

## Short Term Scientific Mission Brief

Action number: CA17132

Start and end date: 01/01/2023 to 31/03/2023

Grantee name: José Alhambra Delgado

Title: The Evaluation of Argumentation by Analogy in Public Discourse

Home institution: Autonomous University of Madrid.

Host institution: University of Windsor, Windsor, ON, Canada.

### *Research interest.*

José Alhambra Delgado is a PhD candidate at Autonomous University of Madrid. In his work he elaborates on concepts from argumentation theory, moral philosophy, and discourse analysis to study the argumentative use of analogies in public discourse. In his publications he has developed a meta-argumentative and particularist approach to the so-called ‘arguments by analogy’, which allow him to explore their role in the logical evaluation of argumentation.

### *STSM Summary.*

The main purpose of the STSM was to design a procedure for evaluating arguments by analogy in public discourse. This procedure was based on two theoretical assumptions. On the one hand, arguments by analogy were understood as a case-to-case type of argumentation. This is opposed to proposals that interpret them as deductions in disguise and postulate a universal principle that covers cases compared and guarantees the conclusion. On the other hand, arguments by analogies analysed were cases in which the elements compared were in turn arguments. Thus, arguments by analogy were understood as a form of meta-argumentation.

The methodology followed consisted of collecting cases of evaluation of arguments by analogy in public discourse and analysing them using tools from argumentation theory and discourse analysis. The objective was to identify dialectical regularities that would allow the design of an evaluation procedure. The results of these analyses were periodically discussed with the members of the Host Institution.

The STSM is directly related to the objectives that the Memorandum of Understanding CA17132 sets for Working Group 2, namely, a normative investigation of concepts and methods to measure the quality of arguments in public policies. In particular, the STSM addresses the sub-objectives (a) “to study the concepts of ‘good arguments’ (valid, sound, reasonable, legitimate) in the public and political sphere” and (e) “to develop new

paradigms and metrics for assessing public arguments”. The main tangible results have been twofold. On the one hand, the writing of a research article entitled “The Evaluation of Argumentation by Analogy” in which the questions worked on during the STSM will be addressed. And on the other hand, the paper “Particularismo en teoría de la argumentación”, submitted to the *II Congreso Iberoamericano de Argumentación (II CIBA)*, to be held in Madrid in the last week of September 2023.