i>	
Democratic Legitimacy and Acts of Dissent	159
<i>Cristina Corredor</i>	
Dissent and Democracy – Commentary on Corredor’s Democratic Legitimacy and Acts of Dissent	177
<i>David Zarefsky</i>	
Strength of Reasons for Moral Dissent	181
<i>James B. Freeman</i>	
What is Peculiar about Moral Dissent? Commentary on Freeman’s “Strength of Reasons for Moral Dissent”	199
<i>John Patrick Casey</i>	
Where Are Dissent and Reasons in Epistemic Justification?	203
<i>José Ángel Gascón</i>	
Knowledge and the Epistemic Function of Argumentation – Commentary on Gascón’s “Where Are dissent and Reasons in Epistemic Justification?”	219
<i>Christoph Lumer</i>	
Justifying Questions?	225
<i>G.C. Goddu</i>	
Commentary on G. C. Goddu’s “Justifying Questions?”	245
<i>David Hitchcock</i>	
Ethnography of Argumentation	251
<i>Kati Hannken-Illjes</i>	
“I said what I said’ - Black Women and Argumentative Politeness Norms”	269
<i>Tempest M. Henning</i>	
Commentary on Tempest Henning’s “I Said What I Said’ - Black Women and Argumentative Politeness Norms”	285
<i>Catherine Hundleby</i>	
The Argument Assessment Tutor (AAT)	289
<i>Michael H.G. Hoffmann</i>	
Grice, Machine Head and the Problem of Overexpressed Premises	305
<i>Michael J. Hoppmann</i>	

Commentary on Hoppmann’s “Grice, Machine Head and the Problem of Overexpressed Premises”	321
<i>Thierry Herman</i>	
Standpoints and Commitments as Products of Argumentative Work: Micro/Macro- Analysis of an Infamous Press Conference	325
<i>Sally Jackson, Scott Jacobs, Xiaoqi Zhang</i>	
A wanting analysis – Commentary on S. Jackson, S. Jacobs, Y. Zhang’s “Standpoints and Commitments as Products of Argumentative Work: Micro/Macro-Analysis of an Infamous Press Conference” . .	347
<i>Harald R. Wohlrapp</i>	
Speech Act Pluralism in Argumentative Polylogues	353
<i>Marcin Lewiński</i>	
Evaluating Relevance in Analogical Arguments Through Warrant-based Reasoning	375
<i>John Licato, Michael Cooper</i>	
Commentary on Licato & Cooper’s Evaluating Relevance in Analogical Arguments Through Warrant-based Reasoning	395
<i>Nicole Cruz</i>	
Arguments From Expert Opinion – An Epistemological Approach . . .	403
<i>Christoph Lumer</i>	
All-out Attack	423
<i>Tshepo Bogosi Mosaka</i>	
Strategic Maneuvering with Speech Codes: The Rhetorical Use of Cultural Presumptions in Constructing Argumentative Discourse .	441
<i>Menno H. Reijven</i>	
Commentary on Reijven’s Strategic Maneuvering with Speech Codes: The Rhetorical Use of Cultural Presumptions in Constructing Argumentative Discourse	459
<i>Beth Innocenti</i>	
Disagreement, Public Reasoning, and (Non-)Authoritarian Argumentation	463
<i>Karim Sadek</i>	
Commentary on Sadek’s Disagreement, Public Reasoning, and (Non-)Authoritarian Argumentation	481
<i>Cristina Corredor</i>	
Uncovering Hidden Premises to Reveal the Arguer’s Implicit Values: Analysing the Public Debate About Funding Prep	485
<i>Sean Sinclair</i>	

Commentary on Sinclair’s Uncovering Hidden Premises to Reveal the Arguer’s Implicit Values: Analysing the Public Debate about Funding Prep	507
<i>Sally Jackson</i>	
Strange Fish: Belief and the Roots of Disagreement	513
<i>Christopher W. Tindale</i>	
An optimistic perspective on deep disagreement? Commentary on Tindale’s Strange Fish: Belief and the Roots of Disagreement . . .	527
<i>Léa Farine</i>	
Profiling Dialogues: Multi-trait Mapping of Televised Argumentative Exchanges	531
<i>Gábor Á. Zemplén</i>	
Commentary on Zemplén’s Profiling Dialogues: Multi-trait Mapping of Televised Argumentative Exchanges	555
<i>Mehmet Ali Üzelgün</i>	
II Thematic papers	559
Visual Argument Schemes in the PTA	561
<i>Leo Groarke</i>	
The Prospects for Multimodal Schemes of Argument: Assessing the Spoofing Strategies in Subvertisements of the Tobacco Industry .	579
<i>Assimakis Tseronis</i>	
(Mis)Framing Photographs as an Obstacle to Fair Dissent	593
<i>Marta Zampa, Chiara Pollaroli</i>	
Dissent, Disadvantage, Testimony and the Ideological ‘Truth’ of Presumptions	607
<i>Harmony Peach</i>	
With All Due Respect: Controversial Beliefs and the Limits of Responsible Argumentation	621
<i>Tracy Howell</i>	
A Quantitative Corpus-Based Study of Evidentiality and Disagreement in Earnings Conference Calls	637
<i>Andrea Rocci, Carlo Raimondo, Daniele Puccinelli</i>	
Five Approaches to Argument Strength: Probabilistic, Dialectical, Structural, Empirical, and Computational	653
<i>Frank Zenker, Kamila Debowska-Kozłowska, David Godden, Marcin Selinger, Simon Wells</i>	

Responsible Agent Deliberation	675
<i>Douglas Walton, Alice Toniolo</i>	
From Dialogic to Argument-Based Teaching: Introducing Pragmatic Criteria to Analyse Whole-Class Interactions	689
<i>Chrysi Rapanta, Dilar Cascalheira</i>	

