ISSA Proceedings 2006 – The Duties Of Advocacy: Argumentation Under Conditions Of Disparity, Asymmetry, And Difference

Traditionally, an advocate is one called to the aid of another (Tasker, 1926, pp. 139-140). A friend or member of the family, who does not have the standing or resources necessary to speak, may be in need of intervention or representation. A professional analyzes a case and makes a recommendation to a client who must evaluate, respond, and choose. A cause whose time has come may demand support or opposition by virtue of interests threatened. In all these situations, "one who pleads, intercedes, or speaks for, or in behalf of, another" is an advocate (Advocate, 1991, p. 194). Such arguers "adopt a stance, advance a cause, and attempt to produce the result in behalf of an interest of a person, group or cause" (Cohen, 2004, p. 9).

The deployment of reasons on behalf of another is one of the oldest forms of human communication. The most celebrated case is found in forensic oratory at the bar of justice. In this respect, "advocacy is one of the most ancient and honorable of all callings" (Timberlake, 1922, p. 25). Yet, the act of communicative intervention itself may be even more ancient than representation in adversarial proceedings. In Homer's *Odyssey*, intervention is coupled to the "plaint," "an audible expression of sorrow, lamentation, grieving," constituting a request for recognition which an interlocutor may grant or withhold (Plaint, 1991, p. 956). Advocates become involved to interpret a distressed situation, promise to make it right, or exploit the confusion. In the trials of Odysseus, Homer wrote of arguments poetically, and thus scripted cultural performances of collective memory and lessons for generations of advocates in the making (Goodnight, 2003).

If the practices of advocacy reach far back (Advocate, 1911, 241-242), its contemporary scope is likewise broad. Elias Cohen observes, "The techniques of

advocacy cut a wide swath. Modes include jawboning, demagoguery, rhetoric, mass communication, and traditional public relations; publications in mass media, trade, and scholarly materials; formal legal proceedings, formal representation of individuals and groups, and formal surrogate decision-making. There are virtually no limits to the breadth or narrowness of the cause in time, space, or intended effects" (2004, p. 9). The duties of advocacy variously are situated in the enterprises of argument (Dewatripont and Tirole, 1999, pp. 25-31); yet, all forms of advocacy argumentation exhibit the characteristic qualities of the act: intervention, reason-gathering, argument-making, contention, and risk in the outcome.

In contemporary theory, advocacy inquiry plays a subordinate role. For instance, Douglas Walton has characterized debate – a paradigmatic case of advocacy – as occupying a half-way house between a quarrel and a dialogue (1989, p. 4). The point is well-taken. Advocates do hit opponents with their best shots, while expecting judges to be convinced by the modesty of their positions. All advocacy, it seems, is argumentation that runs into communication predicaments – as in the case of the dueling expectations of debaters. Unlike in dialogues, the expectations, standing, and resources of advocacy contests are rarely normatively equal, transparent, or distributed without contention. Yet, the sometimes revered and sometimes make-do, situated, contingent constructions of practice shape the ways individuals, groups, and nations learn how to argue. Further, across time, movements arise to reform social practices and to create – through advocacy – more reasonable understanding of argument. Inquiry into practice-establishing argumentation should yield an understanding of the traditions of argumentation and the futures it faces. Thus, I join with Charlotte Jørgenson who holds that "debate should not be perceived as second-rate critical discussion" (1998, p. 431), and so turn to independent critical inquiry into advocacy practice. To liberate advocacy from the half-way house of dialogue, we may start by imagining two distinct worlds, depicted early on by Cicero (1913, pp. 138-140): the scene of interlocutors engaged in dialogue, conversation, or reflective thinking, and the places where debaters are called upon to make a plea, engage in dispute, or construct a publicly defensible judgment.

Argument in a world of interlocutors. Strangers at a social gather to exchange opinions, partners engage in open, reflective encounter, or alter sits ego sit down for a critical discussion. In each of these cases, the duties of argumentation are

connected with the freedom to present issues, the responsibilities to partake in equal exchange, making oneself available for open critical discussion, and the telos of coming to an informed agreement – where only the force of the better argument will do. Here, argumentation is effective reasoning, not reasoning to affect; thus, to be worthy of recognition, an interlocutor must be willing to support reasons with evidence, warrants with backing, and claims with precise qualifiers linked to reservations open for inspection. The normative assumptions of critical thinking, informal logic, pragma-dialectics, or communicative reason alike imagine argumentation to be regulated by reciprocity, reflexivity, sincerity, and a freedom to assert and reply (van Eemeren, Grootendorst & Snoek Henkemans, 1996, pp. 163-188, pp. 213-312; Habermas, 1981, pp.1-45).

Argument in a world of advocates. Imagine taking up a position when called into a private quarrel, a public debate, a professional case, or a spiritual cause. Contention is already underway among interested parties. One's own freedom to exchange views openly cannot be presupposed because the standing of an arguer's intervention is from the outset under question and must be defended. The advocate is free neither to pick issues nor to change positions easily Like a dialogue partner, the intentions of a rival are to give one an education – of sorts, but a rival in a dispute is not likely to be open, disclosive, or even agreeable. The best one can hope is that a common set of procedures may regulate norms of discussion. A mix of formal codes and customary practices govern the construction and development of reasons; but, interpretation, application, and situations vary enormously. In the act of arguing, claims multiply, and the manner of conducting debate itself may become as controversial as initial contentions at hand. Further, what were reasonable precedents or expectations for a judgment in one case may or may not serve to validate reasoning in another; yet, time is limited and choice urgent. In the end a decision may be reached, but even if everyone is satisfied with the process, interlocutors will undoubtedly disagree and may dispute the outcome at another time. As Peter Houtlosser and Frans van Eemeren (2002) might agree, argument in an advocacy world is all strategic maneuvering all the time.

This paper addresses argumentation in the latter world. The essay is premised on the assumption that practices of argument enact, *and* sometimes alter substantively, conventions of reasoning, communication norms, and standards of validity. All acts of advocacy put into play current understandings of the norms

and rules of argument. The pressures within a particular dispute always put at risk state of the art conventions against the development of alternative understandings and strategies. Epoch-making disputes are debates where the challenges of intervention into human affairs are brought to a reflective discussion, the problematics of communication debated, and the domain of what counts as reasonable put to the test. The address visits some of these moments, secular disputes in the public sphere from the classical world, Enlightenment, Modernity, and our current time of Globalization. The aim is to explore advocacy's agonistic traditions as legacies of the classical world, but also to illustrate how cultural projects in the public sphere, from the Enlightenment forward have changed ideas about the social and political practices of reason. Specifically, I contend:

1. The Enlightenment attempted to rectify issues of standing to offset disparities of position among advocates.

2. Modern movements worked to mitigate asymmetries in power where a side in a social dispute typically had all the risks and few of the resources to determine interests.

3. Globalization prompts change by generation patterns of argumentation in new and different configurations. The reading is meant to open a field of study into argumentation by sketching select cultural, social and political projects. The standpoint taken is that of critical appreciation of practice within the secular sphere.

1. *Classical World*

Classical advocacy is recorded in the histories, plays, philosophies, proceedings, and rhetoric, primarily from the Greek and Roman worlds. Advocacy episodes, practices, and criticism form the base of humanities, and the dramas of advocates who engage in public contest has been rediscovered across generations since the Renaissance. The classical world created a sense of advocacy as a personal contest or struggle among citizens in the public sphere (Kennedy, 1968, p. 419).

1.1 Greece: Among ancient Greeks, it was not customary for the advocate to actually plead the cause of his client in court. Yet, speech writers would help level the playing field. Isocrates received 20 talents or $18,000 a speech. The advocate was expected to address a public cause, rather than argue to condemn or support a special interest (Yunis, 1996, p. 10). "In the Athenian ekklesia the speakers did not speak on behalf of, or for or in place of someone" or a party. Yet, we are told

the Greeks were "masters of the art of advocacy," as Aristotle reminds us that the orators in pushing a particular public decision created "political life as a theatre of endless struggle between the oligarchs (who never disappeared) and the demos" (Urbinati, 1999, p. 9; 2000).

The single most famous moment of advocacy is Pericles funeral oration, a paradigm that stands as "a definitive document in the history of political communication" (Yunis, 1996, p. 82). Three points are central to understanding the duties of classical advocacy.

First, Pericles begins the speech with a predicament he faces in praising the Athenian dead: "the friend who is familiar with every fact of the story may think that some point has not been set forth with that fullness which he wishes and knows it to deserve; on the other, he who is a stranger to the matter may be led by envy to suspect exaggeration if he hears anything above his own nature" (Thucydides, 2006). To intercede and give meaning to the lives lost in battle risks saying too little or too much, and so Pericles' argument acknowledges the difficulties of making reasonable a situation requiring intercession, making meaningful human grief, and so positions himself with the audience in creating an occasion for argument.

Second, the main issue of the speech equates the sacrifice of the soldiers with the values of the community, and it is the special quality of the community that renders the death worthwhile and understandable. The claim supports Pericles' own imperial policy of course, and requests–by suggestion – the citizens' tacit support, if not their outright emulation of the dead soldiers' sacrifices. In this sense, a direct claim of advocacy underwrites an indirect claim, the words of praise for others that can be spoken, while the indirect claim – that death in the pursuit of his own policies is worthwhile – cannot be addressed by Pericles without circumspection.

Third, in order to deal with complex communication, advocacy argument is a creature of blended forms; in this case blending encomium – words of praise – with deliberation, justifications for policy. At the other end of the register is vituperation and policy rejection. The conditions of validity in a mixed form require balancing demands to provide, perhaps a formally imperfect. but an overall fitting treatment of complementary reasons. Blended forms are contingent, paradigmatic creations that may be modeled, varied, or changed over time.

The duty of an advocate, judging from the performance of Pericles, is to deploy argument that

1. situates the act of intervention into discussion by addressing the predicaments of communication,

2. works together public resolutions that may be openly discussed with claims more difficult to address directly, and

3. constructs argument with blended forms, assembling a new model from recognizable cultural conventions to suit the unique obligations of circumstances. Greek advocacy was known for placing these complex demands in balance.

1.2 Rome. The change from republic to empire in ancient Rome was accompanied by evolving complexities of advocacy practice. Henry John Roby describes the court:

For the accused, indeed for all involved, character was under question, and reputations were at stake. For the patron-client of the republic, it was the question of whether and to what extent would the patrician stand up for his ward, the patriarch for his clan, and friend for his fellow. Advocacy was personal and public. Accusations deserved defense in situations of necessity where there was no standing [for] a women or child, to succor where an accused was unable to self represent, to equalizing the playing field where the accuser was talented, determined, and ruthless. (1902, p. 407).

For the empire, the sense of pleading as a personal duty was "institutionalized and regulated, but the contest could be no less dangerous for politics and prosecution, charges and cases were linked into opposing social networks questing for power." James May concludes that "in the hands of a rhetorically skillful advocate, particularly one endowed with a very strong personality, the rhetoric of advocacy can be an extraordinarily powerful weapon" (1981, p. 308). Argument was a double-edged sword.

The Roman world refined advocacy into a defined practice, a site where social reality is constructed and contested, case by case. The arguers did not occupy the pro-con dual position of speaker-audience or dialogue partners. Rather, a triadic relationship among pleader, adversary, and judge defined the flow of exchange. Quintilian observes that the *exordium,* or beginning of a speech, was the crucial place where an arguer would begin a narrative that positioned parties (himself included) to the dispute in the unfolding debate. Characteristically, each position is fraught with predicaments in creating a reasonable position.

(1) *The act of intervention, to take a stance:* The question that is foremost in advocacy discourse is the stance which authorizes an intervention through argument into the case and proceedings. If an advocate speaks as a friend, the stance may be discounted as special pleading; or as a professional, indifferent technique. According to Quintilian, the act of intervention is best positioned as a response to a duty, of being called to intercede (1921, p. 11). The duty may be family affiliation, professional obligation, or citizen vigilance. Indeed, the history of advocacy in Rome moves from defining reasonable intervention from moral duty to sanctioning professional representation, with each case having its own somewhat unique requirements and possibilities.

(2) *The confrontation of a rival, to dispute a case:* Dealing with a rival is no less daunting. The advocate has to decide whether to refute an opponent's claims on the merits alone, or to question the very act of attacking the cause or client on behalf of whom he intervenes. The advocate may depersonalize the dispute by sticking to the case at hand, or move toward vituperation by expanding the range of issues to the motives of an opponent and the impropriety of the attack itself. To ignore the arguments of the rival may show disdain, but also be interpreted as cowardice; similarly, there may be strategic value in counterattacking the opponent, but such arguments may divert from the strength of the case. Questions of politics as well as experience weigh into every decision.

(3) *The convictions of a judge, to make the argument:* A judge presents no fewer dilemmas than the rival. A favorable judge is promising, but even a friend may fish-tale from a normal position simply because he wants to appear fair. Even attorneys who have a great reputation can presume no guarantee of success for there is a "natural prejudice in favor of those who are struggling against difficulties, and a scrupulous judge is always specially ready to listen to an advocate whom he does not suspect to have designs on his integrity" (1921, p. 11). The dilemma arises in each case whether to flatter and encourage the judge in order to gain favor, or to threaten a judge or jury with the ill will of the Roman people, while hinting at accusations of bribery, in order to discipline the decision.

For the Romans, advocacy is a positioning of argument that pits intercessor, rival, and judge in a series of communication predicaments surrounding a case (Kennedy, 1968, p. 433; Cicero, 1920, *De Inventione*, pp. 41-51). The choice of a line of argument is always risky business. As discourses flows and influences the decisions of participants to evolve positions, the pressures of debating expand the

issues, matters at stake, and disagreements – even if argument continues. Cicero speaks of an advocate facing "that terror, that dread" which arises in being drawn into pleading a cause. (1930, p. 125; See Powell & Paterson, 2004; Fantham, 2004). In the contest among intercessor, prosecutor, and decision-maker, the proliferation of issues always creates at least some indeterminacy of what really is at stake. *"Quae res ea est?"* Cicero asks rhetorically in his famous speech *Pro Roscio Amerino*, "What is the real reason?" (1930, p. 127).

Advocacy situations put the standing of the arguers and institutions, *dignitas*, in jeopardy, as well as put serious consequences, *gravitas*, on to the table. However treacherous the domain of advocacy may be, it is better than its alternative: sheer violence. "In every free nation, and most of all in communities which have attained the enjoyment of peace and tranquility, the [art of oratory] has always flourished," Cicero extols. "Humans do not have to act on impulse, but alone of creation can put thought into word and decide (1948, p. 23)." Then he adds, "What too is so indispensable as to have always in your grasp weapons you can defend yourself, or challenge the wicked man, or when provoked take your revenge" (1948, p. 25). If at times, argument was only a preliminary to politics by more direct means, disputation could at least might function as a break on unbridled assertions of power.

Whether one emulates the Greek legacy of balance and cleverness or the Roman penchant for moral propriety and political confrontation, the agonistic traditions constitute a powerful legacy. The contest of reasons is embedded still in contemporary norms encompassing human relations, social institutions, human understanding, and politics. For instance, the uses of argument often are held to be a test of character: we expect that in any case, the better person, with the better reasons should prevail; and if not, injustices are never closed to skeptical treatment or open debate. Yet, advocacy has moved beyond the political and moral contests of dynastic politics. When neo-classical thinking is renewed, the social practices of argumentation are coupled with progressively more open, democratic vistas of social change. The very idea of what is reasonable has been tested and expands across the discourses of Enlightenment, Modernity, and Globalization.

2. *Enlightenment*
The Enlightenment transformed advocacy structures. Religious, educational, and social institutions slowly and selectively were changed to fit a new sense of

human rights and human progress. The recovery of neo-classical thinking about advocacy and its aims was important in this project. The powers and prerogatives, checks and balances of emergent democracies, for example, were meant to restrain tyranny through the pressures of counter-veiling argumentation within the state. According to Chevenix, the rise of nations reflect the strivings to turn the exigencies of geography, structures of government, and memories of a people into practices consonant with ancient, yet newly forming national character (1832, pp. 365-366). In the span of Enlightenment, the self-understanding of advocacy traditions itself unfolded within democratic norms through:

1. the strivings of national character,

2. education outfitted for democratic cultures, and

3. social movements that extended Enlightenment thinking by reforming the very standing of advocacy practice itself.

Advocacy and myths of national origin and character go hand and hand. Across many Enlightenment projects, the rise of nations was imagined as unique, progressive, and reaching different potentials of "civilization" (Guerard, 1934, p. 2). In the United States, national character was thought to be unfolding as public spiritedness, a nascent public sphere, where argument blossomed. Alex De Tocqueville writes of his travels with a mail coach across a virginal, frontier America. "Day and night we passed with great rapidity along roads, which were scarcely marked out through immense forests." Only abandoned shacks and lonely cabins interrupt the journey.

Nothing can be more miserable than these isolated dwellings. The traveler who approaches one of them towards nightfall sees the clicker of the hearth flame through the chinks in the walls; and at night, if the wind rises, he hears the roof of boughs shake to and fro in the midst of the great forest trees. Who would not suppose that this poor hut is the asylum of rudeness and ignorance? Yet no sort of comparison can be drawn between the pioneer and the dwelling that shelters him. Everything about him is primitive and wild, but he is himself the results of the labor and experience of eighteen centuries. He wears the dress and speaks the language to the cities; he is acquainted with the past, curious about the future, and ready for argument about the present...." (1831, p. 317)

De Tocqueville is disappointed that the American he meets is not exactly conversant with French politics, but when questioned about his own politics, the backwoodsman's thoughts are clear and precise; "with the Bible, the axe, and some newspapers" and a sense of argumentation the pioneer makes his way into

the wilderness. "It is difficult to imagine the rapidity with which thought circulates in these deserts," de Tocqueville concludes (1831, p. 318).

In 18th century America, the study of argument arose out of the classical tradition, which constitutional founders believed useful in structuring the republic, and was inflected in its colleges and universities as a national discourse. The 1797 *Columbian Orator* was an advocacy handbook filled with dialogues, speeches, poems, plays, controversies; voices of young and old, native Americans, slaves, English officers, women to foster the discourse of a national imaginary. The handbook with updates persisted nearly until the civil war (Bingham, 1998). The advocacy tradition was recreated as a guide to practice blending classical advice with practical situations in James J. McElligott's *The American Debater* where advocacy takes on the plurality of forms required in public life and civil society. Today the debater "may be in a village meeting, discussing the expedience of making a road or building a bridge; tomorrow in a convention, arguing the propriety" [of constitutional change]. Now he is busy among the friends of education … now in a synod, or council, or convocation, exchanging counsels on matters of high religious concernment; and now, again, perchance in Congress, debating questions of law, or tariff, or revenue, of treaties, of peace, of war, and I know not what all" (1859, p. 20). The uses of argument for a pluralistic society spurred a tradition of argumentation and debate pedagogical texts continuous through the 21st century. This tradition traveled, too; McElligott's text was adopted in early modern Japan (Branham, 1994).

Advocacy was more than the discourse of nation or the honing of talent for civil society, however. Enlightenment views fueled a trajectory of reason toward universal emancipation. The legacy of the Enlightenment found its way into social movements that challenged the disparities of standing between full-citizens enabled to vote and speak in the public sphere and those who could not vote and were accorded no voice. As of old, advocacy was a contest of argument, but there was something else, too. In slave narratives, citizens could read of the lives of slaves who could read, reason, and think, make sense and make choices of their surroundings (Douglas, 1845). The particular act of advocacy performed an argument with universal implications, giving witness to the falseness of bigotry that had ruled out the reasons of human beings by asserting self-limiting qualities to a group (Foster, 1979). So, too, women such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton took to the public podium as advocates of extending standing to argue in the public

sphere through granting suffrage. For Stanton, the reason to accord universal recognition of the right to advocacy was the solitude of self. It is the individual alone who in interior deliberation bears the consequences of decision. The widest latitude of "self-dependence, self-protection, self-support" are necessary to cope with nature and the social world "fitting every human soul for independent action" which includes above all experience and judgment in making self-determinations (Stanton, 1892, p. 248).

John Stuart Mill formulated the case for emancipation in relation to argumentation as well as any one. "All our recent constitutional reforms, and the whole creed of reformers, are grounded on the fact that suffrage is needed for self-protection." Just as Cicero detected reluctance bordering on dread to advocate a cause, so Mill detects that even well-intentioned people with the power to represent are reluctant to intervene into problems of others, and may not have the experience to recognize the gravity of the injustice or harm involved. "The remedy is plain," he told a cheering audience at Bristol in January of 1871, "put women in the position which will make their interest the ruler's own interest." Only then can it be assured that interests are addressed "by real arguments, addressed to their own reason, by people who can enter into their way of looking at the subjects in which they are concerned" (1988, p. 66). The outcome of granting standing is not a particular policy; but, through enfranchisement the public sphere is broadened, as classes formally consigned to a privatized world take on possibilities of public power. Full citizenship in a democratic public sphere is a norm of government with advocacy as an inalienable right to standing for purposes of self-defense at its core.

3. *Modernity*
Suffrage offers the standing of citizenship, which situates advocacy as a matter of right and duty in questions of common interest. While formal equality is crucial, it does not offset asymmetries of power among individuals or social groups. An asymmetry in argument is where advocacy arrangements are such that one party need acknowledge no burden of proof for its claims, while the other never manages to meet expectations of proof in a satisfactory way, not withstanding the merits of the case. Put differently, one group takes all the winnings and the other all the risk in a partnership where it would make more sense to share risks and benefits in a cooperative arrangement.

Social advocacy is a discourse of modernity and it is characterized by struggle to

create social change in the interests of mitigating systematic material and other inequalities. Social argument emerged from the combination of moral and scientific normative practices and epistemic efforts, and is embedded in a restricted, but powerful urban imagination. Modern thinking has created a legacy of institutional relationships that invests advocacy (l) in achieving citizen competence, and (2) in struggles for the renewal and reform of public institution.

The road to social advocacy during the industrial revolution was prepared by the literary public sphere (Habermas, 1991). Fiction offer a realm where the abuses of factory-town England could be translated into the sentimental plots of families and friends who endured hardships under the petty tyrannies of middle management. The transfer of fiction to reality was accomplished by burgeoning social sciences. Scholars measured the spread of disease, crime, and threats to family life in the new science of epidemiology, gathered data through survey as Charles Booth's estimations of poverty in London (1968), and deployed new technologies of communication, such as the camera, to render evidence vivid and undeniably real in "studies that seek to measure social problems, heighten public awareness of them, and recommend possible solutions" (Gilbert, p. 101). "To fix social ills, reforms would begin with children," featuring a style of advocacy that combined sentimental tugs with scientific fact (Hawes, 1991, p. 38). Other causes soon followed. Slum housing, poor health, hunger and labor were the targets of advocates, whose findings were fed to the press; and, the clamor gave rise to efforts in the university to develop new policies (Mann, 1963, p. 1). State reform was targeted by informal groups of associations seeking the establishment of public institutions to meet social needs. These civil society associations were "essential not only in protecting minority viewpoints but in creating 'the occasion for a diverse participation in public discourse' …., a quality De Tocqueville (1840) earlier recognized as distinguishing American civil society" (Cox & McCloskey, 1996, p. 273).

Social advocacy merged with progressive reform movements and the "terms of politics changed for ever [through] bitter political struggle and momentous social change" (Stears, 2002, p. 1). Argumentation in this realm, advanced by the press, paradoxically had an Aristotelian proclivity to avoid extremes and cultivate citizen virtue, while calling attention to dire human circumstances with graphic, emotional headlines. Advocacy acts as an engine of social change, rather than an individualistic *agon*, because the design of the progressives was to fit urban scene with its many different uprooted ethnic populations into a venue of citizen

participation in well-run, prosperous city landscapes. The aim of progressivism was to advance of democratic practices generally and serves the polity at large (Hofstadter, 1955).

The formula of advocacy case-making was repeated across many social issues: A harm is discovered, described, measured, and rendered vivid. A public is awoken that was unaware. The harm festering in one of the city's byways is morally outrageous in itself, but worse if left untended can spread to safer more secure parts of the city. An assembly of state regulators, professional experts, and civil society volunteers are engaged, through public discussion and debate, to respond to the social problem – that is ameliorated over time.

Progressives exuded "confidence in man's collective ability to reorder his environment and reshape his destiny" through shaping the national state to meet "social and economic as well as political needs" (Ekirch, 1974, p. 6). Such public argument is powerful because it couples the ethos of science to the legitimacy of competent public administration. On the other hand, progressive advocacy is sometimes undermined by populist anger at social inequities (real or alleged) and limited by fundamentalist fears of pollution that would be brought on by civic participation (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1983). Nevertheless, the legacy of modern advocacy has created an enduring world of public institutions and systems.

Modern advocacy continues to be fought out in the realm of social reform, as spokespersons for the disadvantages intervene through argument into the welfare state (Freddolino, Moxley, & Hyduk, 2004; Lens 2005). Such advocacy institutions range across the full spectrum of education, social welfare and civil society concerns. Further, public institutions that are the result of these interventions themselves may become corrupted, self-serving and pursuing interests that enhance their power and wealth. Thus the practices of education, medicine, welfare, transportation and legal institutions precipitate public debate. Yet, even when institutions work well, the provider-client relationship within institutions create asymmetries. Experts hold power over clients. Doctors are busy and expensive, patients are sick and needy, for instance. To rectify imbalances in deliberative relationships, movements arise that support new communication rules, duties, and training. Informed Consent is lately been accorded the status of a right in the medical field (Goodnight, 2006).

In the modern world, asymmetries of power are woven into advocacy arrangements across key institutions. Asymmetries of knowledge and authority are not in themselves unreasonable, since it may be useful to trust an expert,

rather than to take time to achieve equal knowledge of an issue. However, since outcomes of probable choices based on state of the art knowledge are contingent, there is a risk to any exchange. Too much authority lodged with expertise risks a public that may become angry, confused, and unable to respond appropriately to recommendations; too much catering to public trends risks weakening institutional practices and standards. Communicative competence is on the line every time doctor and patient, lawyer and client, engineer and community, psychiatrist and therapist engage in an advocacy encounter. Practices remain turbulent.

So far my analysis has been largely historical. History is additive, of course, so advocacy customs in places and cases still features agonistic engagement of debate as a trial of character, where standing is crucial to secure rights for self-representation, and where social causes course through civil society to reform public institutions, regulate policy, and lend support to the underprivileged. Yet, advocacy practices typically are refreshed and change with each generation. Presently global corporations and states display ever-expanding "advocacy" practices to defend their own interests (Schuetz 1990; Heath & Nelson, 1985). Rapidly developing technologies of exchange and communications carry, transform, and combine markets, institutions, public relations, advertising, and critical practices in new ways across the globe. Controversies follow on a grand scale.

4. *Globalization*

The rights of citizens and the practices of social advocacy now enter into new predicaments. Citizen advocacy depends upon a connection between cause and effects at the local and national level; yet as the Karen Mundy and Lynn Murphy report, the "centers of power" are increasingly "beyond national boundaries, while forms of democratic participation and societal compromise remain territorially grounded increasingly in increasingly hollowed out welfare states" (1991, p.88). The age of globalization heralds radically new political configurations and the decline of the state (Strange, 1996, p. 73; Rosenau, 1997, p.353).

The same communication and transportation technologies that accelerated the conditions of globalization at the end of the Cold War have become available to advocates who think globally about "environment, women's rights, human rights, Third-World debt and globalization" itself. Thus, global advocacy networks assemble (Keck & Sikkink 1998, 1999). Ethan Nadelmann describes these NGO

activists as "transnational moral entrepreneurs" who "specifically target normative change by framing problems in terms of "cosmopolitan values" rather than "state interest." "The goal of TANs [transnational advocacy networks] is not just to influence outcomes, but to change the terms of the debate, substituting unacceptable positions with more inclusive, democratic normative structures," he concludes (Klotz, 2002, 53). The 1990s appeared to be near achieving a "political globalism" underwritten by expanding transnational, cosmopolitan social and environmental projects (Wapner, 1996; Polletta, 1999). The arguments of these cosmopolitan advocates were to be hurled quickly around the globe by new communication technologies.

The question remains, however, whether international advocacy of the digital age offers new argument practices. Groups in the 1990s did take extensive advantage of speedy, widespread media in holding international conferences on women, human rights, and the environment. Just as the modern mail system had extended the power of social movements in the 18th and 19th century, so new communications made a leap in efficient communication. Messages were delivered in hours or minutes, rather than weeks or days. Yet, global communications appear to act as something more than a supplement to traditional social movement message-making. New, global media wages argument by assembling differences. Consider a few illustrations.

The first TAN herself was probably Princess Diana who was a center of pro and con argument – first within the British tabloid press and then worldwide (Maslin, 2004). Yet, at the same time she managed to link her beautiful appearance, and I would say spirit, to the deformities of bodies by being seen with the victims of landmines. Her act of intervention and adoption of a global cause resulted in a blended popularity that sustained public voyeurism into Windsor life while offering glimpses of response to a man-made plague (McGuigan 2000). In a contemporary version of this blending, the stunning Angelina Jolie gives interviews where she knowledgably advocates alleviation of the suffering in Africa, even while television 'journalists' ask about her husband, Brad Pitt – and the baby.

Another peculiar case Kathryn Olson and I (1994) studied: the influence of international networks through analysis of fur. In the 1990s, a novel a style of argument drifted from Europe to North America working to turn fashion to cruelty, high style to low taste. Anti-fur advocates mixed questions of lifeworld choices and public visibility, untraditionally. Subsequent anxieties promoted over

animal use and rights had no single solution, no focal point of contention, apart from the negative: stop wearing it, and think. Similarly, in the last few years convict diamonds have become a center of advocacy where a splashy gift is turned to a stigma, as the costs to Africa of the diamond trade are assessed (Campbell 2002). Controversy over "conflict commodities" seeks to curb "dangerous appetites" without affirming specific propositional claims driving human rights groups (Tam, 2004, p. 704).

Finally, advocacy strategies find their own encounters with contention across the networked world. *The Pategonian Toothfish*, which is apparently as homely as it is tasty, became the cause of flagging environmentalist who redenominated this denizen of the deep in the 1990s as the *Chilean Sea Bass*. The fish is back, and New York chefs are in the news for their refusal to serve up one culinary creation. Pirates are at fault, it seems. The other side of the debate is well represented on the *Web*, however, by recipe sites that guarantee a *Bass* fish dish as sizzling, mouthwatering, and extra-tasty. In the colorful world of global advocacy, the glamorous and obscene exchange places, as accepted conduct is put under the stress of objection, and contention is lifted out of disciplined forums and put up for accidental display and encounter.

In each case, argumentation departs from standards of informal logic; neither meeting standards of relevance, support of a single claim, or points entered into contention directly. Yet, controversies swirl. It appears that argument performs on the *Web* what Charles Willard has prompted us to search for all these years, a culture of dissensus (1996). Different interests in celebrity and policy blend, opposition multiplies without affirming claims, and a deliberative space open accidentally from the delivery of a search engine. Controversies flow and exchange as inventive expressions of difference. *Web* combinations of circulating assertions, associations, disputes and denials invite rethinking traditional forms, fora, customs, or practices of exchange or interaction.

Advocacy is making arguments with difference, but for some the *Web* – however vast – is but another utilitarian challenge for control, rationalization, and use. Cyberadvocacy, venture capitalist wager, is but a brave new world to capture and colonize. Stella Harrison of the Juno group reports: "Everyday it appears we see some new innovation – computers are smaller, easier to handle, less expensive, in price, and constantly providing increased capacity." Globalization moves beyond modernity by virtue of disgorging an "information surplus," she says (2001, p. 624). The entry costs of advocacy have gone down, as mass access to new

technologies have gone up. Whereas the Net did create a digital divide, mass distribution of cheap cell phone technology to the developing world promises to mitigate the information gap. Across the globe advertising agencies and public relations firms are in a horse race to be the first feed on the new social networks convened by technology uses. Yet, adjustment is unpredictable; this year's gotta-have it gadget often becomes last year's eight track tape. New communications have a near talismanic quality for the private sphere, however; yet, it remains unclear what the organizing principles of advocacy for virtual space will be.

James Klumpp, Thomas Hollihan and Patricia Riley were among the first to recognize the compelling and unique qualities of the cybersphere for argumentation, as they observed that the mix of network movements, international organizations, and new communication technologies create novel networked economies of contention and resistance (2001, p. 579). Others now deploy socio-biological metaphors to describe viral nets of influence and the survival of the fittest contesting memes (Dawkins, 1989; Blackmore, 1999). It may be too early to parse the spaces of virtual advocacy by root metaphors, however. Patterns of exchange are too complex, too chaotic, and evolving too rapidly. Still, styles of argument are emerging.

At one level, arguments spread and mutate across the *Internet* much like the murmurs of rumor, gossip and the crowd (Levy & Nail, 1993). *Web* argumentation, commonly, is shallow and self-elaborating; the circulation of pictures, texts, and self-assembling claims spread across subscription lists, bulletin boards, and chain-letters. Every one receives such daily messages, by the millions. Note also that mass media and interactive sites stylistically now begin to resemble and mirror one another, even as simulations, reality, and fictions exchange places.

At another, communities form counterfactual discussions where institutional advocacy structures themselves are put under pressure by criticism. Just as TANS attacked the indifference of the state, so BLOGS undermine the hegemony of mass mediated corporate news by breaking open to critique the methods by which stories are selected, framed, and argued (Blogosphere, n.d.; Technocrati, n.d.). Like the devil's advocate in cannon law, bloggers argue day by day, story by story, against popularizing myths for restoration of competence, impartiality, and responsibility in public opinion. The consequences for advocacy are mixed.

Advocates were upbeat, for a time. Between *Web* capacity to circulate information and globalized mass media content, *Nikke's* unconscionable exploitation of child

labor would be made public (Sellnow & Brand, 2001). The indifference of governments to genocide in abandoned post colonial territories would be seen, daily. With September 11, 2001, however, these expectations crashed. At least some global advocacy networks have a serious negative side, it seems.

Thus, a contest over what will become prevailing uses of advocacy on the Web swirls across the globe. Sites like *openDemocracy.com* herald a new "digital commons" where you can tour the multi-ethic performances of public culture served up a riot of images from the rain forest, carnivale, and street samba heavens – sound, visuals, and symbols subversive of up-tight, rule-governed deliberations; at other URLs link researchers in Amsterdam and Los Angeles to where Web offerings make states more responsive, and citizens more *Web* service dependent; and on a third variety of sites, disturbing acts of brutality circulate unevenly and for undetermined reasons across national and international spaces. Sales, surveillance, and censorship thus contest with hacker-cultures, open source software, and online communities, as the technologies of connection and diversion swarm across boundaries and mutate avenues of participation. The future grows uncertain.

One thing is abundantly clear, however. There is a rennaisance of advocacy underway. Modern mass media propaganda, advertising and entertainment are being superseded by the revival of the forms of communicative interaction and the renewal of the practices of agonistic intervention. New communication technologies have often given rise to novel advocacy practices, and we are in the midst of a communications revolution. The inventiveness of new networks, the blended forms that fuse picture, graphics, and tropes together, the speed of circulation and commentary, inventive methods of aggregation, measurement, and gamed simulations – all these are trajectories of expanding advocacy worlds. Yet, the world has not been born anew.

It turns out that the disappearance of the state was a premature announcement (Bob, 2001, p. 311; Johnston & Laxer, 2003, p. 39, p. 80). The sentiments of universal declarations do not translate well into peace-keepers between factions on the ground (Belloni 2001). Yet raised expectations of human rights have given rise to contestations over ethnic identity. Presently, cosmopolitan ideas, urban movements, and fundamentalist demands collide across the globe, and new rounds of constitutive national debates emerge. Thus, diaspora politics and pan-nationalisms meet with forces of integration and dispersion at home. Advocacy struggles for ending disparity among citizens, mitigating asymmetries of power, and accommodating difference spread. Understanding the predicaments of

national debates in a globalizing world is a key challenge for our own, 21st century, globally-networked, argumentation community.

REFERENCES

Advocate. (1911). In *The encyclopaedia britannica* (11th ed.) (Vol. 1. pp 241-242). New York: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.

Advocate. (1991). In A. H. Murry, H. Bradley, W. A. Craigie, and C. T. Onions (Eds.), *The oxford english dictionary* (2nd ed) (Vol. 1, p. 194). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bingham, C. (1998). *The Columbian orator: containing a variety of original and selected pieces together with rules, which are calculated to improve youth and others, in the ornamental and using art of eloquence.* New York: New York UP. (Original work published in 1797)

Belloni, R. (2001). "Civil society and peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Journal of Peace Research,* 38, 163-180.

Blackmore, S. J. (1999). *The meme machine.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Blogosphere. (n.d.). *Wikipedia.* Retrieved July 22, 2006, from http:/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blogosphere.

Bob Boles, C. (2001). Marketing rebellion: insurgent groups, international media, and NGO support. *International Politics*, 38, 311-334.

Booth, C. (1967). *Charles Booth's London: a portrait of the poor at the turn of the century, drawn from his life and labour of the people of London.* New York: Pantheon.

Branham, J. (1994). Debate and dissent in late Tokugama and Meiji Japan. *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 30, 1. Retrieved July 21, 2006, from Questia database.

Campbell, G. (2002). *Blood diamonds: tracing the deadly path of the world's most precious stones.* Boulder. CO: Westview Press.

Chenevix, R. (1832). *An essay upon national character* (Vol. 1). London: James Duncan, Pater Noster-Row.

Cicero, M. T. (1913). *Cicero: De Officiis.* T. E. Page & W.H.D. Rouse (Eds.). W. Miller (Trans.). London: William Heinemann.

Cicero, M. T. (1949). *De inventione. De optimo genere oratorum. Topica.* H. M. Hubbell (Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Cicero, M. T. (1948). *Cicero: De Oratore I, II*. (Vol. 1). T. E. Page, E. Capps, W. H. D. Rouse, L. A. Post & E. H. Warmington (Eds.).E. W. Sutton (Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.

Cicero, M. T. (1930). The speech in defence of Sextus Roscius of Ameria In T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse (Eds.). J. H. Freese (Trans.). *Cicero: The Speeches with an English translation: Pro Publio Quinctio; Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino; Pro Quinto Roscio Comoedo; De Lege Agaria* II.6 (pp. 122-265). London: William Heinemann.

Cohen, E. S. (2004). Advocacy and advocates: definitions and ethical dimensions. *Generations*, 28, 9-16.

Cox, J. R., & McCloskey, M. (1996). Advocacy and the Istook amendment: efforts to restrict the civic speech of nonprofit organizations in the 104th Congress, *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 24, 273-291.

de Tocqueville, A. (1945). In F. Bowen (Ed.), Henry Reeve (Trans.). *Democracy in America by Alexis De Tocqueville* (Vol 1.) New York: Alfred A. Knopf. (Original work published 1841)

Dawkins, R. (1989). *The selfish gene.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Dewatripont, M & Tirole, J. (1999). Advocates. *Journal of Political Economy*, 107, 1-36.

Douglas, F. D. (1997). *Narrative of the life of Frederick Douglas.* Retrieved July 19, 2006, from Berkeley Digital Library (Original work published 1845)

Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, D. (1983). *Risk and culture: An essay on the selection and detection of environmental dangers*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Ekirch, Arthur A., Jr. (1974). *Progressivism in America: A study of the era from Theodore Roosevelt to Woodrow Wilson*. New York: Franklin Watts.

Fantham, E. (2004). *The Roman world of Cicero's De Oratore.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

Freddolino, , P. P, Moxley, D. P., & Hyduk, C. A differential model of advocacy in social work practice. *Families in Society*, 85, 119-128.

Foster, F. S. (1979). *Witnessing slavery: The development of ante-bellum slave narratives*. Greenwood Press.

Goodnight, G. T. (2003). The wiles of deliberation: protodeliberation and heroic prudence in Homer's Odyssey. In F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, C. A. Willard, and A. F. Snoeck Henkemans (Eds.), *Anyone who has a view: Theoretical contributions to the study of argumentation* (pp. 283-296). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Goodnight, G. T. (2006). When reasons matter most: pragma-dialects and the problem of informed consent. In P. Houtlosser and A.van Rees (Eds.), *Considering pragma-dialectics* (pp. 74-87). Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum

Guerard, A. (1934). Herder's spiritual heritage: nationalism, romanticism,

democracy. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 174, 1-8.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere* (T. Berger, Trans.). Cambridge: MIT Press. (Original work published in 1962 as Strukturwandel der Őffentlicheit)

Habermas, J. (1981). *The theory of communication action* (Vol. 1). (T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Harrison, S. A. (2001, August 1). The internet, cyberadvocacy, and citizen communication. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 624-626.

Hawes, J. M. (1991). *The children's rights movement: A history of advocacy and protection*. Boston: Twayne Publishers.

Heath, R. L. & Nelson, R. A. (1985). *Issues management: Corporate policymaking in an information society.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstadter, R. (1955). *The age of reform: from Bryan to F.D.R.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. pp. 185-212

Johnston, J. & Laxer, G. (2003). Solidarity in the age of globalization: Lessons from the anti-MAI and Zapatista struggles. *Theory and Society,* 32, 39-91.

Jørgensen, C. (1998). Public debate – an act of hostility? *Argumentation*, 12, 431-443.

Keck M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1999).Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International Social Sciences Journal,* 159, 89-101.

Keck, M. E. & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in international politics.* Ithaca: Cornell UP.

Kennedy, G. (1968). The rhetoric of advocacy in Greece and Rome. *The American Journal of Philology,* 89, 419-436.

Klotz, A. (2002). Transnational activism and global transformations: the Anti-Apartheid and abolitionist experiences. *European Journal of International Relations*, 8, 49-76

Klumpp, J., Hollihan, T., & Riley, P. (2001). Globalizing argument theory. In G. Thomas Goodnight (Ed.). *Arguing communication and culture: Proceedings of the 12th SCA/NCA conference on argumentation* (pp. 578-587). Washington, D.C: National Communication Association.

Lens, V. (2005). Advocacy and argumentation in the public arena: a guide for social workers. *Social Work*, 50, 231-238.

Levy, D. A. & Nail, P. R. Contagion: a theoretic and empirical review and reconceptualization. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 119.

Retrieved July 21, 2006, from Questia database.

Mann, A. (Ed.). (1963). *The progressive era: Liberal renaissance or liberal failure?* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Maslin, S. (2004). *Mine action after Diana: Progress in the struggle against landmines*. London: Pluto Press.

May, J. (1981). The rhetoric of advocacy and patronclient identification: variation on a theme. *The American Journal of Philology*, 102, 308-315.

McElligott, J. N. (1855/1859). *The American debater: Being a plain exposition of the principles and practice of public debate* (3rd ed.). Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Col.

McGuigan, J. (2000). British identity and 'the people's princess.' *Sociological Review*, 48, 1-17

Mill, J. S. (1988). Women's suffrage [3] 12 January 1871. In J. M. Robson and B. L. Kinzer (Eds.), *Public and parliamentary speeches by John Stuart Mill July 1869-March 1873* (pp. 402-409). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mundy, K. & Murphy, L. (2001). Transnational advocacy, global civil society? Emerging evidence from the field of education. *Comparative Education Review*, 45, 85-126.

Olson, K.M. & Goodnight, G. T. (1994). Entanglements of consumption, cruelty, privacy, and fashion. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 80, 249-276.

Plaint. (1991). In A. H. Murry, H. Bradley, W. A. Craigie, and C. T. Onions (Eds.), *The Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd ed) (Vol. 11, p. 956). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Polletta, F. (1999). Activists beyond borders: advocacy networks in international politics. *Contemporary Sociology*, 28, 96-97.

Powell, J, & Paterson, J. (Eds.). (2004). Cicero the advocate. Oxford: Oxford UP.

Quintilian (1921). *The institutio oratoria of Quintilian*. Book IV, 1, 6 (Vol. 2). E. Capps, T. E. Page & W. H. D. Rouse (Eds.). H. E. Butler (Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Loeb.

Roby, H. J. (1902). *Roman private law in the times of Cicero and of the Antonines*. (Vol. II). Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Rosenau, J. N. (1997). *Along domestic-foreign frontier: exploring governance in a turbulent world*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Schuetz, J. (1990). Corporate advocacy as argumentation. In R. Trapp & J. Schuetz (Eds.), *Perspectives on argumentation: Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 272-284). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Stanton, E. C. (1981). Stanton, 'The Solitude of Self,' January 18, 1892. In E. C. Dubois (Ed.), *Elizabeth Cady Stanton-Susan B. Anthony, correspondence, writings, speeches* (pp. 247-254). New York: Shocken Books.

Stears, M. (2002). *Progressives, pluralists, and the problems of the state.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Strange, S. (1996). *The retreat of the state: the diffusion of power in the world economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Sellnow, T. L. & Brand, J. D. (2001). Establishing the structure of reality for an industry: model and anti-model arguments as advocacy in Nike's crisis communication. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 29, 278-295.

Tam, I. J. (2004). Dangerous appetites: human rights activism and conflict commodities. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 26, 687-704.

Tasker, J. G. T. (1926). *Advocate. In James Hastings (Ed.), Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (Vol. 1, pp. 139-140). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Technocrati. (n.d.). *Wikipedia.* Retrieved July 22, 2006, from http:/en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Technocrati.

Timberlake, E. W., Jr. (1922). Origin and development of advocacy as a profession. *Virginia Law Review*, 9, 25-40.

Urbinati, N. (1999, October 11). *Rhetoric and representation: the politics of advocacy.* Political Theory Workshop, University of Chicago. Retrieved July 19, 2006, from ptw.uchicago. /urbinati99.pdf

Urbinati, N. (2000). Representation as advocacy: a study of democratic deliberation. *Political Theory*, 28, 758-786.

Thucydides. (2006). *History of the Peloponnesian war.* R. Crawley (Trans.). Retrieved July 20, 2006, from http://classics.mit.edu/Thucydides/pelopwar.2.second.html (Original work 431 B. C. E.)

Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., Schoeck Henkemans, F. (1996). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory: a handbook of historical backgrounds and contemporary developments.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Ehrlbaum.

Van Eemeren, F. H. & Houtlosser, P. (2002). Strategic maneuvering with the burden of proof. *Advances in pragma-dialectics* (pp. 13-28). Amsterdam: Sic Sat Press.

Walton, D. N. (1989). *Informal logic: a handbook for critical argumentation.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

Wapner, P. (1996). *Environmental activism and world civic politics.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Willard, C. A. (1996). *Liberalism and the problem of knowledge: a new rhetoric for modern democracy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Yunis, H. (1996). *Taming democracy: models of political rhetoric in classical*

Athens. Ithaca: Cornell UP.

ISSA Proceedings 2006 – The Quality Of Argumentation In Masters Theses

1. *Introduction*

Thesis writing is an inherent and important part of university studies that guarantees academic qualifications and the quality of scientific knowledge building. Thesis writing gives students an experience of doing real scientific research. It also has an impact on university teaching and learning methods.

The purpose of the study was to survey the quality of theses. The quality was assessed with respect to the scalability of grades and the structure and standard of the argumentation of the theses. The role of argumentation and argumentation skills are important in thesis writing, both for building scientific knowledge and presenting relevant conclusions. Behind the study lies the fact that the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences introduced a new thesis assessment form in the autumn of 2004.

This is why this project surveys masters theses assessed using this new form. The project is also related to the Bologna Declaration which forms the basis for assessing the standard of university education and theses. The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences of University of Helsinki wanted to evaluate students masters theses and research the scalability of good and excellent grades. The purpose of the project was to evaluate the credibility of the grading system. Teachers and professors wanted to know whether the theses were evaluated according to the same criteria in five chosen departments or whether there were there differences between criteria. Finnish universities have joined in the European Bologna Process (the Bologna Declaration 2003) in August 2005. The Bologna Process requires that the quality of university education and degrees

must be assessed and developed both nationally and internationally. Finnish university studies consist of a two-tier structure. All students first take a bachelors degree but they all have the right to continue their studies to a master´s degree.

The declaration is considered to be a call to assess also the quality of theses. Finnish university pedagogy focuses on counseling and education students so that they become fully qualified experts and researchers in their own disciplinary. This same kind of counseling and education must be present in all the different teaching and learning methods (e.g. lectures, seminars, group works). Teaching methods have to be consistent and in line with learning evaluation methods. Teachers can not teach issues and evaluate students learning differently (Ramsden 2003). For example, students' personal epistemological development and students' skills in justifying their points of view and using argumentation for knowledge building have to be visible in the teaching and learning methods. The principle of university teaching should be a student-focused approach because the quality of students' learning and learning results are used as the criteria for the evaluation of successful teaching. A student-focused approach also sees students as different learners and as individual people each with their own learning skills, values, beliefs and experiences (Trigwell & Prosesser 2004).

Besides the Bologna-process the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences of the University of Helsinki wanted to evaluate students' masters theses and research the scalability of good and excellent grades. The purpose of the project was to evaluate the credibility of the grading system. Teachers and professors wanted to know whether the theses were evaluated by the same criteria in five selected departments or whether there were differences between criteria and whether teachers evaluated good and excellent theses somehow vaguely in any way and by unfair means. In this research, the writing and evaluation of master theses are explored within the context of Finnish higher education. The case study consists of the theses from the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences of the University of Helsinki. In Finland, a thesis is required of all university students completing their master degrees. The nature of the thesis varies across study fields to some extent, but there is a general norm that students have to show a good command of the research phenomenon, mastery of research methods and the capability to produce academic writing.

Students participating in a one-year seminar in which they make research plans and get their own work started. The teaching and practice of argumentation are

not compulsory studies in the seminar and the teaching of argumentative writing is very unusual. These issues also have an impact to data analysis. Finally, in the end of this paper I will point to suggestions for development for teaching argumentation and university pedagogy which are based on the results of the study.

2. *Components of thesis writing and personal development of the student into an expert*

In writing a Master's thesis, students demonstrate that they can think and reason scientifically and that they can perform independent research. The evaluation of the level of the thesis is also important to the scientific community as it can evaluate knowledge building, the sophistication of the student and the community's own teaching methods, and strategy based on the level of scientific thought and argumentation presented in the thesis, as well as the coherency and relevance of the reasoning presented in the conclusions. The role of argumentation and argumentation skills is important in thesis writing, both for building scientific knowledge and presenting relevant conclusions. Argumentation reinforces and contributes to the message being received since a clearly written and expressed explanation is more easily understood than an opinion expressed using long and difficult sentences. The conclusions should be submitted for consideration or criticism from multiple standpoints. To evaluate the reasoning ability in scientific knowledge building the researcher has to explain clearly how he or she has drawn the conclusions and what kind of arguments have been used to prove or disprove the issue.

Argumentation involves building knowledge because argumentation obliges students to present their understanding explicitly, reflect upon it and eventually revise it. It may also involve a posteriori reconstruction of new arguments and the active search for knowledge in the decision-making and problem-solving processes to produce convincing arguments and make reliable decisions. Knowledge building should take place during argumentation. Good argumentation validates the relevance of knowledge. If the student does not use ambiguous language, then he or she can produce more acceptable and relevant knowledge.
It must be noticed that the theses do not describe the processes of thinking and learning that result from the research which has been done. In addition, teachers cannot describe the chain of reasoning which students have produced during thesis writing. The formal procedures of scientific theses and norms within each

discipline determine the specific styles of doing research and writing which conceal the processes of thinking and learning.

Epistemological perspectives of thesis writing

The development of an individual into an expert can be seen in the styles of argumentation, personal experiences and perspectives of personal epistemologies.

When considering thesis writing, one has to take into account that students' personal experiences and expectations of university studies vary greatly. The wider disciplinary context, the departmental ethos (Sheppard & Gilbert 1991, p. 235) has an impact on students study orientations and experiences because the aims and practices of teaching and learning vary between the cultures of different disciplines (Becher & Kogan 1992). In addition, the nature of the writing conventions and norms of different departments has an impact on the structure of theses. Bazerman (1981) has said that different departments have their own writing norms which determine the structure of argumentation. For example, these norms can be the nature of knowledge, traditions for relating new knowledge to existing literature, the extent to which language is understandable to the outsider, the nature of the terminology, the concepts and the style of the writing in relation to how new knowledge claims are made.

Scholars have studied the epistemological development of college students – what kind of epistemological beliefs students have. Theories of epistemological development differ in detail, but they present a common pattern of development that progresses from simple, right-wrong thinking, through an exploration of multiple perspectives, to an understanding of knowledge and knowing that uses complex, contextual and relativistic thinking. The main point of this development is a dramatic change in students' epistemology. As students are exposed to the complexities of various disciplines, theories and methods, they start to understand new standpoints in relation to knowledge. This change means that students experience a dramatic shift from viewing knowledge as a collection of facts, towards an epistemology in which they see knowledge as contextual, relativistic and ever-evolving. The term `epistemic´ relates to knowledge more generally and conditions for acquiring it. From a psychological and educational standpoint, it is important to refer to personal epistemology or epistemic cognition. Personal epistemology or epistemic cognition refers to students' capacity to develop conceptions of knowledge and knowing and utilize them in developing their understanding of the world. Models of epistemological development emphasize

that various cognitive mechanisms related to individuals own belief revision, e.g. awareness of differences between one´s own beliefs or knowledge, are important to produce developmental change. In addition, the individual has to be interested in evaluating their beliefs or knowledge and must not be afraid to doubt their thinking (Pintrich 2002).

There is a small but consistent bodies of research of the increases in intellectual and cognitive capabilities (Perry 1970) and changes in view of knowledge (Kitchener, King, Wood & Davison 1989) through the college years. Several researchers have shown that students of different disciplinary domains do not have similar epistemological beliefs. For example social science students more often than technology students believe that knowledge is a collection of simple isolated facts (Schommer 1993). Students with majors in engineering and science are more likely than students with majors in soft (social science and humanities) fields to believe that knowledge is certain and unchanging (Paulson & Wells 1998).

For example, results of one research have indicated that students' epistemologies vary across knowledge domains. The interview research shows evidence of two major epistemological shifts as students moved from simple to complex epistemologies. The shift from singular truth to multiple perspectives appears to happen more naturally in humanities and social sciences. Students of sciences (mathematics, engineering) understand science as evolving, but also see this evolution to be more than just multiple opinions. They recognize that they have discovered new facts and that these facts fit into theories based upon the contextual setting being analyzed, discussed or applied. In addition, they see the evolving and changing nature of science combined with the fact that scientific method and knowledge still exist within a changing theoretical and contextual framework (Palmer & Marra 2004, p. 320).

3. *Methodology*

The method of analysis deployed was that of qualitative argumentation analysis. I produced my own table for this evaluation because in addition to the argumentation analysis I had to take into account the structure of thesis, departmental cultures and the norms and conventions of scientific thesis writing.

A scale was created for the argumentation analysis that contained criteria (excellent, good, and weak) for evaluating the scientific argumentation. A scale is showed next.

Excellent: (relevant, acceptable, logical and truthful chain of inferences, multiple structure of argumentation, a little superficial description of things, an attempt to build knowledge independently and use relevant evidences, taking into account audiences), evaluate evidence critically from many perspectives (pros and cons), assessing the reliability of the processes of forming beliefs and making choices.

Good: (some multiple structure in the argumentation, relevant, acceptable, logical and truthful chain of inferences), mostly short (simple) structure of argumentation.

Weak: short (simple) structure of argumentation, a lot of description, repetition of knowledge.

Parts of analysis of scientific argumentation (the form of arguments and conclusions) include: Acceptable and relevant grounds, warrants, a claim, counter-arguments (chain of argumentation is relevant and logically coherent).

Principles of argumentative writing (Andriessen & Chanquoy, 1999) and reasoning strategies (presumptive and practical reasoning, if-then reasoning).

Classifications of argumentative scheme (forms of argument) (Walton 1996) and fallacies which can be occurred in the scientific writing (Richardson 2006). Especially the forms of argument from expert opinion (e.g. refer to references), argument from analogy, argument from verbal classification and argument from correlation to cause are important.

I have used Toulmin's (1958) classical model in the analysis as the starting point to evaluate the structure of argumentation. The model has been a successful tool to describe a reasonable structure and clear chain of argument in ill-structured problems. The model does not provide information concerning the processes of problem-solving or decision-making (Voss 2005). I shortened and moulded it a little to apply it to analyzing natural text in which I noticed institutional language. There are also other models of argumentation which notice more the narrative and rhetorical properties of argument. For example narrative structure of argumentation can be useful as concept development and argumentative writing (Andrews 2005). Next is presented the structure of short and multiple argumentation that I created on the ground of the data analysis. The following is of short (simple) argumentation structure:

claim -> a ground

(a warrant) (implied warrant)

or a ground -> a claim

(a warrant) (implied warrant)

Other texts (description, explaining)

no further argument development

Multiple structure of argumentation (acceptable, relevant and coherent chain of reasoning and argumentation from abstract to discussion with the student demonstrating evidence of depth of reasoning) is the following:

Explanation of issue + a (presumptive) ground (at least 3 pieces) -> if-then reasoning, accept, relevant explanation including elements of argumentation -> a claim + an counter-argument + a ground

Warrants (implied warrant)

further argument development and chain of argumentation

I did not use strict (rigorous) and formal argumentation analysis because I wanted to see what kind of chains of reasoning and argumentation were in the theses. The principles of pragma-dialectical reconstruction (van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004) helped to evaluate the implicit parts of argumentation in the different texts. I used the ideal models with theories of argumentation as the starting point of the method but I let the students' styles of writing and chain of reasoning direct the analysis. The classical reasoning procedures, e.g. deduction, are formalistic to describe human natural argumentation. Deduction understands arguments as simple linear structures, moving from one premise to the next. It is necessary not to miss nonlinear arguments, such as metaphor, narration (Hample 2003). But these nonlinear arguments have to form some kind of logical connection and reasonable structure between different parts of argumentation (e.g. grounds, claims and implied warrants).

Argumentation however by no means always takes place in an institutionalized context with fixed procedures. For example, the phenomena of education, psychology and speech sciences are very complex and students of these fields have to solve ill-structured problems. As an analyzer I must be able to make

judgments about the quality of each structural component and to assess the degree to which the composition of ideas coheres in support of the claim. It should be taken into account that argument units take their places within larger contexts of interaction, thoughts, emotions, frames of argumentation and feelings which could also be seen in the chain of written dialogue (Hample 2003). In addition to argumentation analysis, the theses were evaluated according to the thesis evaluation form.

Argumentative writing
When I analyzed the theses I thought about the structure of argumentative writing. I did not expect the students to know how to write in an argumentative style unless they had studied it by themselves. In addition, Finnish university pedagogy does calls little attention to argumentation. There is not a systematic style of teaching of argumentation in the seminar. According to Courier, Andriessen and Chanquoy (1999), argumentative writing contains four processes: reasoning, argumentation, linearization and linguistic coding. When a student is composing an argumentation, she or he must carefully order the presentation of information in the text (elaboration). This information must or can be linked by logical coherent relationships, for example logical chaining for causality (by a connective such as if-then), coordination of arguments with the same orientation (e.g. and) and opposition of orientation (e.g. but). At the same time students have to write to an addressee or audience and remember their communicative goal: to make the addressee accept the proposed standpoint. The difficulties of argumentative writing relate to the linearization process which is a major problem in text production (like connecting pro and counter-argument together in a sequence).

I have used the term coherence in the analysis of thesis writing in this research because it represents the purpose of thesis writing. Organizing text is important in writing because it relates ideas and things to each other in a hierarchical structure as a basis for a coherent text. In addition, it is important for sentence formulations to have logical relationships and a chronological order. These are characteristics of coherent and relevant argumentation.

Johnson (2000, p. 343) has determined the criteria of evaluation of argument. He arranges the order of criteria into acceptability, relevance, truth and sufficiency. It seems as acceptability is relatively easy to determine and to apply, it should come first. He also recommends that it is reasonable to first check to see whether the premises are individually acceptable (they are reasonable and also the

audience can accept them).

Research problems

The research questions are: a) do the theses contain argumentation and argumentation chains? b) what kinds of argumentation occur? c) how coherent are the chain of reasoning that the students present in the defence of their theses? d) what does a comparison between the grades of thesis as good or poor reveal?

Data

Masters theses prepared in five departments of one faculty of the University of Helsinki during the period September 2004 – May 2005 were selected for the study. The goal of the research was to compare theses graded excellent with those graded good. Altogether 50 theses were awarded either an excellent or good grade; of these, 34% (17 theses) were excellent and 66% (33 theses) were good. The theses graded excellent were made up of 6% (3 theses) that had been awarded the grade laudatur and 28% (14 theses) that were graded as *eximia cum laude approbatur.* The theses graded as good were 20% (10 theses) *magna cum laude approbatur,* 36% (18 theses) *cum laude approbatur* and 10% (5 theses) non *sine laude approbatur.* The theses were selected at random by lottery.

4. *Results*

According to the results, the argumentation found in these theses varies. There are only a few long and logical argumentation chains. The argumentation level varies from department to department. Usually, the argumentation is somewhat weak, which can be seen in the structures, chains of reasoning, and content of the language used. At various points in the theses, simple or short, independent argument structures can be seen. For example, the short chains of argumentation are scattered throughout the different parts of the thesis.

The lengths of excellent and good theses varied with the departments. The shortest theses, in both grade categories, were those prepared in the field of psychology (25-55 numbers of pages) and the longest in the field of pedagogy (76-115 numbers of pages). One reason for the quantity of shorter pages in the field of psychology may be the writing conventions because they write a lot of articles. Students are prepared for writing an article. Their theses were more reminiscent of articles than of the normal form of theses but they included the structural elements of theses.

The results in terms of the theses show that there is no causal link between the length of the thesis and the grade awarded. But mostly in the long theses (e.g. over 100 numbers of pages) there is also a lot of description and students tend to describe a phenomenon and try to explain it rather than present criticism or arguments from multiple perspectives. A thesis of 50 to 60 pages, for example, was quite adequate for presenting scientific research of a good standard from the abstract through to discussion section. The chains of conclusion progressed in a coherent manner. Furthermore, the said number of pages was also sufficient for taking into account the reader's view reporting the result in an analytical manner and producing new information. The longest theses, spanning some 120 to 130 pages, were in places overly descriptive and repetitive. The shortest theses were awarded the grade of cl, and they contained 27 to 30 pages. The writers of these theses had mechanically cited the theoretical basis, methods and results, and the discussion section was brief. The shortest theses contained basic research. They were coherent and produced results, but their reliability, discussion and analysis of results were too briefly assessed. This is why they were of a poor scientific standard.

Scientific thinking, argumentation and expertise
Scientific thinking varied, with respect to both its structure and content, in the theses prepared in different departments. Scientific thinking was most abundant in excellent theses containing a coherent, in-depth analysis of a phenomenon in one's own field of science. Scientific thinking was assessed on the basis of the standard of argumentation. Scientific argumentation in excellent theses was evidenced by more coherent chains of argumentation and conclusion, more precise sentence syntax and by more logical treatment from abstract to discussion. Almost all theses contained an argumentation structure (short or multiple) that varied with quantity. However, not all excellent theses contained excellent argumentation, because certain theses indicated very few grounds for claims and used very few logical linking words.

The accuracy of conclusions varied. The theses awarded an excellent grade also displayed scientific argumentation structures, but less often any coherent argumentation chains. Both the excellent and good theses contained examples of a simple or short argumentation structure, i.e. (justification or) warrant using the word "because" and drawing conclusions using the words "if" and "then". The standard of scientific thinking, argumentation or interruptions in logical chains of thought was only referred to in a few thesis assessment forms. Only a few

professors mentioned chain of reasoning problems. One or two professors wrote about the weak argumentations in the thesis grading forms. As a conclusion, we can say that the theses contained a little argumentation of a reasonable or good standard.

It seems that in almost all the good theses, scientific thinking (and argumentation) was interrupted right after the theory section or literature review. In all these theses, the language and method for reporting factual content were reduced to the standard of everyday language in the methods and results sections, but nevertheless stayed within the boundaries of standard language. The accuracy of conclusions varied, and conclusions were repeated on many occasions. The various concepts were, however, used in a systematic manner in all the theses surveyed but the structure and determinations of concepts were superficial.

There was a multiple structure of argumentation in good and excellent theses but more in the excellent theses. Students can be good writers but they cannot produce any new results, conclusions or theoretical idea. For example, students can argue sophisticatedly but they do not construct knowledge to create any new ideas or theoretical knowledge. For this reason some students have got a good grade for their theses, but not an excellent grade.

Scientific and critical thinking is most clearly evidenced in excellent theses and in some good theses. However, the consistency of thinking is interrupted in good theses, shown as a failure to use concepts in a systematic fashion, weak theoretical frames of reference, poor command of methodology or inadequate discussion. It is a case of poor scientific thinking to use practical reasoning for issues requiring consistent and objective language for scientific research, to use ambiguous terms, and to give instructions for action in the theoretical background section or results section without any reason. Further examples of poor scientific thinking are ambiguous source references, long sentences and presenting strong arguments without the justification of scientific research. A fragmented chain of reasoning throughout the thesis is another case of poor scientific thinking. Some examples of short and multiple structures of argumentation are presented below. The main points and the chain of argumentation have been italicised. The following is a pattern of short scientific structure of argumentation:

(1) … "There has not been much research into the consonant combinations used

by native English-speaking children. This research is not suitable for research into the Finnish language because of the differences of structure between the languages and because the consonant combinations of Finnish exceed syllabic boundary compared to the English language in which combinations are first part of the sentences or end in the syllable."... no further chain of argumentation (grade: good/m/department of speech sciences)

An example of argumentation with a short structure is the following:

(2) ... "Studying in the management of household affairs and housekeeping activities using wide and multidimensional theories is meaningful because housekeeping can be looked at on different levels, e.g. through an individual, family, neighborhood, society and from a more global perspective (Turkki 1999, 29, 34.)" ... no further chain of argumentation (grade: excellent/e/ home economics and craft sciences)

Multiple chains of argumentation and presumptive reasoning are as follows:

(3) (… development of idea …)
"Instrumental data, though, suggest that the difference between the flapped and the unflapped variants of the English /td/, at least, is not quite as radical as Barry´s hypothesis would seem to imply.
First, the hypothesis implies that the flap variants involve no diversion of the tongue body whatsoever; this is inconsistent with the findings of Stone and Hamlet (1982), Fujimura (1987), and de Jong (1998) discussed above.
Second, Barry´s hypothesis, if taken literally, implies that it is merely the case that the tip/blade is raised – that no effort is made to extend and raise the tongue sides in the same way as in stops. Byrd´s (1994a) EPG records of two flaps – one in an unspecified context (fig. 7), the other in butter (see also Byrd 1995) – however, show contact along more or less the entire outer edge of the palate, beside the teeth. *Even though vowels like /a/ (at least) may have a slightly concave cross-sectional tongue profile* (see Stone and Vatikiotis-Bateson 1995), I find it hard to believe that such contact would occur if only the tip/blade were muscularly acted upon." ... chain of argumentation continues (grade: excellent/l/speech sciences)

There are different sections that give rise to problems in many theses. At first, it seems that the chain of reasoning is interrupted straight away after the abstract

in that it is describing the goal and aim of the research. These things are not covered in the introduction. The introduction is written a quite poorly because it does not mention the purpose, theories, methods and results. The importance of the study is not argued in the introduction. Some students argue for the aim of the study implicitly. The second problematic part is the introduction and review of the literature. Reviews of the literature are written in a very broad way. Students do not focus on the aim and define the themes. In addition, they contain too much description and little or no conclusions and chains of inferences. The level of scientific argumentation is lacking. The third problem is methodology. The pros and cons of methods are not used enough and the application of method is not always successful. The fourth problem is bias because students do not evaluate phenomenon of many perspectives. The fifth part is an assessment of the validity of knowledge, falsification, and a study of conflicting and contradictory accounts. The standard of argumentative writing can be specified using categorization such as expert vs. novice. The expert looks for conflicts, defects and contrasts whereas the novice does not analyze conflicts or evaluate counter-arguments. Both can have the same standard of reasoning, using conditional sentences and logical link words to describe the links between different matters and present an argumentative structure in their texts. Based on the assessment of the theses, there would appear to be no assessment of contradicting information, search for conflicts or falsification of own information in the good theses and some of the excellent ones. The accuracy of conclusions and more detailed analysis of information (evidence-based claims) were absent in almost all theses.

Comparability of the grading scale

There were no significant differences in the comparability of grading scales between different departments. The excellent and good theses were clearly distinguishable from each other. Figure 1 (see table) shows the strengths and weaknesses of the excellent and good theses written in different departments. The information is based on analysis and the grounds given by the instructors grading the theses.

The theses graded excellent had been graded in compliance with the grading scale. Excellent theses were clearly distinguished from those graded good by their theoretical and methodological basis, as well as by their argumentation and results. The theses graded excellent contained consistent scientific argumentation, they had a coherent structure, the conclusions were carefully drawn, and they clearly strove to present methodologically and/or theoretically

new information or models. The good theses contained conceptual argumentation but there was a difference in implementation between the grades. There was a lack of functional totality in some theses graded good. Other defects included the subject being outside the scope of the intended field of science, failure to master the research method used, no logical link between the theoretical and empirical sections, a poorly established theoretical basis, ambiguous language or brief and superficial discussion. The reasons for awarding a good grade for theses where the chain of reasoning was not continuous were in most cases not stated. The comparability of the grading scale used for theses graded good with respect to the grading criteria varied somewhat between different departments.

5. *Conclusion*

In this paper, the level of argumentation as an evidence of the quality of theses and as a reliable knowledge building process has to be taken into account seriously. The results show that there was some evidence of an excellent and coherent chain of argumentation in excellent and good theses. It is fascinating to see that the argumentation is a useful tool to evaluating the quality of theses. Furthermore, the evaluation led to new questions about the nature of the structure of argumentation in the theses e.g. what kind of reasoning strategies developed a better line of argumentation.

With respect to the coding of argumentation, I experienced some difficulty in determining the presence of warrants because students did not use a logical connector or word such as "because" or "then". It is possible that individuals never think of a warrant because the warrant is implied by the argument presented (Voss 2005). There could be institutional intuition that operates as a warrant. Individuals learn the rules of their own organizations that form the inference between grounds and claims (Freeman 2005). How can intuition can be depicted and analyzed in a particular text? In addition, there were other problems in the theses in which did not contain an argumentation structure but the sentences were put together one after the another in consecutively without the logical connectors. These kinds of elements should be taken into account when developing a better analysis tool for theses.

These results are important in the development of university pedagogy where the student learning process and the level of the scientific theses must be considered. The quality of the theses is also used to evaluate the level and sophistication of the scientific reasoning used as well as the student's ability to perform scientific research. The results can be used to build a master's degree and to develop tests

at the beginning and in the middle of a student's academic career to measure their academic expertise. These tests can also be used to influence teaching and study skills before writing a thesis. The results obtained are also important for increasing the teaching of scientific argumentation, which has been somewhat neglected in Finnish university instruction. Scientific argumentation classes will teach students how to construct arguments while also developing their ability to draw conclusions, build knowledge and think critically and creatively.

How do reasoning strategies affect argumentation? The quality of argumentation in the theses should be researched more from the perspectives of reasoning strategies which are the basis for argumentation. Reasoning strategies might help in understanding the difficulties encountered in giving justifications or evaluating evidence critically. The choice of reasoning strategy is related to performance and the accuracy of research problem. It is also maintained that processing and task demands may influence strategy selection (Morris & Schunn 2005).

According to results of this research, there were little quantity of chains of argumentation in theses. The question of why there were few chains of argumentation needs more research of epistemological perspective (beliefs of knowledge structure and argumentation). Epistemological beliefs are also related to argument avoidance. Nussbaum and Bendixen (2005) found that students with less well-developed epistemological beliefs, specifically regarding the certainty or simplicity of knowledge, tend to avoid arguments. But more research is needed to understand the reasons for the relationships involved in this issue.

The suggestions for development are based on the results of the study. The suggestions are related to creating the theses. The following factors are emphasized. The scientific standard and applicability of the theses must be more accurately assessed. Attention must be paid to the subjects of theses, the theoretical frame of reference, sources, problems in the research, methods and knowledge building. The students' skills with regard to scientific thinking and argumentative writing must be developed. When looking at the reasons for theses receiving failed or poor grades, the trail often leads to insufficient planning and poor command of methodology. Unrealistic goals may have been set or the risks associated with the implementation may have been insufficiently assessed. The most typical defects may be the failure to carry out sufficient pre-studies and a poor command of logic related to the structure of the plan, the theoretical frame of reference and/or implementation.

Counseling must be seen as important and the number of counselors should be

considered. In a world that is complex and constantly changing, teachers should to encourage students to develop and use a sophisticated, and nuanced understanding of the evolving nature of the knowledge we are teaching them. Students have to be encouraged to take risks, explore bold and possibly implausible ideas, and work at the edge of their competences. The independent reasoning, development of scientific thinking and problem-solving skills and self-esteem of the students must be enhanced at different stages of their studies so that they are capable of making more independent decisions and developing their thinking. The students should be more actively involved in the department's research projects, or new research coalitions should be created. The students should be encouraged to join cross-scientific research projects.

Students and teachers should develop their awareness of argumentative writing and teachers should motivate students to critical thinking. More detailed conclusions should be drawn, and information should be assessed in a more versatile fashion (evidence-based claims). Teachers should evaluate their argumentation competence themselves. They should be conscious of the benefit of the argumentation as a cognitive and pedagogical tool to promote characteristics of scientific thinking and behavior.

REFERENCES

Andrews, R. (2005). Models of argumentation in educational discourse. *Text* 25, 107-127.

The Bologna Declaration (2003). Available at http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/

Bazerman, C. (1981). What written knowledge does. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 2, 361-387.

Becher, T. & M. Kogan (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education.* London: Routledge.

Coirier, P, Andriessen, J. & L. Chanquoy (1999). From planning to translating: The specificity of argumentative writing. In: J. Andriessen and P. Coirier (Eds.) *Foundations of Argumentative Text Processing* (pp. 1-28) Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Eemeren, F.H. van & R. Grootendorst (2003). *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation*. The Pragma-Dialectical Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, J. B. (2005). Systematizing Toulmin´s warrants: An epistemic approach. *Argumentation* 19, 331-346.

Hample, D. (2003). Arguing skill. In: J.O. Greene and B.R. Burleson (Ed.)

Handbook of Communication and Social Interaction Skills (pp. 439-470), Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Kitchener, K.S., P.M. King, P.K. Wood & M.L. Davison (1989). Sequentiality and consistency in the development of reflective judgment: A six-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology* 10, 73-95.

Johnson, R.H. (2000). *Manifest Rationality. A Pragmatic Theory of Argument.* London. Mahwah, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Morris, B.J. & C.D. Schunn (2005). Rethinking logical reasoning skills from a strategy perspective. In: M.J. Roberts and E. J. Newton (Eds.) *Methods of Thought. Individual Differences in Reasoning Strategies* (pp. 31-56), Hove and New York: Psychology Press.

Nussbaum, E.M. & L.D. Bendixen (2003). Approaching and avoiding arguments: The role of epistemological beliefs, need for cognition, and extraverted personality traits. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 28, 573-595.

Palmer, B. & R.M. Marra (2004). College student epistemological perspectives across knowledge domains: A proposed grounded theory. *Higher Education* 47, 311-335.

Paulson, M.B. & C.T. Wells (1998). Domain differences in the epistemological beliefs of college students. *Research in Higher Education* 39, 365-384.

Perry, W.G. (1970). *Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Wiston.

Pintrich, P.K. (2002). *Future challenges and directions for theory and research on personal epistemology.* B.K. Hofer and P.R. Pintrich (Eds.). Personal Epistemology. The Psychology of Beliefs about Knowledge and Knowing (pp. 389-414), London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education.* London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Richardson, A.S. (2006). Logical fallacies in the scientific writing. Available at: http://mason.gmu.edu/%7Earichar6/logic.htm.

Schommer, M. (1993). Comparisons of beliefs about the nature of knowledge and learning among postsecondary students. *Research in Higher Education* 34, 3, 355-370.

Sheppard, C. & J. Gilbert (1991). Course design, teaching method and student epistemology, *Higher Education* 22, 229-249.

Toulmin, S.E. (1958). *The Uses of Argument.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trigwell, K. & M. Prosser (2004). Development and use of the approaches to

teaching inventory. *Educational Psychology Review* 16, 409-423.

Voss. J.F. (2005). Toulmin´s model and the solving of ill-structured problems. *Argumentation* 19, 321-329.

Walton, D.N. (1996). *Argument Schemes for Presumptive Reasoning.* Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

ISSA Proceedings 2006 – Controversy Participation As A Function Of Direct Reported Speech In News

1. *Introduction*

As an object of study, controversy presents a problem for argumentation researchers because on the one hand, it suggests something familiar – a discursive conflict in the manner of a dialectical exchange – yet on the other hand, it suggests something afield – an ill-defined discursive conflict embedded in a variegated institutional, historical, social, and textual environment. Dascal has emphasized the second sense of controversy, its qualities that lie outside of the norms of dialectical exchange, thematizing 'accidental and "vicious" aspects', 'endless "procedural" debates about framing', and 'passionate rhetoric' (Dascal, 1990). Where argumentation research has addressed controversy, it has tended to analyze it through argument reconstructions and/or to evaluate it is as a failed or a juvenile dialectical exchange. Viewing controversy this way, as a deviation from the norms of argument and dialectic, encourages a number of presumptions about it as an object of study. One of those presumptions is that, like dialectic, controversies are dyadic exchanges, and, by extension, identifying the participants in a controversy is either not a problem, or not an interesting problem. This paper investigates participation as a problem by asking who counts as a controversy participant.

As part of a constitutive approach to controversy, this paper examines a corpus of newspaper texts that report on the Brooklyn Museum controversy of 1999. A survey by the First Amendment Center narrates the event this way: '*Controversy about the show, titled "Sensation", centered on a painting of the Virgin Mary by British artist Chris Ofili that incorporated elephant dung and cut outs of pornographic images into its design*' (McGill, 1999).

In this paper, I want to discover who counts as a participant in the eyes of journalists who covered the Brooklyn Museum controversy. By asking the question about participation in this way, I can deliver an answer that does not rely on analyst presumptions about the number, kind, or prominence of participants. Instead, it examines the attribution and content of direct quotations in the controversy coverage as a measure of participant prominence and, by extension, the impact of participant prominence on reader representations of the controversy. The paper reports the results of this investigation, revealing that while hundreds of individual participants are quoted directly in the coverage of the Brooklyn Museum controversy, New York City Mayor Rudolph Giuliani is by far the most quoted, and that certain strings of his direct reported speech are routinely repeated across the months and years of coverage, making him a particularly prominent participant. Given that for most readers the coverage is their only experience with the Brooklyn Museum controversy, the journalists representation of this event as one dominated by Mayor Giuliani carries considerable power in inscribing the terms of the controversy for New Yorkers. Beyond the general priority on controversy as an object of study that is wed to its variegated institutional, historical, social, and textual environment, this analysis of the Brooklyn Museum case leads to some conclusions about controversy participation in general: Controversies are not necessarily dialectical encounters. Though many more than two speakers may participate in controversies, as few as one speaker can dominate them. Along with its discoveries about the Brooklyn Museum case, this paper provides an empirical approach to analyzing participation in a controversy, an approach that describes controversy as a kind of event that is named, narrated, and defined for a publicaudience by media coverage.

Analyses of controversy have tended to adopt three strategies that shape the object of study into a dialectic encounter: Issue-based encampment; participant selection based on entitlement & social primacy; participant selection based on

evidence of direct exchange.

While no single study embodies any one of these approaches exclusively, most analyses of controversy use some ratio of them in order to describe and analyze cases. What all of them have in common is that they use the dialectical encounter as a model and often as a framework for evaluation. Many researchers bring a normative framework to bear on their individual cases, evaluating them as failed dialectical encounters, and searching for the argumentative means by which the participants could have resolved the issue.

Many of the events that we call 'controversies', especially in a contemporary context, are mediated heavily by news reports and other second-hand reports. They are mediated at three significant points: between controversy participants,between the controversy event and the reporter, and between the reporter and his or her readers, listeners, and/or viewers. This final point of mediation is particularly important, as most people learn about controversies exclusively through news or historical documents. In the case of the Brooklyn Museum controversy, for instance, most people experienced first hand none of the events of the controversy – the press conference where the Mayor threatened the museum, the sermon where Cardinal O'Connor spoke out against the museum, the court rooms in which the museum and the city filed suits, the opening of the exhibit, etc. For most people, the representation of the controversy in media coverage is isomorphic with the controversy as an event. It follows, then, that the media will play a significant part in identifying and codifying the cast of participants in a controversy. Unlike other approaches to participant selection⎵issue-based encampment, participant selection – based on entitlement & social primacy, and participant selection based on evidence of direct exchange – my approach foregrounds media texts rather than abstracting from them.

Although controversy is an object of study that is central to rhetorical analysis and argumentation, researchers typically use the term in a non-technical, ordinary sense. Goodnight (1991) has identified this as a problem and has aimed to develop a more careful technical understanding of controversy (G. T. Goodnight, 1992; G. Thomas Goodnight, 1999; Olson & Goodnight, 1994). Other scholars from rhetoric and argumentation have also addressed the problem (Dascal, 1990; McKeon, 1990; Phillips, 1999). In these cases, scholars have developed technical definitions based on their knowledge of the rhetorical and the philosophical traditions, on publicsphere theory, and on pragmatics. The approach that I take in this paper by examining the discourse behavior of journalists does not conflict with these approaches. Instead, it provides an

empirical alternative.

2. *Design, method, & results*

Direct quotation is a site at which journalists regularly foreground event participants- characters in an ongoing news narrative. Van Dijk emphasizes this function of direct quotationin journalism:

'Introducing participants as speakers conveys both the human and the dramatic dimension of news events. News actors are represented as real actors in that case, playing or replaying their own role' (Dijk, 1988).

In this study, I identify and quantify the attribution of quotations to particular news actors and draw conclusions about the controversy participation based on these results. In order to identify the newspaper coverage of the event, I compiled a corpus of news texts about the event from the top three circulating newspapers in New York City. In order to isolate direct quotations and identify speaker attributions, I searched the corpus electronically for direct quotes, recorded the speaker to whom the quotation was attributed in each case, and tabulated the number of times each speaker was quoted. Finally, I counted and ranked all of the direct quotations and the speakers to whom they are attributed in the newspaper coverage the Brooklyn Museum controversy.

Quoted participants per newspaper

Mayor Giuliani is the most quoted participant in coverage for all three newspapers. His prominence is especially marked in the *Daily News* and the *New York Post*, where he is quoted 51 and 24 more times, respectively, than the next most quoted participant, and his quotations account for about 14% of all of the direct quotations in the coverage of those two newspapers. In the *New York Times*, he is quoted only 6 more times than the second most quoted person, and his quotations account for 9.90% of all of the direct quotations in the controversy coverage of the Times. For the *Daily News* and the *New York Times*, Arnold Lehman, the director of the Brooklyn Museum, is the second most quoted, accounting for 4.73% and 9.39% of direct quotations in each of those newspapers respectively. In the *New York Post*, Lehman is the fourth most quoted, accounting for 3.04% of all direct quotations.

Participants quoted first, second, or third within an article (leading)

Giuliani is the most prominent quoted participant in coverage, overall, which suggests that he is the central participant in the controversy coverage. However,

since newspaper readers often read only the first few sentences or paragraphs of an article, quotation order within articles offers another important variable for assessing prominence. For instance, if Giuliani were the most often quoted, but he was never quoted first, second, or third within an article, then any claim to his prominence would be compromised.

With one minor exception, Giuliani is the most quoted speaker in the first, second, and third positions for all three newspapers. The exception is for the second position in the *New York Post*, where scare quotes are the most common, closely followed by Giuliani. Lehman and scare quotes are also prominent in leading quotations, along with painting vandal Dennis Heiner, in the case of the *New York Post*. In the coverage corpus, the tendency to be quoted often seems correlated with the tendency to be quoted early.

Analysis of leading quotation text by most quoted participants
Stylebooks and news writing textbooks recognize direct quotations as crucial sites of liability and authority for journalists. Beyond the general journalistic criterion of newsworthiness, textbooks encourage journalists to directly quote discourse on the basis of two criteria: level of controvertability and the liveliness of the speaker's expression (Fox, 2001). For instance, Fox emphasizes the importance of direct quotations in the case of controversial statements:

'*Direct quotes are especially important in stories that hinge on controversial or inflammatory statements. By providing a full quotation of the statement in question, writers protect themselves from the charge that their leads inaccurately interpret the speaker's words*' (Knight, 2003).

Knight explains that ordinary statements do not require direct quotation. He writes, 'There is no reason to make a direct quote from a mundane informational statement – I was born in a hospital in Tacoma, Washington – but if the quotation has some life to it, try to get it verbatim' (Fox, 2001). Many strings of discourse satisfy both criteria. Controversial statements, after all, tend to be lively simply for being controversial. Of course, there are news stories that do not report on controversy. In these stories, the liveliness criterion will dominate. In these cases, Fox recommends quoting discourse that is 'striking or emphatic' (Siegal & Connolly, 1999).

These criteria resonate in the coverage of the Brooklyn Museum controversy. We have seen that Giuliani dominates the direct quotations in the coverage corpus. One likely reason for this is his role as an entitled political speaker and authorized

participant, a crucial factor in journalists' source selection (Roshco, 1975). In addition to his social primacy and political entitlement, however, I investigate here his specific language, the language that journalists chose to quote directly, as a way to learn something more about his dominance of quotation in coverage. Since the leading quotation is the one most often seen by readers, who rarely read entire newspaper articles, here I analyze leading quotations by the Mayor. The most conspicuous term in Giuliani's leading quotations is 'sick'. Not only do all three papers quote his use of this term often, it is cited regularly over time. The regular quoting of this term is consonant with the quotation criteria from journalistic pedagogy and style proscriptions, as Giuliani offers it as a controversial evaluation of the Sensation exhibit and the Ofili painting. A number of his other leading quotations are also controversial and are 'striking and emphatic', as Fox puts it. *The Daily News* quotes Giuliani as he utters words like 'disgusting', 'perverted', and 'ideology' (Haberman & Barrett, 1999). *The New York Post* quotes his inflammatory comment to a caller to his radio show: 'take some Valium!' (Haberman, 1999). The Post also quotes a particularly strong accusation by Giuliani, who claims that the Brooklyn Museum has 'no compunction about putting their hands in the taxpayers' pockets' (Bumiller, 2001; Niebuhr, 1999). *The New York Times* quotes the Mayor's strong and emphatic language in strings like 'Catholic-bashing' and 'disgusting' (Barry, 1999). Although all three papers quote a number of controversial or emphatic words or phrases of Giuliani in the leading position, the *New York Times* also quotes his fully realized assertions in a few cases.

3. *Discussion*

In news writing, journalists choose sources based on their access and availability and based on their ability to contribute legitimacy and authority to their narratives. By directly quoting sources, journalists ground their narratives in evidentiary testimony, and add variety to their stories. In addition, direct quotations tend to confer authority on quoted speakers and tend to increase reader acceptance of and agreement with discourse represented within direct quotes. For this reason, participants first leverage their political, economic, and social prominence in order to be chosen as a news source and then benefit from the authority and reader acceptance conferred by having their discourse reproduced verbatim in a newspaper account. For these reasons, totaling his or her direct quotations offer one way of measuring the prominence of a participant as he or she is presented in coverage. The results of the study show that Mayor

Rudolph Giuliani achieves unique prominence as a participant in the coverage of the Brooklyn Museum controversy. In addition, the study reveals that Giuliani's leading quotations tend to qualify as controversial, striking, and emphatic especially in comparison to those of other speakers.

4. *Conclusion*

Many studies of controversy begin with the assumption that it is a dialectical encounter. In conceptualizing controversy this way, they bring a dyadic model of participation to bear on their investigation of cases. That is, they discover that controversy presents an issue with two opposing positions, parties, and/or participants. This is realized through three major strategies that are commonly adopted by controversy analysts: issue-based encampment, participant selection based on entitlement & social primacy, and/or participant selection based on evidence of direct exchange. What all of them have in common is that they use the dialectical encounter as a model and often as a framework for evaluation, and that they background their method of participant selection. This means that analysts must make a number of assumptions about what counts as the issue, or the 'controversy's demand' as Dascal puts it, and who counts as a participant.

Rather than abstract from the media sources from which many analysts find their raw material for analysis, I have foregrounded media texts in order to discover who counts as a participant in the eyes of journalists who covered the Brooklyn Museum controversy. By asking the question about participation in this way, I have aimed to avoid analyst presumptions about the number, kind, or prominence of participants.

Discovering how journalists map the field of participants in a particular case cannot solve the controversy participation problem in any complete way. However, it does offer one way to account for participation empirically, where the alternatives seem to be to ignore the problem or to abstract from received accounts of the event. If researchers remain committed to analyzing controversy as a juvenile or failed dialectical exchange, then participation is unlikely to present itself as a problem. However, if we see controversy as an ill-defined discursive conflict embedded in a variegated institutional, historical, social, and textual environment, participation emerges as an important empirical question.

REFERENCES

Barry, D. (1999, 9- 25). Political memo; on display at city hall, 2 catholics, 2 views. The New York Times, p. 1; Column 2; Metropolitan Desk.

Bumiller, E. (2001, 2- 16). Affronted by nude 'last supper', Giuliani calls for decency panel. The New York Times, p. Column 5; Metropolitan Desk; p. 1.

Dascal, M. (1990). The controversy about ideas and the ideas about controversy. In G. Fernando (Ed.), Scientific and philosophical controversies: Lisboa: Fragmentos.

Dijk, T. A. van (1988). News as discourse. Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Fox, W. (2001). Writing the news: A guide for print journalists (3rd ed.). Ames: Iowa State University Press.

Goodnight, G. T. (1992). Habermas, the public sphere, and controversy. International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 4,3, 243-255.

Goodnight, G. T. (1999). Messrs dinkins, rangel, and savage in colloquy on the african burial ground: A companion reading. Western journal of communication, 63,4, 511.

Haberman, M. (1999, 9- 25). Rudy: Museum board goes out: If the show goes on. The New York Post, p. 004.

Haberman, M. & D. Barrett (1999, 10- 9). Rudy shouts it out with radio caller over museum flap. The New York Post, p. 004.

Knight, R. M. (2003). A journalistic approach to good writing: The craft of clarity (2nd ed.). Ames, Iowa: Iowa State Press.

McGill, L. T. (1999). Brooklyn museum art controversy survey, 1999. Storrs, Connecticut: Center for Survey Research and Analysis, University of Connecticut.

McKeon, R. (1990). Dialogue and controversy in philosophy. In T. Maranhão (Ed.), The interpretation of dialogue (pp. 25-46). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Niebuhr, G. (1999, 10-3). Anger over work evokes anti-catholic shadow, and mary's power as icon. The New York Times, p. 48; Column 41; Metropolitan Desk.

Olson, K. M., & G.T. Goodnight (1994). Entanglements of consumption, cruelty, privacy, and fashion: The social controversy over fur. The quarterly journal of speech, 80,3, 249-276.

Phillips, K. R. (1999). A rhetoric of controversy. Western journal of communication, 63,4, 488.

Roshco, B. (1975). Newsmaking. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Siegal, A. M., & W.G. Connolly (1999). The New York Times manual of style and usage (Rev. and expanded ed.). New York: Times Books.

ISSA Proceedings 2006 – Argumentation At The Swedish Family Dinner Table

1. Introduction

Argumentative competence is a basic communicative skill generally supposed to be acquired through formal training in school. Accordingly, most studies of argumentation among children have been based on discourse samples elicited in semi-formal or experimental pedagogic or clinical settings (see Pontecorvo & Fasolo 1997).

However, in a paper on argumentative discourse in informal discussions between peers in a school situation, Maynard claims that children between five and seven years of age use argumentative techniques in an already quite sophisticated way. Furthermore, language acquisition research gives evidence for considerable argumentative knowledge even before school (Pontecorvo & Fasolo 1997; Viksten Folkeryd 1998). Despite the focus on narratives as the first genre to appear in communication with small children (Snow 1978; Snow & Goldfield 1983; c. f. Pontecorvo & Fasolo 1997) caregiver experience as well as observations of conversations between parents and children suggest that family discourse may be an important context for emerging argumentative strategies (Pontecorvo & Fasolo 1997; Wiksten Folkeryd 1998, Wallgren Hemlin 2001). Focusing on family disputes, Wiksten Folkeryd shows for example rudimentary skills in children from one year and six months, in expressing both points of view and opinions. However, except for those mentioned above (i. e. Pontecorvo & Fasolo 1997; Viksten Folkeryd 1998), there still seems to be surprisingly few studies of family discourse as a context for argumentative development. The fact is that studying argumentation in family discourse may be of interest not only for revealing the ontogenesis of argumentation but also for theoretical considerations: the irregular, illogical and often incoherent structures emerging in these natural discourse situations indeed put a challenge to current argumentative theories and

models of analysis.

The study to be presented here is focused on argumentative exchanges during dinner conversations in twenty families with school children in the age range 6-17 years. By using a model of analysis adapted to argumentation occurring in informal conversation, I wanted to 1) describe certain recurrent argumentative features in the context of family discourse and 2) find out whether and how argumentative structures differ with the ages of the participating children. The study thus takes a developmental, non-evaluative (c. f. Vuchinich 1990) perspective and is primarily descriptive (c. f. Felton & Kuhn 2001), though governed by a model, basing model construction and analyses on a corpus of video recordings (c. f. Viksten Folkeryd 1998).

Methods

1. Data generation

Twenty Swedish families with one to four children of school age (7 – 17 years) were divided into two groups, depending on the children's age spans. In both groups, at least one child was aged 10-12 years (mean age 10;8 and 10;9 respectively), referred to as the target child, but the families of group A included siblings who were younger (6-9, mean age 7;3) than the target child, while the families of group B included siblings who were older (13-17, mean age 13;9).

In each family, one dinner table conversation was entirely recorded (average duration: seventeen minutes; see further Brumark 2003). Verbal utterances and non-verbal expressions of all participants, having a clear communicative function relevant to the conversation as judged by two researchers, were identified and transcribed. Selected parts of the transcriptions were checked against the video recording by two researchers familiar with the actual transcription methods. The reliability of this check amounted to 85% of the compared transcripts.

For the segmentation of the recorded conversations, the basic unit of turn was preferred to that of move (c.f. Maynard 1985) or speech act (Grice 1975), the former allowing for a thorough analysis of the interactive as well as the argumentative structure without regarding it as a logically constructed game.

Exchange refers to two or three part discourse, comprising at least two turns but generally three or four (i. e. two adjacent pairs of four turns) held together and delimited by a main topic (macro-theme) or referential focus and a main function or communicative aim (c. f. game in Linell & Gustavsson 1987, Linell 1998). An argumentative exchange according to the model presented in section 2.2 should entail a disagreement between at least two parties and a follow-up consequence

of this disagreement consisting of at least one turn.

Sequence refers to two or more exchanges, held together and delimited by a main topic (macro-theme) or referential focus, a main function or aim (c. f. local sequence in Linell 1998). An argumentative sequence contains at least one argumentative exchange but may comprise an indefinite number of exchanges, of which not more than one has to be argumentative. In table 2, an overall picture shows the extent to which argumentations appeared in the two family groups.

2.2. Descriptive model of argumentation

Applied to informal conversations characterised by "interaction in which opinions give rise to spontaneous, dialogic and developed disagreements in the form of direct responses" (Wirdenäs 2002, p. 70), traditional argumentative theories and models reveal a number of shortcomings (c. f. Felton & Kuhn 2001, Wirdenäs 2002). First, the rather weak arguments of everyday discussions would be regarded as failures or fallacies according to the normative view inherent in these logical approaches. Second, the argumentative structure is conceived as context-free and general (van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1992). Third, the perspective is largely speaker-based, considering listeners foremost as guarantors for the relevance and validity of the arguments used.

Thus, the kind of interactive argumentative structures occurring in family discourse at the dinner table required tools of analysis modified and adjusted to the material. The structural model to be presented here is partly anchored in earlier theoretical and empirical research (for instance the pragma-dialectical approach of van Eemeren et al 1986, van Eemeren & Grooendorst 1992; Weger 2002) but has been elaborated to account for such aspects of everyday argumentation as *simplicity* with regard to structure, *complexity* of multiparty interaction and conversation, *dependence* on the context of situation and activity and *diversity and mixture of subgenres* occurring in informal discourse. This elaboration is based on earlier study of childrens´s arguments (e. g. Maynard 1985) and on more recent research within the field of discourse analysis on argumentation in family and school context (e. g. Pontecorvo & Fasolo 1997; Viksten Folkeryd 1998, Wirdenäs 2002).

2.2.1. Structural simplicity and interactional complexity

First, the model had to suit the *structure* of informal multi party discourse. Accordingly, minimally *three* but generally *four turns* (c. f. the four stages in van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1992) constitute a basic *argumentative exchange*

between at least two parties. However, an infinite number of exchanges may build up sequences held together by one topic or different aspects of a main topic.

The first step, the *first standpoint,* initiates the argumentation – on the condition that it triggers an opposition from another party. The second step, the opposition or the *second standpoint,* establishes the *disagreement* between parties or against a third party within or outside the context (c. f. Wiksten Folkeryd 1998; Wirdenäs 2002). The standpoints on both sides may be rephrased and iterated (Wiksten Folkeryd 1998).

In order to count as an argumentative exchange, the disagreement, whether rephrased or not, should however be followed by a *developing expansion* through backing arguments (c. f. Wiksten Folkeryd 1998; Wirdenäs 2002).

The *conclusion* generally finishes the argumentative exchange but may be absent in those cases where the disagreement continues but argumentation is dissolved for example by one party yielding (c. f. Maynard 1985, Wiksten Folkeryd 1998). The following example illustrates a rudimentary form of an argumentation, where the indirect opposition is triggered by a non-verbal action (see further 2.2.2.) and the expansion consists of one argument, which is put into doubt in an ironic conclusion:

(1)
The child puts bacon on her mother's plate – *initiation (standpoint 1)*
Mother: Oh, why don't you want it? – *opposition (standpoint 2)*
Child: I don't know. I just don't feel like it. – *expansion (argument 1)*
Mother: That's why you took so much is it? – *conclusion*
Well, have one of these instead.
(Points at a pancake)

As mentioned above, the standpoints may be iterated, as in example (2) below:

(2)
The father wants his son to eat what is served for dinner

Father: You have to eat the hamburger as well. – *initiation (standpoint 1)*
Child: No. *opposition – (standpoint 2)*
Father: Yes. *iterations – (standpoint 1)*
Child: I don't want to. – (standpoint 2)
Father: You have to. *(standpoint 1)*

Child: No, I don't like hamburgers. *Expansion (standpoint 1)*
I only like real meat. *(argument 1 + backing)*

However, if the opposition and the standpoints are not followed by an expansion through one or more arguments, as in example (2) above, the exchange does not meet the traditional criteria for an argumentation. This is the case in example (3), where father and son repeat their standpoints without backing them by (relevant) arguments (c. f. Viksten Folkeryd 1998: "argumentation without support"):

3)
The child is supposed to wake early for an important hockey match.

Father: Are you tired, son? Will you be able to get up at six o'clock tomorrow – *initiation – (standpoint 1)*
Child: No.- opposition – *(standpoint 2)*
Father: Yes. – *(standpoint 1)*
Child: No. – *(standpoint 2)*
Father: Yes. No. Yes …. I'll see to it, even if I have to drag you out of bed! – *(standpoint 1+argument?)*

A opposition has been established, the expansion may consist of just one supportive argument, followed or not by backing support. But the expansion may be developed in infinity by iterations (Wiksten Folkeryd 1998) of standpoints and support for standpoints, or extensions through digressions toward new aspects or arguments related to the main topic.

Occasionally, oppositions or standpoints and backing arguments may be integrated in one and the same turn, as in the following example, where the mother's opposition and backing of her standpoint is expressed in two utterances (marked by italics) within the same turn:

(4)
The ice cream van can be heard from outside elicitation

Child: Can I have an ice cream from the ice cream van ? – *initiation (standpoint 1)*
Mother: *Not today, love. – opposition (standpoint 2)*
We bought one last time and it's enough with one a month.- (argument 2)
Child: (Whines)

On the other hand, one structural element may emerge through interaction between two or more parties. In the example (11) in Results, the opposition is for example produced in *collaboration* between the two older siblings in this family.

2.2.2. Dependence on situational context

Second, compared to most previous theoretical and empirical studies of argumentation (for instance van Eemeren & Grootendorst 1992) this model implies an explicit reliance on the impact of *context*. Thus, the situational context of family dinner frames (c. f. Goffman 1974; Linell 1998) and determines what kind of communication is accepted at the dinner table. Generally speaking, the implicit rules governing the western middle class dinner allow two main kinds of communication at the table: *instrumental talk*, monitoring or regulating the main activity and *non-instrumental conversation* for more social purposes (Blum-Kulka 1997). These two types of dinner talk form the *conversational contexts* of argumentative exchanges and sequences.

As pointed out in the outline of the structure (2.2.1.), the context may however as well be integrated as part of the *argumentative structure* itself. In his by now classical study, Maynard (1985) also argues for the importance of consideration of contextual aspects and non-verbal behaviours when studying the elicitation of a dispute (c. f. Eisenberg & Garvey 1981).

This means that the initiation or initial standpoint may be *elicited* by anything in the conversational or situational context (c. f. Wiksten Folkeryd 1998).

The elicitation, as well as the initiation, may be *non-verbal* or presupposed by circumstances in the context (c. f. Maynard 1985), as in the example (4), where an incident outside the window elicits the first standpoint, and in the example (1), where the first standpoint is made non-verbally. The difference between elicitation and initiation is the degree of communicative intentionality (c. f. example (4) and (1), where there seems to be no communicative intention behind the action).

The initial step may thus consist of non-verbal expressions or triggering aspects in the context but they become a triggering initiation only through a following reaction or opposition, as a result of an antagonist regarding it as inviting opposite standpoints (see Wirdenäs 2002). Like the initiation, however, the opposition may be present or represented by a third party in or outside the context.

2.2.3. Diversity and mixture of sub-genres

Third, contrary to for example Wiksten Folkeryd (1998), who following the distinction made by Schiffrin (1985), talks about argumentation as a non-narrative discourse genre (Wiksten Folkeryd 1998, p.89), this study regards argumentation as delimited conversational sequences of varying length, integrated within a number of different genres and sub-genres (c. f. Wirdenäs 2002).

Exchanges and sequences of exchanges may thus appear as incoherent by including other types of conversational exchanges into the argumentation (c. f. Sacks et al 1974; Schegloff 1990; Linell 1998). Exchanges disrupting the coherence of an argumentative sequence may be of any kind. Adjacency pairs (Garvey 1979), clarifying or clearing up misunderstandings regarding the argumentation, are however accounted for as part of the argumentative exchange. On the other hand, a coherent argumentative exchange may be integrated in other kinds of conversation, as in example (5) below (argumentation represented by italics):

(5)
The mother wants her son to eat some vegetables

Mother: What are you going to do now? *Have some cabbage?*
Child: No.
Mother: Yes, you need it. It's good for you.
Child: You're wrong.
Mother: So?
Child: So what?
Mother: What are you going to do now?
Child: Play on the computer.
Mother: That makes a change!
(Ironically)

Furthermore, depending on function, structure and the presumed goal of a given sequence, different sub-categories of argumentative exchanges may be distinguished. In this study, I will focus on three *sub-genres*, here termed disputation, deliberation and negotiation (c. f. Brumark 2003).

Disputation, corresponding to the rhetorical notion epistemic (scientific knowledge), typically deals with general phenomena, about which we may have different opinions. The implicit purpose of a disputation is primarily to contrast different theoretical standpoints and to try to convince the other party by using

relevant arguments, without any intention to reach a consensus. Moreover, the standpoints may be hypothetical and need not arise from true involvement. Disputation typically concerns more theoretical or hypothetical questions about which the participants may have different opinions (see example (8) in Results).

Deliberation (Englund 2000), corresponding to the rhetorical notion phronesis (practical judgement), appears as a kind of exploring discussion, characterized by the presentation of different standpoints, met by tolerance and respect (Englund 2000). A deliberation is often related to practical problems in the immediate context and has the attainment of consensus as its collective ambition or goal. Deliberation is thus generally concerned with practical problem-solving and is thus oriented towards the future.

Negotiation, corresponding to the rhetorical notion *techné* (instrumental skills), resembles interaction within commercial contexts. According to Wagner (1995), negotiating activity "is a conversational activity in which speakers may engage when proposals are not accepted." (Wagner 1995, cited in Öberg 1995, p.17). Wagner furthermore points to the differences between negotiation in ordinary conversation and business negotiation, where participants have to reach an agreement. But even in ordinary conversation, negotiation often has the goal of reaching agreement and making one of the parties submit to a mutual decision and then conform to the practical consequences of that decision.

Table 1. Length of recordings,
Number, mean number and percentage of turns, utterances and argumentative turns

Family group	A	B
Length of recordings	9-25	9-20
Mean length of recordings	17	17.77
Number of turns	2354	2751
Mean number of turns	261.6	250
Number of utterances	2743	3502
Mean number of utterances	304.8	318.4
Number of utterances/participant	85.6	83.2

Table 1

Results

3.1. Basic quantitative data

As a preliminary measure, turns and utterances made by all family members in the groups were identified and calculated (*table 1*). Non-linguistic as well as linguistic contributions were analysed in relation to the previous and subsequent conversational context.

As might be expected, the number of argumentative sequences, exchanges and turns differed considerably between the family groups (table 2). The total frequency of argumentative sequences amounted to 40, of which 24 appeared in the families with older children compared to 16 sequences in those of younger children.

Further, the sequences seem to be longer in the family group of older children if the number of argumentative exchanges/sequence were included. This family group also produced considerably more turns per argumentative sequence (*table 2).*

3.2. Descriptive analysis

3.2.1. Dependence on situational context

Table 2. Number of argumentative sequences (AS), exchanges (AE) and turns

Family group	A	B
Number of AS	16	24
%	40	60
Mean number of AE/AS	4.1	5.8
Mean number of turns in AS	9.9	17.5
Number of turns/groups		
Mothers	68	147
%	31.6	68.4
Fathers	13	22
%	37.1	62.9
Children	78	250
%	23.8	76.2

Table 2

As already suggested by the examples in the outline of the model of analysis, the situational context or frame (Goffman 1974) is of crucial importance when analysing informal discourse. In the twenty table conversations studied, the impact of the situational context on argumentative exchanges was most obvious in instrumental talk where the focus was on the dinner activity.

A comparison between family groups, furthermore, revealed considerable differences between the age groups (table 3). In the family group with younger children, most of the argumentation occurred within instrumental conversation, i. e. concerning the activity of eating, including comments on food and table manners (in 13 out of 16 sequences). Examples (1) to (5) show typical argumentative sequences within instrumental conversation in the families with younger children.

The family group of older children showed the reverse pattern, where 5 sequences out of 19 appeared in instrumental talk. Example (6) shows how joint planning within the family may be argumentative:

(6)
Family group B

Mother: Now I'm going to pack your things. Dad will be here to collect us at quarter-past seven.
Child 1: Half-past six.
Child 2: What?
Child 1: Half- past six.
Child 2: Half-past six?
Child 1: He's collecting us at half-past six. He told me.
Mother: No.
Child 1: Yes. He was going to take S home and then collect us.
Child 2: Tonight?
Mother: He said quarter-past nine.
Child 2: Tonight?
Mother: Mmm …

Table 3. Conversational context

Family group	A	B
Conversational context		
Instrumental	13	5
%	72.2	27.8
Non-instrumental	3	19
%	13.6	86.4

Table 3

3.2.2. Diversity and mixture of genres and sub-genres
The incoherence resulting from disrupting and disrupted exchanges and the diversity of argumentative sub-genres in the twenty dinner conversations questions the concept of argumentation as a clearly defined and coherent genre in informal discourse (Bahktin 1986; Wiksten Folkeryd 1998). The results of my study show for instance how narratives may include argumentative parts, as illustrated in example (7) below.

(7)

A mother is telling a story, but her son comes with objections

Child: You'd forgotten I had to go to school.
Mother: I hadn't.
Child: You hadn't set the alarm.
Mother You know what happened.
Child: You hadn't set it 'cos you thought it was weekend.
Mother: What time did the alarm clock say when you woke up?
Child: My watch said umm..
Mother: Half past ten (speaks very quietly).
Child: Your watch said half past ten, mine said quarter to seven (smiles significantly)
and when I woke you up you said: "But it's weekend."
Mother: Did I?
Child: Yes. (Mother and child laugh)

This example represents a very common type of family narrative found in my material: a dispute arises about a narrated incident. This argumentation is framed by a non-instrumental conversational context, the purpose of which seems primarily to establish a common understanding of a joint experience. On the other hand, there were also narratives illustrating standpoints or claims, integrated into other genres.

As for the three sub-genres considered, some specific observations can be made. *Deliberation,* generally concerned with how to handle a problem practically in the future, occurred mostly among older children and could be quite lengthy.

Disputation, typically concerning more theoretical or hypothetical questions, seemed relatively rare in the twenty families studied, at least in families with younger children (table 4). The argumentative exchanges in example (8) below might, however, count as a disputation, though within an instrumental context on a fairly concrete and trivial topic.

(8)
Family group A

Mother: Was that a fart?
Child 2: No (laughing).
Mother: That was a fart. I heard a noise.

Child 2: No (laughs).
Mother: Yeah, yeah (laughs).
Child 2: No it was a burp but I made it sound like a fart.
Mother: OK, so it sounded like a fart.
Child 2: But it was a burp.

Negotiation appeared frequently in the immediate instrumental conversational context regarding the mealtime activity in the family group of younger children, more seldom in the group of older children (table 4). Negotiation seemed to arise when the adult wanted the child to behave properly at the dinner table, eat what was served and not leave until everybody was finished (as in the example (13) below).

In both family groups, opposition to the child's proposals or requests sometimes gave rise to negotiations, as in the example (9) below, from family group B. In this sequence, the ten-year-old child wanted her mother to peel her potatoes. Her fourteen-year-old sister supports the mother in this negotiation by referring to the age of the younger child (c. f. Goodwin 1983).

(9) Family group B

Child 1: Can you peel my potato?
Mother: No I can't. You can peel it yourself.
Child 2: You're ten and can't peel a potato.
Mother: Look, you have to peel it yourself.
Child 1: No, you peel it.
Mother: Here's somebody who can peel her own potato.
Child 2: You have to peel your own potato in school, don't you?
Child 2: If you know how to do it, then show everybody.
Child 1: No, it's already peeled in school.
Child 2: What – your potatoes are peeled these days?
Child 1: Yes.
Mother: That can't be true can it?
Child 2: All the goodness disappears when you peel potatoes.
Mother: Maybe, but I don't think they can manage.
Child 1: Yes, we can.
Child 2: They do it for us sometimes as well but I don't know why 'cos the only thing that happens is that they cook them too long and they get all hard and thick,

like an extra layer of peel. Disgusting!

This negotiation continues for another couple of turns and is reiterated two sequences later. As in this example, negotiations in family group B arise exclusively between adults and younger siblings.

Table 4. Argumentative and structural types of AS

Family group	A	B
Argumentative type		
Disputation	2	7
%	12.5	29.2
Deliberation	2	10
%	12.5	41.6
Negotiation	12	7
%	75	29.2

Table 4

3.2.3. Interactional complexity and structural simplicity

A comparison between the groups revealed no obvious differences regarding the distribution of the steps of initiation, opposition and conclusion, which supports the claim of Maynard (1985) of structural skills being fairly developed at an early age. However, the argumentative exchanges and sequences in both groups provided interesting examples of interactional complexity on the one hand and structural simplicity on the other.

As mentioned in the outline of the model of analysis, initiation was sometimes produced through collaboration between adult and child, or between children, illustrated by the example below, where a discussion of a TV program gives rise to a new sequence of argumentative character. The mother begins by taking part in the initiation but proceeds by bringing about an opposition:

(10)
Family group B

Mother: Was it not x we saw? All the episodes put together as a film. A whole weekend.

Table 5. Distribution of child initiations, oppositions, expansions and conclusions [1]

Family group	A	B
Initiations[2]		
Mother	6	9
Father	2	
Children	8	11
Collaboration		4
Oppositions		
Mother	5	6
Father	5	5
Children	6	11
Collaboration		2
Conclusions		
Mother		4
Father		2
Children		2
Collaboration		1

Table 5

Child 1: A very long film.
Mother: Yeah.
Child 1: A very, very long twelve hours.
Mother: Come on, the episodes weren't that long.

This argumentation goes on for two more exchanges.

The opposition, providing the second and opposite standpoint, was either (and quite often) expressed as a naked denial or as a more elaborated repudiation, sometimes by adding the first backing argument (as in example (9), if the second utterance in the second turn is analysed as an argument). The opposition could also be more indirect or produced in collaboration between two or more participants (like the initiation). In the following example, the mother (family group B) suggests a film to see together with her four children of different ages:

(11)
Family group B

Mother: Let's see if we can watch Tarzan.
Child 1: Tarzan!?
Child 3: (uttered with a sigh of disgust)

This argumentation continues and finishes five exchanges later by the youngest son coming to his mother's rescue and by the older siblings deciding to go to see another film.

Occasionally, initiation and opposition were elicited by a non-verbal action, obviously not intended to be an initiation (c. f. Maynard 1985), as in the following example (c. f. example (2) in the outline of the model):

(12)
Family group B

Child: (Takes garlic with her own fork)
Mother: You don't eat it like that.
Child: Well, I do.
Mother: That's not very nice. Now you are putting it down again.
Here, take mine and put some on your plate will you.
Can you manage that?

This dispute continues for some more exchanges.

Expansion, constituting the argumentation proper, could be distinguished as just one argument but generally by more than one, backing different standpoints. The expansion may be prolonged, not only by the elaboration of arguments but also by iterations of standpoints (c. f. Viksten Folkeryd 1998). Thus, the expansion step of the argumentative sequences varied considerably in length, though tending to be most elaborated in the family group of older children. The size of the expansions depended, not only on the production of arguments and iterations of standpoints, but also on moving toward sub-aspects of the main topic or other kinds of digressions (for an extensive analysis of modified polarity, see Viksten Folkeryd 1998). In the example (13), the negotiating sequence begins by the child's request to leave the table, opposed by the mother's suggestion that she should stay for a dessert.

The digression arises from a successive shift of the focus from the child's preference for chocolate instead of grapes to the question of her actual liking for grapes (a negotiation of the pole to use the expression of Viksten Folkeryd 1998) and finally toward the need for other dishes for dessert (a distraction according to Viksten Folkeryd 1998):

(13)
Family group B

Mother: You can have some chocolate after. First you have to have some grapes.

Child: Oh, how many?

Mother: We have quite a lot so you can have as many as you want.

Child: Five at the most.

Mother: What?

Child: Five at the most and then I want some chocolate.

Mother: (Laughs) But I thought you liked grapes.

Child: Yes, but …

Mother: Take a small one first.

Child: But …

Mother: But first you need a clean plate.

Child: Can't I have the chocolate first and the grapes after?

Mother: No, first the grapes and then the chocolate.

Child: But …

Mother: But I thought we could have a small dessert.

Child: But …

Mother: Here …

Child: Not so much.

Mother: No, no. But, I have to get some small plates.

Maybe we can use the ones we already have, even if they are a bit dirty.

The mother's purpose is obviously to coax the child to submit without raising her voice. It is worth noting that such strategies were quite frequently used by the adults in these dinner conversations.

Reaching a conclusion accepted by both parties was not necessary for the argumentation to finish (c. f. Viksten Folkeryd 1998) and actually seldom occurred (see table 6). Argumentative sequences typically finished by participants moving towards another topic or just dropping the topic due to lack of more arguments or out of a wish to withhold argumentation (thus defusing the argumentation to use the term of Maynard 1985). One way of defusing argumentation seemed to be distraction by suggesting new associations away from the main issue (c. f. Viksten Folkeryd 1998, c. f. mitigating in Eisenberg and Garvey, 1981). In example (14) the argumentation starts by a negative judgement made by an older sibling about her younger sister's bandy coach and finishes by a positive estimation of the players by the father, which turns the discussion toward another issue:

(14)

Family group B

Child 3: Their coach seems completely mad.
Child 2: I don't want
Child 3: Their coach seems completely mad.
"Go for the ball, go for the ball, go for the ball." (He says)
Father: You can't say that, really.
Child 3: Oh yes I can, because he is.
Child 4: But it's the first time and they have to learn.
Father: They already have. At least I think so.
I think they can stay in position much better.

Discussion and conclusion
4.1. Discussion of methods
As pointed out in the theoretical framework, the lack of usable tools for empirical observations of argumentation in naturally situated discourse between more than two participants of different ages necessitated the construction of a suitable model of analysis. This model, however, met with both practical and theoretical problems, despite being adapted to the empirical data of the present study.

Looking at argumentation from an interactionist perspective, discerning the argumentative structure can hardly be done with exact precision (as pointed out by Viksten Folkeryd 1998) since the different parts of the structure collapse, change places, and also are repeated and sometimes indirectly expressed. In addition, both elicitations and initiations often consist of non-verbal expressions or contextual features (Maynard 1985). Participants simultaneously assume the roles as both speaker and listener and may modify or even give up positions during the process of argumentation. These and other anomalies have to be considered and the question arises whether structural coherence even exists in natural discourse. Another problem indicated by for instance Maynard (1985) is the researcher's constant need for inference through semantic as well as pragmatic interpretation. Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992) require the analysis to be based on externalization i. e. considerations restricted to the explicit commitments of the participants. However, this method seems difficult to apply in analysing the discourse exhibited in family dinner conversations where so much is conveyed implicitly, by subtle contextual clues. Furthermore, since this study had the aim of distinguishing developmental differences, a normative, though not idealizing, perspective was to some extent implied. The question to be

posed then is whether structural coherence is preferable and thereby unmarked, whereas incoherence would be the marked case. However, incoherence is common in more interactionally complex argumentation. On the other hand, other developmental aspects, such as length of sequences may be a consequence of mere iteration of standpoints and repetitions of arguments, thus not reflecting a more developed argumentation. Finally, certain aspects considered in this study are not exclusively argumentative but rather belong to the conversation as a social exchange and thus perhaps do not reflect the argumentative skills of the children. On the other hand, argumentation within conversation is naturally embedded in conversational structures and is thus difficult to separate from this structural framework.

As mentioned in methods, the study included twenty monolingual middle class Swedish families from one area south of Stockholm. The homogeneity of the families with regard to social backgrounds as well as attitudes regarding conversation at the table and family socialization was checked by questionnaires. However, in spite of this, the internal communication structures and relations proved to differ considerably. Further, the data was based on only one recording of approximately seventeen minutes in each family, and this might have affected the results.

4.2. Discussion of results

With the reservations mentioned, the quantitative findings nevertheless suggest clear differences between the family groups with regard to most of the variables studied. But, as pointed out in the results section, certain variables were not independent. More frequent and extensive argumentative sequences in family group B most likely were due to the frequency of turns and exchanges on the whole. And, even if comparing percentages, the larger amount of argumentative sequences would cause a greater variation of conversational contexts and types. Furthermore, the different argumentative types were related to the different contexts, though not to the extent expected (e. g. disputation).

The findings also showed a tendency toward coherence within argumentative sequences, except for intrusions of repair exchanges and short instrumental exchanges related to the dinner activity. This circumstance could speak in favour of treating argumentation as a genre. But, on the other hand, short argumentative exchanges were often intermixed within other types of conversational structures, such as co-narration.

Most of the results regarding the developmental differences were to be expected. The poverty of the arguments used by the children, as well as by the adults was, however, unexpected, given earlier findings (Viksten Folkeryd 1998). As mentioned above, there was seldom more than one argument, which was repeated though modified. Perhaps the lack of conscious argumentative purpose resulted in the low ambition to elaborate arguments.

The similarity between family groups with regard to argumentative structure (except for length) was also unexpected. In one respect group B differed, by producing conclusions in almost one third of the argumentative sequences. The argumentative sequences within family group A lacked conclusions, a finding that might reflect a formal training among the older children (although the parents were responsible for 75 % of the conclusions).

4.3. Concluding remarks

Despite the methodological problems discussed above, this study might contribute by empirical validation of argumentative theory in some respects. First, the *dependence* on the context of situation and activity on the argumentative exchanges appears clearly, not only with regard to emerging sub-genres but also with regard to the structure. Second, the analyses of the argumentative sequences reveal a *diversity and mixture of argumentative subgenres*, though with a tendency toward coherence within the exchanges. Third, the *complexity* of multiparty interaction and conversation, as well as the participation of children of different ages appear to favour *simplicity* of argumentative structure and arguments. Finally, the model of analysis used proved to catch developmental aspects fairly well.

NOTES
[1] Due to the small number of items, the results are represented as factual frequencies
[2] Elicitations were not considered part of the argumentative structure
Expansions were not calculated but submitted to a qualitative analysis below
Conclusions appeared seldom

REFERENCES
Bakhtin, M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. C. Emerson and M. Holquist (Eds.), Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press
Blum-Kulka, S. (1997). *Dinner talk. Cultural patterns of Sociability and Socialization in Family Discourse.* Lawrence Erlbaum, Mahwah, NJ.

Brumark, Å. (2003). Democracy starts at the dinner table. *Working Papers*. Södertörn University college, Huddinge.

Eisenberg, A. and Garvey, C. (1981). Children´s use of verbal strategies in resolving conflicts. *Discourse Processes* 4:149-70.

Englund, T. (2000). *Deliberativa samtal som värdegrund – historiska perspektiv och aktuella förutsättningar*. Stockholm: Statens skolverk.

Felton, M. & Kuhn, D. (2001). The Development of Argumentative Discourse Skill. *Discourse Processes*, 32 (2&3), 135-153

Garvey, C. (1979). Contingent Queries and Their Relations in Discourse. In E. Ochs and B. Schieffelin (Eds.) *Developmental Pragmatics*. Academic Press: New York.

Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In: Cole, P and Morgan, J (Eds), *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech acts*, Academic Press, New York (1975), pp. 41-58.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodwin, M. H. (1983). Aggravated correction and disagreement in children`s conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, VII (6).

Linell, P. (1998). *Approaching dialogue: talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives.* John Benjamins Publishing Co: Amsterdam.

Linell, P. & Gustavsson, L. (1987). *Initiativ och respons: Om dialogens dynamic, dominans och coherens.* SIC 15. Linköping: Department of Communication Studies.

Mac Whinney. (1991). *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Maynard, D., W. (1985). How children start arguments. *Language in Society*, 14, 1-29.

Pontecorvo, C. & Fasulo, A. (1997). Learning to argue in family dinner conversation: the reconstruction of past events. In L. Resnick, R. Saljo & C. Pontecorvo (Eds.), *Discourse tools and reasoning.* Berlin: Springer Verlag.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organisation of turn-taking in conversation. *Language 50* (1974), pp. 696-735.

Schegloff, E. A. (1990). On the organisation of sequences as a source of "coherence" in talk-in-interaction. In Dorval, B. (Ed.) *Conversational Organization and its Development*. Norwood, N.J.:Albex.

Schiffrin, D. (1985). Everyday Argument. The Organization of Diveristy in Talk. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Vol 3, London: Academic Press.

Snow, C. (1978). The conversational context of language acquisition. In R.

Campbell and P. Smith (Eds.) *Recent Advances in the Psychology of Languages*. Plenum Press: New York.

Snow, C. E. & Goldfield, B. A. (1983). Turn the page please: situation specific language acquisition. *Journal of Child Language* 10 (1983), pp. 551-569.

Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R. & Snoeck Henkemans, F. (1986). *Fundamentals of argumentation theory. A Handbook of Historical Backgrounds and Contemporary Developments.* Lawrence Erlbaum Ass. Publishers: New Jersey.

Van Eemeren, F. H. & Grootendorst, R. (1992). *Argumentation, communication and fallacies: a pragma-dialectical perspective.* Hillsdale.

Vuchinich, S. (1990). The sequential organization of closing in verbal family conflict. In: A. D. Grimshaw (Ed.), *Conflict Talk: Sociolinguistic Investigations of Arguments in Conversations.* New York: Cambridge University Press. 118-138

Wagner, J. (1995). What Makes Discourse A Negotiation? In: K. Ehlich and J. Wagner (Eds.) *The Discourse of Business Negotiation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyer.

Wallgren Hemlin, B. (2001). Overall på. *Retorikmagasinet* 2001.

Weger, H. (2002). Violating pragma-dialectical rules in arguments between intimates. In: F. H. van Eemeren (Ed.), Advances in Pragma-Dialectics. Amsterdam: Sic Sat

Wiksten Folkeryd, J. (1998). The Acquisition of Genres: Some findings from an investigation in Swedish families. *RUUL* 33, 89-122.

Wirdenäs, K. (2002). *Ungdomars argumentation. Om argumentationstekniker i gruppsamtal*. Nordistica Gothenburgensia. Acta Universitatis Gothenburensis. Göteborgs Universitet.

Öberg, B-M. (1995). *Negotiation Processes as Talk and Interaction. Interaction Analyses of Informal Negotiations.* Diss, Linköping University, Linköping.

ISSA Proceedings 2006 – Arguments About "Dialogue" In

Practice And Theory

This paper examines arguments appealing to a normative concept of "dialogue" in discourse samples drawn from newspapers, websites and other sources. The analysis identifies normative assumptions that are involved when "dialogue" is used as grounds for assessing, advocating, or opposing some action, or when arguing that dialogue in a relevant sense has certain requirements or that it is a good, necessary, impossible, or bad way to communicate with some particular others or in some type of situation. Having provided an exploratory description of assumptions about "dialogue" in ordinary metadiscourse (practical discourse about discourse), the paper concludes by reflecting briefly on these practical arguments about dialogue from the standpoint of dialogue theory.

1. *Dialogue as a Practical and Theoretical Concept*
The English word "dialogue" has several distinct senses. This paper is concerned with dialogue understood as a normative way for people to communicate with others who are different, a sense in which we can speak of dialogue as occurring, or failing to occur, between nations, ethnic or religious groups, or individuals. This sense of dialogue "represents a common contemporary European concept" that emerged only in the mid-twentieth century (post-World War II) and is perhaps "particularly salient in English, not only in the political and religious contexts but also in many other domains – social, cultural, scientific, etc." (Wierzbicka 2005, pp.7-8). This specific concept of dialogue has no equivalent in many other world languages but has been spreading globally with the use of English as a lingua franca.

According to Wierzbicka's corpus-based semantic analysis, this sense of dialogue refers to a process of reciprocal communication that occurs in a series of episodes over an extended period of time. Participants in dialogue are aware of their differences and are motivated to seek mutual understanding and common ground but not necessarily full agreement or rapprochement. Their attitudes are characterized by mutual respect, good will, and openness to change. Dialogue "usually involves groups of people (or people representing such groups) rather than private individuals," and the term inherently implies a positive evaluation, the "assumption that interaction of this kind can be valuable (constructive,

productive, etc.), that is, that it can lead to something good" (Wierzbicka 2005, p. 6). But, Wierzbicka notes,

"It is not, however, uniformly valued; there are also those who fear that "dialogue" may take the place of genuine discussion and healthy argument, that it may be used to promote relativism and to discourage a search for truth or that it may pursue a perceived need for harmony that is in reality false and phoney rather than based on truth." (p. 20)

Wierzbicka contrasts this ordinary concept with currently prominent theoretical concepts of dialogue such as those attributed to Martin Buber and (mistakenly, she claims) to Mikhail Bakhtin:

"Given the great expectations linked with the word *dialogue* in many philosophical and psychological writings on human relations and the human condition, it is important to recognize that dialogue in the sense explicated here is a relatively modest ideal, which does not imply anything like Bakhtin's "interpersonal communion" or Buber's "I – thou" relationship. It does not imply closeness, intimacy, "heart-to-heart" communication, or even complete frankness and openness. It implies that each party makes a step in he direction of the other, not that they reach a shared position or even mutual warm feelings. It does not imply full mutual understanding or a closeness which no longer requires words." (p. 21)

Wierzbicka appears to assume that these theoretical concepts of dialogue have little or no practical importance, an assumption I do not share. Pointing out that "the meanings of words are social facts which cannot be changed at will by individuals, no matter how prominent," she goes on to argue, "Philosophers can of course use words in idiosyncratic and metaphorical ways (and they often do), but such use has usually little if any impact on the meanings which are shared by whole speech communities" (p. 22). While this is undoubtedly true as a generalization about the resistance of natural languages to intentional change, it does not warrant the assumption that theoretical debates about dialogue have no potential to influence linguistic-communicative practices in society.

True, individual theorists are seldom able to influence society "at will." In a broader view, however, ideas that become prominent in academic and intellectual discourse do sometimes circulate through society and influence everyday concepts and practices. Theoretical concepts that are relevant to practical concerns can be used in practical metadiscourse. For example, some educated

ordinary speakers are able to criticize fallacies in others' arguments, using the technical language of argumentation theory for practical purposes. The potential for this kind of transference from theoretical to practical metadiscourse seems especially strong in the case of a communication-related concept like dialogue, because communication is a topic about which there is considerable public interest and a growing demand for "expert" knowledge (Cameron 2000).

The inherent reflexivity of language-in-use implies a potential for theoretical and practical ideas about communication to interact. The goal of a "practical" communication theory is to exploit this potential by engaging theoretical reflection with practical concerns and normative ideas found in ordinary metadiscourse (Craig 1996, 1999, 2005, 2006). Metadiscourse encodes normative, ideological beliefs about language and communication (Jaworski et al. 2004; Taylor 1997; Verschueren 1999). Wierzbicka's analysis illustrates this point by showing that dialogue (in the sense she discusses) "embodies a certain social ideal" of good communication (p. 22). This normative ideal is not only implicit in everyday uses of the word, it can be advocated explicitly by proponents of dialogue or criticized, as Wierzbicka points out, by those who argue that dialogue promotes relativism or inhibits healthy controversy. Wierzbicka herself participates in this metadiscursive debate by commenting, "there can be great value in dialogue" even though "it can be used as a tool of manipulation, propaganda, or pseudo-communication" (pp. 20-21).

Recent work in the ethnography of communication lends further support to the approach I am advancing. Carbaugh (2005) defends the assumption that ethnographic interpretation can engage with the reflexivity inherent to cultural practices of communication (see p. 6). Katriel (2004) writes, in the introduction to her profound study of dialogue in Israeli culture, "the Israeli quest for authentic dialogue has its roots in ideological and philosophical trends that flourished in Europe in the first part of the twentieth century and became part of mainstream scholarly writings in the second part" (2004, p. 2). These studies suggest that philosophical writings on dialogue and communication should not be assumed irrelevant to ordinary cultural meanings.

Commonplace assumptions about dialogue embedded in ordinary metadiscourse, having been explicitly articulated by scholars, can enter the general intellectual debate where they can become objects of theoretical explication, critique, and revision. Members of the lay public (including students in university courses) who attend to these intellectual debates can be influenced to think and talk differently

about dialogue and to espouse different normative ideals, which may or may not continue to diffuse more widely through society. This is not a process that anyone can actually control, but it is a process in which anyone can participate with more or less reflective intentionality and theoretical sophistication (Craig 1996). Arguments about dialogue in practical metadiscourse thus have proto-theoretical content and carry the potential both to inform and to be informed by intellectual theories of dialogue.

2. *Purpose and Method*

This research does not address a technical problem in linguistics or argumentation theory. It is an exploratory, descriptive study of arguments found in unsystematically gathered samples of contemporary public discourse about "dialogue." I examine claims and assumptions about dialogue and how they are used pragmatically in the discourse samples. My purpose, as explained in the previous section, is to make these practical ideas about dialogue available for analysis and critique by communication theorists, thus contributing to a much-needed dialogue between dialogue theory and praxis.

For this exploratory study, I collected about 50 English language discourse samples over a period of several months in 2005-2006. Along with a few examples encountered accidentally in my daily reading, most were found by using the Google.com and LexisNexis search engines. I did not follow a systematic sampling plan but experimented with various keyword combinations and phrases including the word "dialogue" and browsed the search results for relevant examples (i.e., texts presenting any normative argument about dialogue in a relevant sense). The search word "dialogue" by itself yielded many hits (hundreds on LexisNexis in a six-month time frame, hundreds of millions on Google) but with relatively few usable examples. I also used narrower searches to explore particular themes, such as: "dialogue is needed" (or "… necessary"); "dialogue is impossible" (or "… not possible"); "our dialogue"; "dialogue with my"; "no dialogue"; "seek dialogue", and "'diplomacy has failed' AND dialogue". These narrower searches tended to be more fruitful.

3. *Results*

My study of arguments about dialogue in the discourse samples found a rich array of argumentative premises and assumptions not yet fully analyzed and too numerous to report in detail in this initial paper. The following subsections present selected results focusing on: (3.1) the range of relevant uses of the term

dialogue in comparison to the semantic analysis reported by Wierzbicka (2005); (3.2) argumentative themes that seem to characterize distinct domains of political/international, inter-group/societal, and individual dialogue; and (3.3) themes that occur similarly across domains.

Although I note certain gross patterns of relative frequency and association among themes in my discourse samples, these are only rough qualitative estimates, not based on systematic sampling, coding, or statistical procedures. Qualitative descriptions of the arguments identified in the discourse samples are more securely grounded in the data.

3.1 *Comparison to Wierzbicka* (2005)

Uses of the term dialogue in my discourse samples were generally consistent with Wierzbicka's (2005) semantic analysis, but with at least four qualifications.

First, dialogue most commonly referred to an open-ended process that might occur in episodes over a span of time; however, dialogue also sometimes referred to a single episode that might or might not occur as part of a continuing dialogue, as in the following example:

1. "Watching the recent dialogue between young Singaporeans and Minister Mentor Lee Kuan Yew, I came away with mixed feelings." (Jueh 2006)

Wierzbicka (2005) regards these as two distinct senses of dialogue (discrete episode versus relationship over time). However, I found no noticeable difference in argumentative themes associated with the two senses.

Second, the most frequent contexts of dialogue in my discourse samples were political (especially international), and inter-group or societal (including inter-faith religious dialogue and, most prominently, dialogue between Muslims and other groups within Western societies, a reflection of current events at the time of this study). However, numerous references to dialogue between individuals (spouses, family members, professional colleagues) were easily found in web searches. As will be shown, the three domains of dialogue (political/international, inter-group/societal, and individual) were associated with different argumentative themes in my discourse samples, yet were also knitted together by common themes. I am not convinced that dialogue between private individuals is peripheral or represents an entirely different concept.

Third, discourse about dialogue, especially in non-political contexts, often has

religious and/or therapeutic undertones. Wierzbicka (2005) mentioned religion as one context in which dialogue occurs. What struck me in the discourse samples I examined were the frequent occurrence of relevant examples on religiously oriented websites or embedded in discourse registers recognizably associated with spirituality and/or therapy.

Example 2 illustrates the blending of therapeutic (intimacy, openness, vulnerability) and religious (goodness, love) discourse elements in an argument about the requirements of interpersonal dialogue:
2. "Our intimacy is directly related to our openness and vulnerability with our spouse … We need to regularly take risks in our dialogues, be vulnerable with our spouses and trust in their goodness and their love for us."
(http://www.ematrimony.org/dialogue/3minutebarrier_quinn_20040331.htm)

The example is from eMatrimony.org, a website published by World Wide Marriage Encounter, Inc., an organization whose "mission of renewal in the church and change in the world is to assist couples and priests to live fully intimate and responsible relationships by providing them with a Catholic 'experience' and ongoing community support for such a lifestyle" (http://www.ematrimony.org/resources/wwmemission_secretariat_200307.htm).

Of course, not all mentions of interpersonal dialogue are explicitly associated with religion or spirituality, just as not all public discourse about communication uses the term "dialogue." However, discussions of communication presented in markedly religious or spiritual contexts do seem especially likely to focus on dialogue and, in doing so, also to incorporate elements of therapeutic discourse.

This point leads to a fourth qualification to Wierzbicka's analysis of dialogue: Dialogue between individuals or within groups, whether presented in a religious or a secular context, is quite often described as a technique, a structured communication process that follows certain steps and rules. These descriptions of dialogue often appear on websites associated with formal groups or training programs devoted to dialogue.

3. "Dialogue is a structured form of communication between two people. It's an attempt to communicate our feelings to our spouses. Once we begin to understand and accept each other's feelings, our levels of emotional intimacy soar, and our relationship improves dramatically."

(http://www.daughtersofstpaul.com/growinginfaith/lifeways/marriage2.html)

4. "By following some simple guidelines and techniques, you can make the most out of your dialogue."(http://www.wwme.org/rules.html)

5. "Using the structures (and following the guidelines) described above can help lead to the personal transformations that are necessary for progress." (Weissglass 1997)

Examples 3 – 5 all refer to dialogue as a discrete communication episode conducted according to a standardized procedure involving expression of feelings, nonjudgmental listening, and so on—concepts ultimately derived from the domain of therapeutic communication. My discourse samples thus tend to confirm the important influence of therapy on contemporary popular discourse about communication (Cameron 2000).

Wierzbicka might reasonably object that these references to specific procedures of interpersonal dialogue represent a distinct sense or senses of the word that should not be confused with the more frequently occurring sense of public dialogue defined earlier. This is a technical linguistic issue that I am not prepared to address in this paper. However, my study of arguments about dialogue suggests that these various uses of the term represent, if not aspects of a single concept, at least a close family of concepts knitted together by many overlapping themes. (For a critique of Wierzbicka's approach to semantic analysis from a standpoint in argumentation theory broadly compatible with the present analysis, see Rigotti and Rocci 2005.) For purposes of this study, in any case, I have chosen to examine arguments about "dialogue" along this whole range of related senses while also attending carefully to differences across domains.

3.2 *Reasons For or Against Engaging in Dialogue Differ Across Domains*
Many arguments were found either advocating or (less often, but not rarely) opposing dialogue in particular contexts. These arguments tended to cluster into three broad categories that appear to be rather strongly, though not exclusively, associated with the three distinct domains of dialogue mentioned in previous section: dialogue in political contexts (especially international relations), inter-group or societal dialogue (especially involving religious groups), and dialogue between individuals such as spouses, family members, or professional colleagues. In the following subsections I show how arguments in these three domains tended

to be drawn, respectively, from realist, moral, and experiential discourses.

3.2.1 *Political/international dialogue: Appeals to outcomes, interests and power relations (realist discourse)*

References to "dialogue" in political contexts, especially in international diplomacy, occur with great frequency in contemporary public discourse around the world (at least in English). It would be interesting to know more about the history of this usage. Wierzbicka (2005) notes that it emerged only after World War II but does not go into details. In the absence of data, I can only speculate that ideas directly or indirectly attributable to intellectuals such as Martin Buber and Carl Rogers, both of whom became internationally famous in the 1950's and '60's, were somehow drawn into the political domain where dialogue came to be used as a normative ideal for public discourse (on Buber, Rogers, and public dialogue, see Cissna & Anderson 2002). If some such process occurred, however, the idea of dialogue was significantly transformed as it was assimilated into the political domain. Arguments in my discourse samples that refer to dialogue in political/international contexts tended to be couched in a "realist" discourse that has little resemblance (as Wierzbicka points out) to philosophical theories of dialogue.

In what I am calling a realist discourse, arguments for and against dialogue appeal to calculations of interest, power, and consequences. According to these arguments, parties should engage in dialogue with others with whom they are interdependent, and whom, therefore, they cannot afford to ignore, when there is a potential for agreement or cooperation in their mutual interest, and when dialogue is the most effective means to obtain desired results. Parties should not engage in dialogue when it is impossible, ineffective, or in some way against their interests to do so. The following brief examples illustrate realist arguments for (6) and against (7) dialogue.

6. "Calling Japan and the European Union 'natural strategic partners,' the head of the EU's executive body called for a more intensified political dialogue …" (Barroso urges closer Japan-EU ties 2006)

7. "The British Government's policy towards China, a policy of dialogue and 'quiet diplomacy' on human rights, has failed to prevent this crackdown." (Reynolds 1999)

3.2.2 *Inter-group/societal dialogue: Appeals to morality, justice and truth (moral discourse)*

Arguments about political dialogue are not exclusively realist. Political dialogue is sometimes advocated for idealistic reasons, for example, by pacifists who uphold it as a morally preferable alternative to war and violence without regard to calculations of interest. Moral arguments for dialogue may also be the rhetorical tactic of choice for less powerful groups seeking to influence situations dominated by more powerful groups. Political dialogue can also be opposed for moral reasons, for example, because it may tend to compromise essential principles or legitimize an evil opponent (often labeled as "terrorists" in contemporary political rhetoric).

Whereas moral argumentation seems to play a secondary role in the political domain, I found that arguments for and against inter-group or societal dialogue characteristically highlighted moral reasoning, as in the following examples.

8. "The community wants to demonstrate; we haven't because we appreciate that the Canadian and Quebec press have not published these cartoons … Instead, we would like to open a dialogue with our neighbours, in our mosques, to explain who the prophet Muhammad is, why he is important to the community." (Bains 2006)

9. "And interfaith dialogues are the training grounds for us as a group to stop forbidding evil. In an effort to make Islam pleasing to the non-Muslim's eye, we, in effect, distort Islam. We say that it is what it is not." (http://etori.tripod.com/dialogue.html)

The speaker in each example is a Muslim man who argues either for or against dialogue with non-Muslims. The argument for dialogue in (8) appeals to a moral calculus of reciprocity. Muslims in Montreal wanted to demonstrate in protest against the publication by European newspapers of cartoons they regarded as blasphemous; however, they refrained from demonstrating because the Canadian press had refrained from publishing the cartoons. Inspired by this evidence of good faith, they would like to engage their "neighbours" in dialogue.

In the larger web text from which (9) is quoted, the writer does not argue that dialogue per se is evil but argues that inter-faith dialogue too often leads Muslims to misrepresent their faith and compromise their principles. Inter-faith dialogue, therefore, is morally objectionable.

3.2.3 *Individual dialogue: Appeals to personal experience – deeper intimacy, self-change, etc. (experiential discourse)*

Turning, finally, to the domain of dialogue between private individuals, we find both a different characteristic type of arguments for dialogue and a notable absence of arguments against dialogue (of which I found none in my 50 discourse samples). In contrast to the realist discourse that characterizes the political/international domain and the moral discourse that characterizes the inter-group/societal domain, arguments about dialogue in the individual domain typically appeal to personal experience. Earlier examples (2, 3, and 5) as well as the following (10) illustrate how arguments about interpersonal dialogue are couched in this experiential discourse.

10. "Trying to explain a positive gut feeling to someone who wasn't there is always hard so I remained pretty private. Eventually after meeting with Jim and Israel a second time, I discussed my decision to be on Off The Map's 'lost persons panel' with my mother in greater detail which opened up a wonderful dialogue between us that had not previously existed before."
(http://www.off-the-map.org/idealab/articles/idl0303-1-losthappy.html)

The general form of these arguments is that one should make the sometimes difficult efforts required to engage in genuine dialogue (e.g., by disclosing one's true feelings, listening properly, or following recommended guidelines) because doing so will lead to positive experiences such as personal transformation, intimacy, and improved relationships. As noted earlier, this therapeutic kind of communication is not always labeled as dialogue but seems especially likely to be labeled as dialogue in contexts associated with religion or spirituality, as illustrated by (2), (3), (4), and (10).

3.3 *Themes Across Domains*

While arguments about dialogue in the political/international, inter-group/societal, and individual domains tend to draw their premises from different discourses, I also found many argumentative themes that are not strongly associated with any particular domain but seem to apply across domains.

Many of these themes fall under the general heading of normative requirements for dialogue. While reasons for and against engaging in dialogue may differ among domains, arguments assuming that certain normative requirements are essential to genuine dialogue do not differ as markedly from one domain to another. Examples of such requirements found in my discourse samples (but not

illustrated in further detail in this paper) include: clear communication, frankness, mutual respect, lack of anger, courage to speak, good faith, openness to other views and to change, and commitment to continuing the process of communication. Although these requirements may be disputable either in general or in particular situations and may take different characteristic forms in different domains (e.g. structured communication formats in the case of interpersonal dialogue), the underlying principles seem to apply quite generally, reflecting a common normative ideal of dialogue across domains.

Another category that cannot be discussed in detail within the bounds of this paper includes arguments about the possibility of dialogue: reasons why dialogue is either possible or impossible in a given situation. Some of these arguments may be distinctive to particular domains while others occur more generally. An especially interesting line of argument that seems to occur across domains is that a certain critical event creates an "opening" in which it suddenly becomes possible for dialogue to occur. As illustrated in the interpersonal domain by example 10, an act of open disclosure by one party can lead to dialogue. In the political/international domain, gestures or hints indicating one party's interest in dialogue may similarly cause a sudden change in atmosphere that makes a broader dialogue possible. (11) and (12), both examples from the inter-group/societal domain, illustrate another common variation in which an otherwise unfortunate crisis is redeemed by virtue of having created the conditions for a productive dialogue to emerge.

11. "The race riots that have rocked France for the past two weeks have been violent and harmful … But [the crisis] also offers the hope that smart action by the French authorities can calm the situation and hasten the launching of a deep new national dialogue over what it means to be 'French' today." (Cobban 2005)

12. "And if this event allows us to do that and to begin a dialogue in a broader basis … we can have something good come out of that, come out of this event, would be a good thing and that's what we would very much like to do." (NBA Commissioner David Stern 2004)

4. *Conclusion: Implications for Dialogue Theory*
In this concluding section I reflect briefly from the standpoint of dialogue theory, which is not a unified theory but rather a complex field of thought comprising various theoretical approaches (for a recent collection of papers presenting a

range of approaches, see Anderson, Baxter & Cissna 2004). The study of arguments about dialogue in practical discourse suggests several issues that warrant further consideration by dialogue theorists.

First, practical arguments about dialogue are framed in realist, moral, and experiential discourses, whereas dialogue has been theorized primarily in terms of experience, that is, in terms of phenomenology. Are these realist, moral, and experiential discourses of dialogue incompatible with one another? How are they related? Have theories of dialogue adequately accounted for these practical arguments? How should they be assessed and responded to from within the various lines of dialogue theory?

Second, and more specifically, certain tensions either manifestly present in, or notably absent from each of the three discourses require further theoretical analysis. Realist arguments about dialogue manifest a tension between dialogue and interest-power calculations. Dialogue is a good thing in principle but practical decisions to engage in dialogue are influenced by "realist" considerations of interdependence, power imbalances, and projected outcomes and consequences of dialogue. Moral arguments about dialogue manifest a tension between dialogue and moral absolutism. The practice of dialogue, which requires openness to other views and to change, may be judged immoral if it tends to promote compromise on principles that should be upheld absolutely or lends legitimacy to proponents of falsehood or evil. These tensions, which theories of dialogue have largely ignored, suggest practical and moral limits to dialogue that must be negotiated in particular instances.

A third tension that, in contrast, has been much discussed by theorists of dialogue but is notably absent from the discourse samples I have examined, is that between dialogue and technique. The relation of technique to dialogue is controversial in dialogue theory. In some interpretations, the two are radically incompatible because following fixed-in-advance technical procedures and focusing on anticipated outcomes contradict the openness and direct relation to the other that are regarded as essential elements of dialogue. In other interpretations, dialogue relies on skills that can be improved with training and can be facilitated by following certain structured communication formats designed to encourage open expression, listening, consideration of all views, etc. Without reviewing these theoretical arguments about dialogue in further detail, I merely point out that I have found no evidence of this tension in my practical discourse samples. To the extent that techniques of dialogue were mentioned in

my samples (primarily with reference to dialogue among individuals in intimate or professional contexts), they were identified with dialogue per se or regarded as unproblematic means of producing dialogue. Perhaps this is an issue on which practitioners of dialogue have something to learn from theorists, or theorists something to learn from practitioners, or both.

It is that dialogue on "dialogue" in practice and theory that I hope to have advanced in some small measure by means of this research.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R., Baxter, L. A., & Cissna, K. N. (Eds.). (2004). *Dialogue: Theorizing difference in communication studies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bains, S. (2006). Montreal Muslims seek dialogue. *The Gazette* (Montreal), February 6, 2006, Final Edition, p. A4. Retrieved April 24, 2006 from LexisNexis.

Barroso urges closer Japan-EU ties. (2006). *The Daily Yomiuri* (Tokyo), April 22, 2006, p. 2. Retrieved April 24, 2006 from LexisNexis.

Cameron, D. (2000). *Good to talk? Living and working in a communication culture.* London, UK: Sage.

Carbaugh, D. (2005). *Cultures in conversation*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cissna, K. N., & Anderson, R. (2002). *Moments of meeting: Buber, Rogers, and the potential for public dialogue.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Cobban, H. (2005). Europe needs its immigrants. Christian Science Monitor (Boston, MA), November 10, 2005, *Opinion,* p. 9. Retrieved April 24, 2006 from LexisNexis.

Craig, R. T. (1996). Practical-theoretical argumentation. *Argumentation*, 10, 461-474.

Craig, R. T. (1999). Metadiscourse, theory, and practice. *Research on Language and Social Interaction,* 32, 21-29.

Craig, R. T. (2005). How we talk about how we talk: Communication theory in the public interest [2004 ICA Presidential Address]. *Journal of Communication*, 55(4), 659-667.

Craig, R. T. (2006). Communication as a practice. In: G. J. Shepherd, J. St. John & T. Striphas (Eds.), *Communication as ...: Perspectives on theory* (pp. 38-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Jaworski, A., Coupland, N., & Galasinski, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Metalanguage: Social and ideological perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jueh, Dr. E. T. C. (2006). MM Lee's dialogue shows that knowledgeable young Singaporeans are not wise. *The Straits Times* (Singapore), April 22, 2006.

Retrieved April 24, 2006 from LexisNexis.

Katriel, T. (2004). *Dialogic moments: From soul talks to talk radio in Israeli culture.* Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

NBA Commissioner David Stern. Press Conference Announcing Indiana Pacer and Detroit Piston Player Suspensions. November 21, 2004. Retrieved January 9, 2006 from http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/davidsternpressconference.htm

Reynolds, A. (1999). Opinion: Quiet diplomacy has failed. *BBC News*, October 19, 1999. Retrieved September 26, 2005 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/478377.stm

Rigotti, E., & Rocci, A. (2005). From argument analysis to cultural keywords (and back again). In: F. H. v. Eemeren & P. Houtlosser (Eds.), *The practice of argumentation* (pp. 125-142). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Taylor, T. J. (1997). *Theorizing language: Analysis, normativity, rhetoric, history.* Amsterdam-New York-Oxford: Pergamon.

Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Weissglass, J. (1997). Deepening Our Dialogue About Equity. *Educational Leadership*, April 1997, pp. 78-81. Retrieved May 30, 2006 from http://ncee.education.ucsb.edu/articles/deepeningdialogue.pdf

Wierzbicka, A. (2005). The concept of 'dialogue' in cross-linguistic and cross-cultural perspective. *Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association*, New York, May 29.

ISSA Proceedings 2006 – Agonistics Among The Wooden, Democratic And Monarchic Discourses In Contemporary

Bulgaria

The political communication in post Communist Bulgaria reflects trends which are common for all other countries in transition to democracy, like Russia, Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary and others, namely:

1. Democracy is understood as a full consensus in public life rather than as an interplay and competition among various groups, expressing different viewpoints and ideas;

2. Society is still expecting primitive egalitarism as a consequence to the ideological matrix inherited from socialism;

3. Demand-led satisfaction in terms of expectations that the state should meet all the needs of its citizens;

4. The prominent role of the workplace in association with the home, not the local community, as the crucial organizing centre of everyday life;

5. The prevalence of apathy and passivity facing the future;

6. Generalized mistrust of authorizes, elites and media. (1)

The demolition of the communist state machine and the one-party rule in all post communist countries brought about a new type of political discourse, defined by Jacques Derrida as "monstrous". The monster according to the French philosopher is a "figure" composed of heterogeneous organisms, planted one on top of another. At the same time "monstrous is what is happening for the first time and therefore is not yet recognized". It is "something" which still has no name, which however does not mean that the kind or combination, i.e. the hybrid of already familiar kinds is abnormal". (2)

The "monstrous" discourse is connected with the future, i.e. with the unknown, the unexpected, which causes fear with its uncertainty. The power of the monstrous effect corresponds to the strength and contrasts the collision between the desire for change and the fear of the unknown. The reality of transition in which the very foundations of a society are destroyed, i.e. the status quo is done away with, in order to build a new civil society without knowing either its framework, or the methods and the means of achieving it, can be described as monstrous. It is here that the nostalgia and the disappointment of a large section of the population stems from. Experienced in all former communist states, the diversity of idialects became paradoxical and exotic during the last several years

in Bulgaria.(3)

In 2001 Bulgaria shocked the world with three unique events in its political communication. Firstly, the last Bulgarian tsar – Simeon II Saxe Coburg-Gotha returned home after 50 years of exile, organized a political movement named after him in less than two months and won the General Elections gaining absolute majority, thus becoming the first and only King-Prime Minister of a Republic in the world. Soon after the "royal victory" in the autumn of 2001 the Bulgarian public witnessed the success of the Bulgarian Socialist Party (the reformed successor of the Bulgarian Communist Party). Its leader, Georgi Parvanov, was elected President of the Republic in the end of the same year. The third paradox of 2001 was the failure of the United Democratic Forces. Its leader, Ivan Kostov, who at that time was the Prime Minister of the only cabinet that completed its full term in office since 1989 badly lost the Parliamentary Elections. These, at first glance, paradoxical events evolved and showed their essence during the next several years when the real reasons for the change of position became evident. The paradox can be observed not only in the carriers (communicators) but in the political discourse itself (wooden, monarchic and democratic). In any case it cannot be regarded as a tag once and forever pasted on the concrete representatives.

Speaking about political language we, naturally, have to analyze such elements as key words, slogan, clips, billboards, manifestos, programs, inaugural speeches, press releases, interviews, also numbers insinuations and the black PR.

Contemporary political discourse in Bulgaria is represented by two mutually exclusive and interactive trends: vulgarization and over-simplification of the discourse on the one hand and euphemism, political professionalism, striving after political correction and indirectness on the other. Politicians use three kinds of notions: neutral, euphemistic (Greek. eu – well and phemi – speak) and disphemistic. Among the neutral words the first place belongs to the Euro Rhetoric. The European integration of the country is becoming an indisputable argument- a taboo against every objection, which may deviate Bulgaria from the great goal. Today everything is aimed at "European policy, European language, European legal basis, European practice, European standards, European identity, European future, European partners", etc. The category of disphemisms includes rough, coarse and neglectful designations which replace emotional and stylistic neutral nominations. It is not accidental that in the transitional political life there

are so many nicknames of the political leaders: The Commander, Steam-roller, Form mistress, Simo the Mentha, etc.

Traditionally it is thought that the boundaries of the bon ton in the Balkans are quite different from these in West European institutions. We consider ourselves overemotional, vulgar, unpredictable. But during the last corruption scandal in Italy we had enough of the non-formal communication of former crowned personalities – the reactions of prince Vittorio-Emmanuelle to his cousin Simeon Saxe Coburg- Gotha) and could be enough disappointed of his non-aristocratic language. In our western neighbouring country the minister of foreign affairs of Yugoslavia called openly the head of the Tribunal in Hague "Bitch del Ponte". In our country one may read a title in a newspaper calling "insane" the European commissioner for Bulgaria: "It's not acceptable one olygophren, pardon me, Olli Rehn to scold us." (4)

An utterance that is potentially face-threatening can be said to communicate difficulty. The speech directness of one of the former successful transition's prime-ministers and party leader of DSB (Democrats for strong Bulgaria), Ivan Kostov was among the reasons because of which he gradually and irreversible lost his supporters. Ivan Kostov named his closest follower "pomiar" (stray dog) and announced that "he will vote for him with disgust".

For all the 17 years of transition, words like "politics" and "democracy" lost their value to such a degree, that the greater part of the population associates them with negative connotations: lie, play of lies, double-tongued, chaos, mess, shit, trees, ignorance, insolence, cynicism, frauds, dirt, mud, swindlers, prostitution, idiots, mafia, demagogy, nasty sponger, whore, corruption, meanness, animal, dirty dealings, nastiness, horrors, dullard, rope dancer.

According to prof. Peter-Emil Mitev, director of the Ivan Hadjiiski (5) Institute for Ideology Surveys, the violation of tolerance today proceeds along three lines: erotica, ideology and everyday life underestimation. The erotic analogies are related to sexual activities and relations, the ideological concepts are coloured and rejected and the plain every day relations humiliate the politicians. Here are some examples: the erotic line offers various "poses", "someone bent", another one "squat", a third "took each other" or frankly "are copulating"; the ideological line gives an exclusive possibility to append to every negative definition the adjectives "red", "blue" or "yellow", the symbolic colours of the parties; with regard to everyday life activities the deputies, members of the Parliament, guzzle, gobble "deputies' meat-balls" (which are cheaper than in every other restaurant

outside the Parliament!?), the people are bought by "jar lids" (Bulgarian house keepers make preserve food at home to support their families in winter); the discussions between politics look like "local squabbles"(Michailova and Mozer took each other by the hair). The negativism reaches a peculiar peak in making a caricature of the aristocratic origin and conduct of Simeon Saxe Coburg-Gotha, who "behaves like a peasant" and smells of "paunch soup with garlic and wears fusty dirty socks."

The nihilistic nature of the Bulgarian is shown in the exclusively colourful parliamentary polemics and discussion, where one may hear far bloodier words than those, which the parliament in Britain declared as non-parliament language. Among them we can define: "stupidity", "impudence" "betrayer", "calumny", "dishonesty", "brutal insolence", "criminal", "hypocrite", words and phrases, which in Bulgaria are common parliamentary practice.

Euphemisms appear when social control on speech situations and speaker's self-control have developed. These are the reasons for the total regulations of the former socialist societies' political language – everything was subordinated to the "General line" – declinations from it were veiled, glossed over, covered. Reality had "varnished" in order to be represented in the way the political and state leadership (that was one and the same!) expected.

Indirectness in principle is oriented to the Speaker as well as to the Addressee. The fall of the Iron Curtain broke off the dam of the nomenclature censorship and the entire political space filled up with disphemisms. At the same time indirectness as part of politeness and political tolerance plays an important role in political discourse, especially in managing verbal conflict and confrontation. Indirect verbal communication allows the accomplishment of certain potentially tense, risky or difficult utterances under the guise of other lucid and less difficult utterances. Politeness is culturally prescribed. What is considered a normal polite way of talking about, say, an elderly statesman in a developed democracy, may not be considered polite in another democracy. For example among the French and Japanese longer utterances there are more polite phrases than in the shorter ones. Thus, a request made without a mitigator and final component, is said to be power loaded or impolite. It is interesting to note that a request with a long mitigator, followed by the request itself and a final component may be so polite as to appear overdone. If such strategy is used by a superior to a junior, it will be interpreted as ironic, even sarcastic.

Usually we can distinguish four main types of indirectness, namely:

1. formulated indirectly;

2. addressed indirectly;

3. with an indirect author (proverbs, folktales, riddles which are authored by the anonymous body of ancestors) and

4. indirect because of its "key" (reproaches and criticism delivered in jokes or fashion.

The strategies through which indirectness finds expression include metaphor, silence, evasion, circumlocution, innuendo, rhetorical figures (argumentum ad hominem, argumentum ad populum, argumentum ad baculum, argumentum ad verecundiam). We will consider only some of the above mentioned strategies.

From "wooden" to democratic language

After 1989 the political metaphors entered impetuously into so called "langue de bois" ("wooden language"; the notion was invented by the French expert in Political Science Francoise Tom). Certainly she did not have in mind Bulgarian totalitarian reality. Nevertheless, this term responds objectively to it. The researchers of Socialist Rhetoric are well aware of the characteristic features of the totalitarian or wooden language: bureaucracy, depersonalization, quotations, ritualism, quibbles, and monologues. Today democratic discourse is above all dialogues; it reflects the revolutionary transformations which are most evident in lexis. The new forms of social order have made their impact on the word-building – neologisms; archaisation of terms describing phenomena of socialist reality (TKZS – socialist collective farms), de-archaisation of words, used prior to 1944 (gendarmerie, police, tsar, etc.); appearance of new terms depicting the new realities and renaming the former socialist organs of power (loan-words like Prime Minister, Vice President); historicisms – mainly from Turkish and English language and finally vulgarisms (street language – "mutra" (wrestler-gangster), "mente"-(fake).

On political metaphors, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) insist that an economic issue may be understood better if it is personified through ontological metaphors. (6) This is exactly what Bulgarian politician Ahmed Dogan indicated several months ago. He is the leader of the ethnic Turkish party "Movement for Rights and Liberties" (MRL), the most flexible Bulgarian politician of Turkish origin, who during the 17 years of transition to democracy has acted as a provider of balance in formal and informal state governance.

He is often criticized for his sophisticated philosophical constructions and the excessive use of scientific terms in his speech. However, this abstract and non-rhetorical approach is partly habitual, because while talking to his electorate, Dogan uses clear and simple language. He is the best-prepared and the most experienced politician in Bulgaria, but his sensibility does not allow him to claim the posts of prime-minister, deputy prime minister or a minister. The Balkan separatism and the rising Bulgarian nationalism would not permit him to do it. We can draw the charter of the modern democratic discourse of Bulgaria on the basis of Dogan's speeches:

1. Though the party leader has a mission of his own, he should not be perceived as a messiah.

2. If you have not realized the existence of Mephistopheles in yourself, you can not be Faustus,

3. The problems the country is facing are so big that we all have to sit around one table as equals! Everyone should say how he can help the country instead of opening new fronts (25.10. 2000),

4. The conceitedness of a political party brings about its tragic end,

5. The loneliness of a political leader who is not striving for a constant and constructive dialogue, but views himself as a patron saint, as an icon or a messiah, leads to one's over exaggerated self-evaluation, which does not correspond to the real voters' estimate,

6. The moral supremacy of a politician is a precondition for his political longevity".(7)

Dogan's political metaphor "hoop of companies" became emblematic for the political life in Bulgaria. As a reaction to it the opposition created another metaphor – "surfeit with power". It implies the participation of this mostly ethnic in its dominant composition party in the state governing. The phrase "hoop of companies" caused a furor not only in the media and in the oppositional parties, but also among some of the coalition partners. Nevertheless the philosopher, with a PhD, and a lecturer at the Sofia University, inspires respect in politicians with his theoretical treatment of the nature of the transition, the necessity of lobbying and regulating it by law. We should remind that around the world the countries where lobbying is legalized, as it is in the USA, are not many. At the 6th National Conference of MRL Ahmed Dogan distinguished a difference between hoop of companies and oligarchy by using the metaphor "barrel". "Hoop" is not a dirty word (i.e. political corruption) he explained, because, usually, the most

fundamental is the simplest. For instance, if you take off only one hoop from a cask or a wooden barrel, it starts to leak and falls apart with time; the hoop ensures stability and safety in every system, including the media. "Oligarchy" in his interpretation consists of "powerful, at the moment, businessmen who adapt parts of the legal, judicial and executive power to their own benefit. They infiltrate people in every level of power because they need their cooperation for speculative deals, legitimating funds and activities, related to the "grey" sector.

Euphemistic speaking is the basis of politeness, political correction and indirectness. It is motivated by political interests and political necessity, as well as by personal face-saving and cultural auto-censorship. In general, experienced political actors tend to communicate in vague and oblique ways in order to protect and further their own careers and to gain both political and interactive advantage over their political opponents. This behaviour of politicians is goal-oriented and instrumental in nature.

Silence is a fact of speech communication which everybody should respect. It contains the relation between uttered speech and thought speech. Silence plays the role of background as far as speech is concerned, and that is why the mutually enriching character of their interaction is so evident. The question about the quality of their interaction is less evident, yet more meaningful.

The latest two former Prime Ministers of Bulgaria maintained constant silence in politics. While Simeon II Saxe Coburg-Gotha was trying to convince the journalists with the phrase: "You will learn it when the time is ripe", Ivan Kostov – nowadays the leader of Democrats for Strong Bulgaria Party felt offended by the Bulgaria people, who did not understand him and did not appreciate his achievements. For two complete years he did not take part in political life and was an illustration of Homo Tacens (The Silent Man). Then, following his long self-isolation, his speeches presented ritualistic solutions, the leader's super ego disregarded the republican principle of collective work. In their cases the paternalistic model and mentor's tone replaced rational arguments. Kostov's party stands for extreme confrontational style of political behaviour both against its opponents and vis-a-vis its fellow party member. Because of the authoritarian methods of leadership, Ivan Kostov was nicknamed "the Commander".

Another feature of the present political language is the positive speaking pursuing a particular cause. For the first time in its 1300 year long history, Bulgaria is governed by a triple coalition. It came into reality due to the results from the vote and with the delicate help of President Georgi Parvanov. Notwithstanding the

flood of criticism from the left and the right side, this was the only real, balanced and responsible decision. The accusations for change of people's vote were ungrounded because the coalition was formed with regard to the idea, shared by full consensus – the accession of Bulgaria to EU. The new government configuration poses before the coalition parties new controversial requirements: to reform and to keep the status quo at the same time. These mutually excluding each other tendencies are in contrast with the promises given before the election. Naturally, the discrepancy between criticism and promises before elections are drastic. The new social situation requires a new political language, where the confrontation of ideas is subjected to national interests and the objective unifying does not lead to deprivation of individuality, depersonalization. Common work on state issues provokes partners to be critical to principles, yet to make compromises to persons. In fact political communication resembles business communication. The leading idea of the coalitional cooperation came again from Ahmed Dogan: "We need to communicate… we are thirsty for each other". Putting economic priorities as the basis of his politics, Dogan warned the collaborators: "The most important interaction happens, when there is mutual dependence. There is an ancient saying: "There is no friendship in politics, only interests."

The conduct of the comparatively young Prime Minister Sergei Stanishev is indicative. He is pressed by the EU commissioners, who criticize the Government in three areas: corruption, organized crime and court system. The prime minister carefully expressed his criticism in the media: 83% of his statements in the media are positive, emphasizing his enthusiasm that on 1 January 2007 Bulgaria will join the European Union, and only 3% are negative. The current President of the Republic – Georgi Parvanov as a communicator is seldom spontaneous, he rarely uses artistic speech. We can find his charisma mainly in his pro-active thinking and openness for dialogue. The President's personal style has nothing to do with confrontation or revenge. His messages are cautious and moderate. His speeches can be characterized with the frequent use of double negations (We cannot but observe; I cannot refrain from pointing out), the conditional forms (I would like to say; I would like to point out) present him as European type of leader. His political language is a step forward; he succeeds in kerbing his emotions. No doubt that his real democratic culture brought him second victory at the presidential elections (2006).

Is Bulgaria really ruled today by "an ostrich cabinet", which counterblows within

the framework of praises for its own activity and achievements"? Or, do the prime minister and the president keep themselves from arbitrary, gratuitous political talk? Are they trying to make people have a positive view of the situation in Bulgaria, so as to make Bulgarians trust them, and to persuade the monitoring European institutions that we are "doing everything possible to meet the requirements for accession"? The positive and the negative issues are balanced: – the Euro commissioner for enlargement Olli Rehn is playing the negative role, the role of the antagonist: 67% of his statements are negative: the head of the Euro-commission Jose Barroso issues 34% positive statements against 44% critical.

The media on their part balance all critically positive relations to the Bulgarian accession: 48% of all published statements are critical, 33% – positive and 19% neutral. Among the critical publications the largest part concerns the postponing of the accession and the introduction of save guard clauses (11% against 9%), reflecting the official statements that Bulgaria will join the EU on the expected date: 1 January 2007.

Evasion is the way to avoid direct answering or facing up really "difficult" or responsible communicative issue. When an interactant attempts to avoid a question or gets around it, he evades it. Evading a question involves refusing to answer it with or without explanation or mitigation. Evasion could include mitigated refusal.

The following techniques belong to the question evasions:
1. Acknowledging the question without answering;
2. Questioning the question;
3. Attacking the question;
4. Apologizing, stating that the question being asked has already been answered;
5. Declining to answer the question repeating an answer to a previous question and making a political point;
6. Ignoring the question asked;
7. Attacking the question.

All these types of answers can be discovered in the Bulgarian political practice and especially in speeches of the newest political parties – "Attack" and "Citizens for European Development of Bulgaria" (CEDB). The emergence of the nationalistic party "Attack" led by Volen Siderov looks very much like Quintillian's "prepared improvisation". Siderov is a well known journalist, the former editor of the "Democracy" newspaper – the organ of the Union of Democratic forces, and

an anti-Semite, author of the book "The Boomerang of the Evil". The book is branded as racist and xenophobic. The "Attack" party was formed as a protest of part of the Bulgarian intelligentsia against the corruption and the dubious morality of the Bulgarian political class and partly against the privileges extended to the Turkish and the Roma minorities in Bulgaria, presented by the party "Development for Rights and Liberties", led by A. Dogan. This is not the popular Euro – scepticism. The vocabulary exploited by "Attack"- collapse, national betrayers, mother sellers, anti-Bulgarians, cliques, marionettes, killers and so on, have their alternative in words like: rescue, sovereignty, Bulgarization, payment and revenge. Siderov copies the manipulative schemes of his French and Austrian colleagues and reflects the most painful issues of society. His failure at the presidential elections showed that the citizens of Bulgaria are already ripe for democracy. Although, the radical negativism, for the governing class ("Everyone, but to none of those who have been in power since 1989 to follow him.") continues to attract supporters.

Boyko Borisov – general and the present mayor of Sofia, and informal leader of the "newly born" party (CEDB) is an excellent PR man and a creation of the mass media. He rejects the political system in general, all predecessors and their activities. He is complete political chameleon: he started his professional career as a fire man, then he was a body guard of the former communist leader Todor Zhivkov, after some time – of the former king – Simeon II; Chief Secretary of the Ministry of Home Affairs during the "Tsar"'s rule – quickly made general in Police forces and now – mayor of Sofia with strong ambitions for the president's or the prime minister's chair... We should be sorry that Berthold. Brecht is not alive to write the continuation of the story of Arturo Hi... Boyko Borisov's answers are always controversial, ultimative and definite; his behaviour is not predictable. His next step can turn his decision to 180 degrees. Nevertheless, many Bulgarians, suffering from nostalgia for the "strong hand" of the patriarchal ruling believe in him.

Both parties castigate all the political elite (left, right and centrists) use populist means to persuade the people and to fight against the governing three – party coalition. The most correct image of these two populist Bulgarian parties gave Thomas Carothers, an American scholar, who created the following definition of the countries in transition: "They are neither dictatorial, nor clearly on the track to democracy. They have entered the political Grey Zone."(8) This Grey Zone is characterized with political instability caused both by the activity of old

authorities painfully parting with the monopoly of power, and the actions of the new authorities which legitimize themselves as the new executive elite. In such atmosphere the monarchic discourse prospers in Bulgaria already six years.

Monarchic discourse

The monarchic discourse in this case characterizes a kind of political behavior, rather than a form of government. The return of the ex-king to Bulgaria and his entry into political life was so unexpected and extravagant, that it descended upon the Bulgarian public like the Tungussian meteorite. The memories of a six year old boy, saluting the guard of honor, are still alive in many people's minds. The saying "Living like little Simeon" is still often used in the country to express a royal care-free life of plenty, without any duties or obligations. Then the public had to address a royal figure with unclear and dubious characteristics, e.g. lack of knowledge about his education, profession, social commitments, etc. On the other hand, the Bulgarian public had to put up with the tsar's dignified aristocratic conduct with its main connotations: silence, avoidance of public accountability, contempt for the media. He treated his close aides as his royal entourage while all the rest were his subjects. The disrespectful use of first-name language, without the use of Mr. or Mrs. marked his royal arrogance.

In his Program address to the Bulgarian people on 6th April 2001, Simeon Saxe Coburg-Gotha put salt into the wound of millions of Bulgarians, who were staggering chaotically along the transition's way. People had lost their faith, living in poverty and having no hope or perspective. The address was based on the contrast parallelism: the aim of the orator – radical change – concentrated in the word "New Morality in Politics"; new economic solutions with new Bulgarian ideas and new people as the moving force on the one hand and on the other hand, Simeon's declaration "I will get in confrontation with no one". He added that the target of the new movement would not be the parties or the individuals, but the basic problems of Bulgaria. The king turned to all his compatriots "irrespective of their political affiliation or ethnic origin". He relied on the well-educated and the highly qualified young people as his "strongest potential ally" for the purpose of achieving the changes. In fact during his ruling the London "Yuppies" in the cabinet – young qualified and successful Bulgarians (the minister of finance Milen Velchev, the deputy prime minister and minister for transport Nikolay Vassilev), successfully carried out the Prime Minister's policy.

The program address (9) of Simeon II National Movement (SNM) had three principle goals. First quality change of the standard of living in Bulgaria through

functioning market economy in accordance with the European Union membership criteria and through an increase of the inflow of foreign investments of the serious world capital." Simeon promised to propose "a scheme of economic measures and socio-economic partnership through which in not longer than 800 days the famous Bulgarian industriousness and enterprise would change citizen's lives; Secondly, to break off with partisan politics and unite Bulgarian science on long cherished ideals and values which has preserved its glory throughout our millennia-long history; Thirdly, introduction of rules and creating of institutions for eradication of corruption, which has become a major enemy of Bulgaria. It has condemned the people to poverty and has repulsed life-saving foreign capital.

The power of the address was incredible. Only one month and half after it SNM won the elections by 44%. It is here that we remember Thomas Hobbes, who saw one of the great weaknesses of democracy in the fact that it could not do without rhetoric. Democracy is inclined to make decisions based on the "impulses of the soul", rather than on "common sense" – its orators adapt themselves not to the "nature of things" but to the biases of their listeners. Therefore Hobbes and later Max Weber advised that politics should be made with the head, rather than with some other parts of the body. Democracy as a great achievement of political construction is neither realm of virtues, nor an independent super value. It is only a way of realizing freedom and social order in contemporary society. Boundless democracy endangers freedom itself and provides room for crime.

Let me make a literary analogy (everything with our former king looks like a fairy tale).On his birthday, June 16 2001, Simeon Saxe Coburg-Gotha won the parliamentary elections. For many years the fans of James Joyce's novel "Ulysses" have celebrated June 16, the so called "Bloom's Day" in the streets of Dublin. On this very day Joyce's hero, the advertising agent Leopold Bloom, set out on his remarkable stroll through Dublin (his odyssey) until he came back home in the early hours of the next day – all this covering 1200 pages. Leopold Bloom was involved in the chaotic, amorphous play of life, depriving him of personality.

One can say that the Tsar passed through Bulgaria like Joyce's hero. The damages to his self-consciousness are deeper than those afflicted to his people. Peoples are as a phoenix; they somehow heal their wounds. But imagine a person whose birth was announced by 101 cannon salutes, who has been accepted as a king all his life, who became Prime Minister in a republic, was dethroned after 4 years on the top of the executive power. A year later, again on his birthday, June 16, 2006, an international scandal exploded; his cousin Vittorio-Emmanuele, heir to the house

of Savoy, was arrested for bribing of civil officials, forgery and call girls exploitation for personal benefit...

The rule of Simeon II survived after six motions of non-confidence. In these battles, as well as in the whole 4-year "republican reign", his main weapon was again silence, but aristocratic, royal silence. It includes: running away from the media and in general from any form of publicity, whether it concerns the decision-making process or the evaluation of a concrete political situation: "You will learn it when the time is ripe; Let us look at it from the positive side; Trust me." Silence puts him on a pedestal above ordinary people – subjects must a priori trust his intentions because the monarch knows better what is good and what is bad for his people. Here we find the classical treatment of Ernst Kantorowicz "about the two bodies of the king" and the "dichotomy of sovereignty". "This feudal concept of royalty (royal honors) presupposes that the king has two bodies – one profane, naturally subjected to passions and death, and the other – divine, immortal and political". (10) Simeon himself, in his interview for the "24 Chassa" newspaper said that though he was always taught that the king should not be involved in active politics, he decided to offer his help in order to bring in "new spirit in my country" (11)

The inference that a civil society already exists in Bulgaria won't be premature although that the public opinion was based on two other reasons. First, during his six years in Bulgaria Simeon Saxe-Coburg Gotha never showed preference for the Bulgarian media; he always gave interviews for foreign papers. In connection with Vittorio Emmanuele's scandal Simeon Saxe Coburg-Gotha talked first to the Italian Stampa newspaper; a press-conference for the Bulgarian public was made six days latter. Second, in his statement, he didn't mention even once that the accusations against him threw a shade upon Bulgaria – he was concerned only about his own image and the name of Savoy, on which dirt and mud was thrown so easily.

Simeon II has a sober understanding of the public opinion in Bulgaria and of the impossibility of restoring the monarchy in the country – only 18% of the interviewed supported the return to the monarchic institution. Simeon was brought up with the hope to rule Bulgaria and he has lived with it for more than 50 years. Nevertheless, he took the steering wheel of the republic without the necessary preparation. "Irrespective of the fact whether I continue to regard myself as king or not, my people accept me as the king. But my own discreetness, modesty and diplomacy, allow to me live with two hats as the Americans say."(12)

In another interview he added, "I took an oath before Bulgaria. Whether it is called a republic or a kingdom, it is still Bulgaria, as long as it remains democratic" (13)

So, the Tsar replaced the "political" with "ethical" speaking about "new morality, duty, self-sacrifice, respectability in everything, confidence, forgiveness", etc. The monarch – republican Prime-minister changed the political system of post-communist Bulgaria; he softened the confrontational model "left-right", "communists- anti-communists", appointed in his cabinet two socialists – prominent representatives of executive power. In his interview for a top Bulgarian TV show Simeon quoted one of his friends who used to call him the "social Tsar". At the same time the monarch forgot his promise not to claim back his father's and grand-father's property. Whatever his ancestors possessed was restituted to him (the total value of the palaces, land, forests is worth approximately US$ 200 million tax free (for comparison the Constitutional Court of Romania decided to compensate their former tsar for the nationalized property of the royal family with the amount of US $ 30 Million).

In conclusion I would like to say that if we agree with M. Foucault that power is "the ability to control the meanings and in this way to control other's thinking and actions" (14), we shall be convinced that this endless and opened strategic game of political discourse in Bulgaria raised the political culture. However the communicative professionalism does not relate only to the politicians but to the electorate too. That's why Noam Chomski was right to say that: "Citizens in a democratic society should undertake a course of intellectual self-defence to protect themselves from manipulation and control, and to lay the basis for more meaningful democracy".(15)

REFERENCES
Carothers, Th. (2002). The End of the Transition Paradigm, *Journal of Democracy*, 13.01.2002.
Chomsky, N. Necessary Illusions: *Thought Control in Democratic Societies Boston:* 1989, p.1.
Derrida, J. (1992). *Passages du traumatisme a la promisse in Points de suspension* (Etretiens), Ed. Galilee, Paris, pp. 399-400.
Dogan, A., The supremacy of Georgi Parvanov over Petar Stoyanov in the presidential elections", "Trud" newspaper, 15.11.2001.
Foucault, M. *Dumite I neshtata,* (Translation), PH Nauka I izkustvo, Sofia, 1992,

p. 127.

Interview of Fani Chodzhumova, "Novinar", 14.04.2006.

Kantorowicz, E. (1989). *Les deux corps de roi. Essai sur I theologie politique au Moyen Age*, Ed. Gallimard, Paris.

Lakoff, G. & M. Johnson (1980). *Metaphors We Live by.*

Lukasiewicz P. & A. Sicinski (1992). *Attitudes in Everyday Life in the Emerging Post-Socialist Society, in Escape from Socialism* (EDs.) W. Connor and F Ploszajski, Warsaw, IFIS Publishers.

Mitev, Petar-Emil, *Introductory Speech, Round Table, Pre – election Speaking*, Institute "Ivan Hadjiiski", Sofia, 2006.

Saxe Coburg-Gotha, S. (2001). "I have no alternative, I will have to be the Prime Minister", "*24 Chassa*" newspaper, 02.07.2001.

Saxe Coburg-Gotha, S. Inaugural Speech, 6.04.2001.

Saxe Coburg-Gotha, S. (2001). "I took oath in the name of Bulgaria", Interview of Valeria Veleva, "*Trud*" newspaper, 02.08.2001.

Tsenov, G., Interview of Fani Chodzhumova, "*Novinar*", 14 April 2006.

Znepolsky, Iv. (2002). The Return of Monarchic Discourse, *Culture newspaper*, Issue 6, 15.02.2002.