Key Components of Argumentation

Argumentation theory, or argumentation, is the interdisciplinary study of how conclusions can be reached through logical reasoning; that is, claims based, soundly or not, on premises. It includes the arts and sciences of civil debate, dialogue, conversation, and persuasion. It studies rules of inference, logic, and procedural rules in both artificial and real world settings.[1] Argumentation includes deliberation and negotiation which are concerned with collaborative decision-making procedures.[2] It also encompasses eristic dialog, the branch of social debate in which victory over an opponent is the primary goal.[3] This art and science is often the means by which people protect their beliefs or self-interests—or choose to change them—in rational dialogue, in common parlance, and during the process of arguing.

Argumentation is used in law, for example in trials, in preparing an argument to be presented to a court, and in testing the validity of certain kinds of evidence. Also, argumentation scholars study the post hoc rationalizations by which organizational actors try to justify decisions they have made irrationally. Argumentation is one of four rhetorical modes (also known as modes of discourse), along with exposition, description, and narration.
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Vision
Well justified conclusions

Mission
To reach conclusions through logical reasoning

Values
  - Logic
  - Reasoning
1. Goals & Arguments

Understanding and identifying arguments, either explicit or implied, and the goals of the participants in the different types of dialogue.

1.1. Arguments

*Make the arguments explicit.*

1.1.1. Understanding

*Understand the arguments.*

1.2. Goals

*Make the goals of the participants explicit.*

1.2.1. Understanding

*Understand the goals of the participants.*
2. Premises

*Identify the premises from which conclusions are derived.*
3. Claimants

Determine who made the claim.

Stakeholder(s)

**Claimants**

Kinds of argumentation

**Conversationalists**

Conversational argumentation — Main articles: Conversation analysis and Discourse analysis — The study of naturally occurring conversation arose from the field of sociolinguistics. It is usually called conversation analysis. Inspired by ethnomethodology, it was developed in the late 1960s and early 1970s principally by the sociologist Harvey Sacks and, among others, his close associates Emanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Sacks died early in his career, but his work was championed by others in his field, and CA has now become an established force in sociology, anthropology, linguistics, speech-communication, and psychology.

Mathematicians:

Mathematical argumentation — Main article: Philosophy of mathematics — The basis of mathematical truth has been the subject of long debate. Frege in particular sought to demonstrate (see Gottlob Frege, The Foundations of Arithmetic, 1884, and Begriffsschrift, 1879) that arithmetical truths can be derived from purely logical axioms and therefore are, in the end, logical truths.[9] The project was developed by Russell and Whitehead in their Principia Mathematica. If an argument can be cast in the form of sentences in Symbolic Logic, then it can be tested by the application of accepted proof procedures. This has been carried out for Arithmetic using Peano axioms. Be that as it may, an argument in Mathematics, as in any other discipline, can be considered valid only if it can be shown that it cannot have true premises and a false conclusion.

Scientists:

Scientific argumentation — Main articles: Philosophy of science and Rhetoric of science — Perhaps the most radical statement of the social grounds of scientific knowledge appears in Alan G. Gross’s The Rhetoric of Science (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990). Gross holds that science is a form of sequential reconstruction, meaning that it has special epistemic authority only insofar as its communal methods of verification are trustworthy. This thinking represents an almost complete rejection of the foundationalism on which argumentation was first based.

**Dialogical Process Participants**

Interpretive argumentation — Main article: Interpretive discussion — Interpretive argumentation is a dialogical process in which participants explore and/or resolve interpretations of a text or any medium containing significant ambiguity in meaning. Interpretive argumentation is pertinent to the humanities, hermeneutics, literary theory, linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, semiotics, analytic philosophy, and aesthetics. Topics in conceptual interpretation include aesthetic, judicial, logical, and religious interpretation. Topics in scientific interpretation include scientific modeling.

Lawyers:

Legal argumentation — Main articles: Oral argument and Closing argument — Legal arguments are spoken presentations to a judge or appellate court by a lawyer, or parties when representing themselves of the legal reasons why they should prevail. Oral argument at the appellate level accompanies written briefs, which also advance the argument of each party in the legal dispute. A closing argument, or summation, is the concluding statement of each party's counsel reiterating the important arguments for the trier of fact, often the jury, in a court case. A closing argument occurs after the presentation of evidence.

Politicians:

Political argumentation — Main article: Political argument — Political arguments are used by academics, media pundits, candidates for political office and government officials. Political arguments are also used by citizens in ordinary interactions to comment about and understand political events.[11] The rationality of the public is a major question in this line of research.

Voters:

Political scientist Samuel L. Popkin coined the expression “low information voters” to describe most voters who know very little about politics or the world in general. In practice, a “low information voter” may not be aware of legislation that their representative has sponsored in Congress. A low-information voter may base their ballot box decision on a media sound-bite, or a flier received in the mail. It is possible for a media sound-bite or campaign flier to present a political position for the incumbent candidate that completely contradicts the legislative action taken in the Capitol on behalf of the constituents. It may only take a small percentage of the overall voting group who base their decision on the inaccurate information, a voter block of 10 to 12%, to swing an overall election result. When this happens, the constituency at large may have been duped or fooled. Nevertheless, the election result is legal and confirmed. Savvy Political consultants will take advantage of low-information voters and sway their votes with disinformation because it can be easier and sufficiently effective. Fact checkers have come about in recent years to help counter the effects of such campaign tactics.
Establishing the "burden of proof" – determining who made the initial claim and is thus responsible for providing evidence why his/her position merits acceptance.

3.1. Responsibility

*Hold the claimant responsible for providing evidence to support the claim.*
4. Evidence

Marshall evidence to force acceptance of the expressed position.

For the one carrying the "burden of proof", the advocate, to marshal evidence for his/her position in order to convince or force the opponent's acceptance. The method by which this is accomplished is producing valid, sound, and cogent arguments, devoid of weaknesses, and not easily attacked.

4.1. Arguments

Produce valid, sound, and cogent arguments, devoid of weaknesses, and not easily attacked.
5. Rejoinder

*Show why a valid conclusion cannot be derived from the reasons provided.*

In a debate, fulfillment of the burden of proof creates a burden of rejoinder. One must try to identify faulty reasoning in the opponent's argument, to attack the reasons/premises of the argument, to provide counterexamples if possible, to identify any fallacies, and to show why a valid conclusion cannot be derived from the reasons provided for his/her argument.

3.1. Reasoning

*Identify faulty reasoning.*

3.2. Counterexamples

*Provide counterexamples.*
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