

Scientific presentations in this program are **COLOR-CODED**, as follows:

PLENARY EVENTS: these are always in Aula 2, with no other parallel session at the same time.	LONG PAPERS: 55 minutes slots, with assigned commentator and including Q/A.	REGULAR PAPERS: 25 minutes slots, without assigned commentator and including Q/A.	PANELS: series of regular papers that have been submitted as part of the same mini-event.
--	---	---	---

Wednesday, September 28, 2022 – ECA Rome 2022, University of Roma Tre, via Ostiense 234

WED 28/09	Aula 2	Aula 3	Aula 4	Aula 6	Aula 7	Aula 8	Aula Verra	Aula Matassi
14:00-14:10	Opening remarks (aula 2): <i>Fabio Paglieri</i> (ECA Chair) and <i>Francesco Ferretti</i> (Deputy Director of the Department of Philosophy, Communication, and Performing Arts, Roma Tre University)							
14:10-15:40	Plenary keynote talk (aula 2) Chris Reed , THE JOY OF DATA Chair: <i>Serena Villata</i>							
15:40-16:10	Sally Jackson . <i>Specialized warrants and criteria for evaluating the arguments they generate: a qualitative empirical study from the controversy over chronic fatigue syndrome</i>	José Ángel Gascón . <i>The reasonableness of fallacy accusations: an empirical study</i>	Santiago Marro, Elena Cabrio and Serena Villata . <i>Argumentation quality assessment: an argument mining approach</i>	Mika Hietanen . <i>Forget the Toulmin-scheme, remember the epicheireme!</i>	Cristian Santibanez . <i>Argumentation and epistemic distributed vigilance</i>	Solmu Anttila . <i>Argumentative injustice in political argumentation</i>	Mark Weinstein . <i>Cognitive bias in social argumentation</i>	Gabrijela Kisicek . <i>Classification and reconstruction of auditory arguments</i>
16:10-16:30	Coffee break							
16:30-17:00	Henrike Jansen . <i>When plausible deniability becomes implausible</i> <panel: Contemporary approaches to fallacy theory>	Michael Baumtrog and Federica Bordini . <i>Reasoning through coping</i>	Annette Hautli-Janisz, Zlata Kikteva, Wassiliki Siskou, Kamila Gorska, Ray Becker and Chris Reed . <i>The argumentative impact of questions in broadcast political debate</i>	Tomáš Ondráček, Mariusz Urbanski and Pawel Lupkowski . <i>Mines, environment, questions, and disagreements. An analysis of the Turów coal mine disputes</i>	Lucija Duda . <i>Two points for the feminist view on disagreement and adversariality</i>	Paula Olmos . <i>Wittgenstein's hinges and the limits of argument</i>	Hubert Marraud . <i>Reasonism and inferencism in the theory of argument</i>	Mehmet Ali Üzelgün . <i>Expanding deep disagreements: Incompatible narratives as interpretative repertoires in political disagreements</i>
17:00-17:30	Steve Oswald . <i>On the rhetorical effectiveness of fallacies</i> <panel: Contemporary approaches to fallacy theory>	Marcin Lewinski . <i>The concept of argument: Revisited and reengineered</i> (commentary by Harvey Siegel)	Rudi Palmieri and Elena Musi . <i>"We didn't do it because if we did it would have been against our interests". Arguing with counterfactuals in denial strategies for trust-repair. The case of Meta</i> <panel: Arguments for digital (dis-)trust: from technologies to actors>	Yeliz Demir and Juliëtte Schaafsma . <i>Political apology as an argumentative activity type: The institutional preconditions of the political apology</i>	Mariana Orozco and Mieke Boon . <i>Eliciting argumentation in engineering-science education. Making justified research-and-design decisions in conceptual modelling</i> (commentary by Jan Albert van Laar)	Harald R. Wohlrapp . <i>The role of frames in Plato's Laches</i>	Trevor Bench-Capon and Katie Atkinson . <i>Argumentation schemes for making choices</i> (commentary by Chris Reed)	Hugo Mota . <i>Resolving social deep disagreements: argumentation and change of perspective</i>

WED 28/09	Aula 2	Aula 3	Aula 4	Aula 6	Aula 7	Aula 8	Aula Verra	Aula Matassi
17:30-18:00	Katharina Stevens. <i>Sophisms and the vice of contemptuousness</i> <panel: Contemporary approaches to fallacy theory>		Katarzyna Budzynska, Ewelina Gajewska, Konrad Kiljan, Barbara Konat, Marcin Koszowy, Marie-Amelie Paquin and He Zhang. <i>Trust analytics in digital rhetoric</i> <panel: Arguments for digital (dis-)trust: from technologies to actors>	Gabor Zemplén and János Tanács. <i>Landmark Hungarian press-rectification cases: claimant-choice and media-choice</i>		Maurizio Manzin. <i>Beyond Jørgensen's dilemma. Rhetorical profiles of the definition of logic</i>		Guido Melchior. <i>Deep disagreement as rationally irresolvable disagreement</i>
18:00-18:30	Eugen Octav Popa and Alexandru Cârlan. <i>Evidentiary convincing and evidentiary fallacies</i> <panel: Contemporary approaches to fallacy theory>	Álvaro Domínguez Armas. <i>Communicative activism as an 'alternative' argumentative strategy to confront contexts affected by hate speech</i> (commentary by Sara Greco)	Andrea Rocci, Olena Yaskorska-Shah and Carlo Torniai. <i>Explaining a failure of explainable AI to financial stakeholders: a study of trust-oriented argumentation before and after the iBuying algorithm fiasco</i> <panel: Arguments for digital (dis-)trust: from technologies to actors>	Natalia Luna Luna. <i>Countermeasures to personal attacks and ad hominem arguments in political debates for the 2018 presidential election in Mexico</i>	Hailong Wang. <i>The concept of argumentation in Chinese writing education and the modern transformation of Chinese thinking and reasoning</i> (commentary by Frank Zenker) [the speaker will present the paper online]	Rahmi Oruç. <i>The interaction between argumentative norms: The case of Munazara</i>		Ingeborg van der Geest and Bart van Klink. <i>How to deal with deep disagreements? The role of rhetoric in crisis communication: The case of SARS-CoV-2</i>
18:30-19:00	Martin Hinton and Jean Wagemans. <i>A procedural approach to fallacies</i> <panel: Contemporary approaches to fallacy theory>		Colin Porlezza. <i>Design partnerships with journalists: Building arguments for trust in algorithms and automated journalism</i> <panel: Arguments for digital (dis-)trust: from technologies to actors> [this presentation will be a pre-registered video]	Hédi Csordás and Alexandra Karakas. <i>Visual argumentation in the framework of the dual inference system</i>		Niilo Lahti. <i>The parables of Jesus as argumentation – A case in point: Matthew 24–25</i>		Davide Mazzi. <i>"We have weathered the Omicron storm...": A case study on the argumentative use of metaphor in Ireland's political discourse on Covid-19</i>

Thursday, September 29, 2022 – ECA Rome 2022, University of Roma Tre, via Ostiense 234

THU 29/09	Aula 2	Aula 3	Aula 4	Aula 6	Aula 7	Aula 8
09:00-09:30	Hans Vilhelm Hansen. <i>Argument kinds and argument schemes</i>	Sharon Bailin and Mark Battersby. <i>Collaborative oppositionality, judgment revision, and critical thinking education</i>	Sara Greco, Sara Cigada and Chiara Jermini-Martinez Soria. <i>Dispute mediators' argumentation with "said" emotions</i>	Théophile Robineau and Marianne Doury. <i>Argumentation and (un)reasonableness in anti-vax discourses</i>	Daniel de Oliveira Fernandes, Pascal Gyax and Steve Oswald. <i>Insinuated ad hominem: An empirical approach to its rhetorical effects</i>	Jarmila Bubikova-Moan and Margareth Sandvik. <i>Argumentation in the early years: a systematic review of international research literature</i>
09:30-10:00	Shiyang Yu and Frank Zenker. <i>A comprehensive understanding of critical questions: definition, functions, sources</i>	Menashe Schwed. <i>Argumentation, critical thinking, liberal democracy, and non-Western students</i>	Scott Jacobs. <i>Showing and telling in "The Silent Scream"</i>	Maria Grazia Rossi and Dima Mohammed. <i>Exploring the argumentative potential of doubt in medical consultations</i>	Kamila Debowska-Kozłowska and Dale Hample. <i>An attempt to account for young Poles' understandings of interpersonal arguing</i>	Lea Eldstål-Ahrens, Malin Nilsen and Niklas Pramling. <i>Micro-genetic development of argumentation: Analysis of a primary school child's participation in a small-group discussion</i>
10:00-10:30		Serena Tomasi. <i>Education, argumentation and the law: the courts are not an arena, but a model for social education</i>	Viviana Masia. <i>Modulating epistemic commitment to disagreeing and aggressive contents exploiting the evidential function of implicit communication</i>	Roosmaryn Pilgram and Lotte van Poppel. <i>The third party in shared decision-making: The role of extra participants in discussions between health professionals and patients</i>	Cristian Santibanez and Dale Hample. <i>Sharing a language, sharing the argumentative attitude? The case of South American Immigration in Chile today</i>	André Rognes, Maria Rogvin, Margareth Sandvik and Solfrid Storeli. <i>Promoting young children's reasoning during tinkering with LEGO® robot algorithms</i>
10:30-11:00	Coffee break					
11:00-11:30	Wenqi Ouyang. <i>Argumentative virtue and dialectical obligations</i> (commentary by Katharina Stevens) [the speaker will present the paper online]	Michael Hoppmann. <i>Mapping arguments in favor of the presumption of innocence</i> (commentary by Petar Bodlovic)	Léa Farine. <i>Defining the notion of inference: A helping hand from the research on conditional construction</i> (commentary by Andrea Rocci)	Jose Alfonso Lomeli Hernandez. <i>Disentangling critical questions from argument schemes</i> (commentary by Henrike Jansen)	José Alhambra. <i>A particularist theory of argumentation by analogy</i> (commentary by Jean Wagemans)	Dima Mohammed. <i>The polarisation dynamic: An argumentative view</i>
11:30-12:00						Manfred Kraus. <i>Gaming the cognitive principle of relevance in social media</i>
12:00-12:30	John Casey and Scott Aikin. <i>Meta argument and para argument</i>	Yanlin Liao. <i>Are analogical arguments a distinctive type of arguments?</i> [the speaker will present the paper online]	Geoff Goddu. <i>The argument is the thing...</i>		Henri Mütschele. <i>Persuasive modes within deliberation - Symbiosis or parasitism?</i>	Jianfeng Wang and Christopher Tindale. <i>The credibility of the institutional "faces" of Facebook: Mark Zuckerberg's response to the Facebook crisis as social argumentation</i> [the speaker will present the paper online]
12:30-13:00	Beth Innocenti. <i>Cultivating normative terrains in information ecologies</i>	Alexandra Karakas and Hédi Virág Csordás. <i>Argumentative artefacts. Toward a theory of multimodal visual argumentation</i>	Christoph Lumer. <i>How to describe arguments in fundamental criteria for good arguments?</i>	Ulrike Hahn, Jens Koed Madsen, Stefan Schubert and Chris Reed. <i>Summarizing scientific debate through argument maps</i>	Brooke Hubsch. <i>Invitational rhetoric: A move towards persuasion, not beyond it</i>	Sara Greco. <i>Twitter activists' subdiscussions as "argumentative wedges" in the controversy surrounding sustainable fashion</i>
13:00-14:30	Lunch					

THU 29/09	Aula 2	Aula 3	Aula 4	Aula 6	Aula 7	Aula 8
14:30-16:00	Plenary keynote talk (aula 2) Catarina Dutilh Novaes , CAN ARGUMENTS CHANGE MINDS? Chair: <i>Jan Albert van Laar</i>					
16:00-17:00	Fabio Paglieri . <i>Argumentative virtues: Back to basics</i> (commentary by Daniel Cohen)	Olena Yaskorska-Shah, Andrea Rocci, Giulia D'Agostino and Costanza Lucchini . <i>Argumentative patterns initiated by closed-list questions in accountability dialogues. A corpus study of financial conference calls</i> (commentary by Katie Atkinson)	Marcello Guarini . <i>Contextual and emotional modulation of source case selection in analogical arguments</i> (commentary by Marcin Koszowy)	Chiara Jermini-Martinez Soria . <i>Reframing as an umbrella term encompassing four phenomena in dispute mediation</i> (commentary by Elena Musi)	Charlotte van der Voort . <i>Dilemmatic argumentation: A pragma-dialectical approach to a classical topos</i> (commentary by Dima Mohammed)	Bitá Heshmati . <i>Developing criteria for reconstructing visual arguments: Meta-visual disputes</i> (commentary by Gabrijela Kišiček)
17:00-17:30	Coffee break					
17:30-18:30	Plenary Panel: NORMS OF (PUBLIC) ARGUMENTATION Speakers: Marcin Lewinski, Frank Zenker (chair: Steve Oswald) Organized by the APPLY COST action CA-17132, European Network for Argumentation and Public Policy Analysis (https://publicpolicyargument.eu/)					

20:00-23:00	NIGHT VISIT TO THE ROMAN FORUMS (Foro di Cesare and Foro di Augusto, https://goo.gl/maps/VhXvJrN5eGQ2Xw1y5), with multi-media commentary; for further details, visit https://www.viaggioneifori.it/en/ Only for participants who registered to this special event. Each participant should make their own arrangements to reach the Forums, since transportation is not included and will not be provided: from the conference venue, taking the metro B from Marconi to Colosseo is the easiest and fastest option. During the visit it will not be possible to eat, so participants are advised to have a light dinner before the visit starts. The visit to the Forum of Caesar is a walking itinerary (very relaxed and not taxing), whereas the visit to the Forum of Augustus is a seated show. Bringing some water with you might be advisable.
-------------	---

Friday, September 30, 2022 – ECA Rome 2022, University of Roma Tre, via Ostiense 234

FRI 30/09	Aula 2	Aula 3	Aula 4	Aula 6	Aula 7	Aula 8
09:00-09:30	Zihan Niu and Minghui Xiong. <i>An argumentative reconstruction of Mencius's virtue theory</i> [the speakers will present the paper online]	Thierry Herman and Steve Oswald. <i>Ancillary arguments</i>	Stavros Assimakopoulos and Dimitris Serafis. <i>From incitement to inference: Hate speech and argumentation</i>	Juan Mamberti and Dale Hample. <i>Interpersonal arguing in Argentina</i>	Harry Weger, Justin Eckstein and Scott Jacobs. <i>Tracking argumentative relevance using the flowsheet: Academic debate tools for argument analysis</i>	
09:30-10:00	Diane Liberatore. <i>"You feed him by answering him...It's a waste." Corpus based analysis of the strategies inducing the settlement or the re-launch of the argumentation</i>	Giulia Terzian and M. Inés Corbalán. <i>No, I won't let you play devil's advocate</i>	Elena Musi and Rudi Palmieri. <i>Framing in the infowar: The genocide hashtag as an argumentative frame in the Russia-Ukraine war</i>	Iryna Khomenko, Cristián Santibáñez and Dale Hample. <i>Connections between age and interpersonal arguing in Ukraine</i>	Andreas Reichelt Lind and Emilia Andersson-Bakken. <i>Critical thinking in a consensus-oriented classroom</i>	
10:00-10:30	Zlata Kikteva and Annette Hautli-Janisz. <i>Strategies for disagreeing on Reddit</i>	Isabela Fairclough. <i>Frames and argument schemes</i>	Irina Diana Mădroane. <i>The role of narratives in media calls to action: Ukrainian refugee stories from a rhetorical and practical argumentation perspective</i>		Lawrence Lengbeyer. <i>Normal vs. intense scrutiny: distinct modes of critical thinking?</i>	
10:30-11:00	Coffee break					
11:00-11:30	Daniel Cohen. <i>Inconclusive argument appraisal: Difficulties in concluding argument evaluations and evaluating arguments without conclusions</i>	Jennifer Schumann. <i>Investigating the refutational dimension of straw man fallacies. An experimental approach to perceived disagreement</i>	Antonis Kakas, Emmanuelle-Anna Dietz and Adamos Koumi. <i>Cognitive machine argumentation</i>	Sten Hansson and Ruth Page. <i>Legitimation in government social media communication: A corpus-assisted discourse analysis</i>	Federico Puppo. <i>Rhetoric, anthropological models and law</i>	Davide Liga. <i>Labelling argumentative sequences using transfer learning</i> [the speaker will present the paper online]
11:30-12:00	Joel Yalland. <i>The duty to object and duties to not object</i>	Jan Albert van Laar. <i>The fallacy of popularity: Who should draw the line?</i>	Martín Pereira-Fariña, Jacky Visser, Cesar Gonzalez-Perez and John Lawrence. <i>Unearthing deep disagreements in cultural heritage debates: Combining argumentation and domain models</i>	Alina Landowska, Marcin Koszowy and Katarzyna Budzynska. <i>Prolepsis as an attention attractor in digital media rhetoric</i>	Blake Scott. <i>The methodology of the New Rhetoric (and why it still matters)</i>	Ilija Stepin, Alejandro Catala and Jose M. Alonso-Moral. <i>A proof of concept on dialogue games for Explainable Artificial Intelligence</i>
12:00-12:30	Iovan Drehe. <i>Sinister interest as an argumentational vice</i> [the speaker will present the paper online]		John Lawrence and Jacky Visser. <i>Employing argument mining for reason-checking</i>	Chiara Mercuri. <i>Conflicting characterization frames and argumentation in the public controversy surrounding fashion sustainability</i>	Barbara Konat, Ewelina Gajewska and Wiktoria Rossa. <i>Pathos appeals in natural language argumentation</i>	Leonard Kupś and Mariusz Urbański. <i>Relevance and evocation of questions</i>
12:30-13:00	Marcin Lewinski and Catarina Dutilh Novaes. <i>The many-to-many model: Argumentation and trust in online conversations</i>	Scott Aikin and John Casey. <i>Specious allegations of fallacy and meta-argumentative errors</i>	Dimitra Zografistou, Chris Reed, Jacky Visser and John Lawrence. <i>An argumentative analysis of the ACH technique</i>	Zlata Kikteva and Annette Hautli-Janisz. <i>Types of disagreement on Reddit</i>	Jiaxing Li. <i>Audience: A central conception in social argumentation</i>	John Licato, Lindsay Fields and Zaid Marji. <i>Resolving open-textured rules with templated interpretive arguments</i>
13:00-14:30	Lunch					
14:30-16:00	Plenary keynote talk (aula 2) Harvey Siegel, ARGUING WITH ARGUMENTS: ARGUMENT QUALITY AND ARGUMENTATIVE NORMS (or, every theory in its place: the virtues of the epistemic theory) Chair: <i>Fabio Paglieri</i>					

FRI 30/09	Aula 2	Aula 3	Aula 4	Aula 6	Aula 7	Aula 8
16:00-16:30	Marcin Koszowy and Steve Oswald. <i>Nature, features, dynamics and effects of rephrase in argumentation: a pragma-rhetorical approach</i> <panel: Rephrase in argumentation: Corpus and experimental approaches>	Vivian Laurens, Brooke Hubsch and Michael Hoppmann. <i>Reasoning about peace: Identifying argument schemes in Colombia</i>	Jose Alfonso Lomeli Hernandez. <i>Journalists' questions in press conferences during the Covid-19 pandemic. A corpus-based analysis from an argumentative perspective</i>			
16:30-17:00	Barbara Konat and Katarzyna Budzynska. <i>Corpus analysis: Methodological considerations for studying rephrase</i> <panel: Rephrase in argumentation: Corpus and experimental approaches>	Lucia Salvato. <i>The types of appeals to religious authorities – Kairos and interreligious communication</i>	Michel Dufour. <i>Minimal Argumentation: A research program</i>			
17:00-17:30	Coffee break					
17:30-18:00	Jennifer Schumann. <i>From corpus to experiment and back. Insights on the experimental approach for the study of rephrase</i> <panel: Rephrase in argumentation: Corpus and experimental approaches>	Federica Cominetti, Edoardo Lombardi Vallauri, Doriana Cimmino, Viviana Masia, Claudia Coppola, Laura Baranzini, Giorgia Mannaioli and Giulia Giunta. <i>The role of implicitness in persuasive argumentation: looking at different text genres</i>	Dorottya Egres. <i>The relevance of moral emotional appeals in environmental politics</i>			
18:00-18:30	Konrad Kiljan and Marcin Koszowy. <i>Qualitative and quantitative evidence for linguistic and discursive features of rephrase</i> <panel: Rephrase in argumentation: Corpus and experimental approaches>	Alex Reunecker. <i>Assessing classification reliability of conditionals in discourse</i>	Martin Hinton. <i>Argumentation and identity: Evaluating the arguments of delegates to the COP26 UN Climate Change conference</i>			
18:30-19:00	Ramy Younis, Daniel de Oliveira Fernandes, Pascal Gygax and Steve Oswald. <i>Experimental evidence for the rhetorical effects of rephrase</i> <panel: Rephrase in argumentation: Corpus and experimental approaches>	Amalia Haro Marchal. <i>Two subtypes of illocutionary acts of arguing</i>	Menno Reijven, Alina Durrani and Gonen Dori-Hacohen. <i>Lists as an argumentative resource in political discourse</i>			

20:15-23:00	<p>SOCIAL DINNER</p> <p>Only for participants who registered to this special event. During the dinner, the winner of the 2022 edition of the ECA Frans van Eemeren prize will be announced and the prize awarded by the President of the Jury, Ulrike Hahn. Location: <i>Condominio Marconi Restaurant</i>, via Enrico dal Pozzo 5, 00146 Roma, https://goo.gl/maps/XDhcAfQCHibnkFbeA</p> <p>The restaurant is within walking distance from the conference venue (about 2 km); alternatively, it can be reached using public busses (check Google Maps or similar apps for instructions) or taking a cab (again, a quick search online will reveal various options). The menu will be fixed, with options for vegetarians, vegans, and people with specific dietary restrictions.</p>
-------------	---

Map of the conference venue

