Katarzyna Budzynska & Chris Reed
Inference Anchoring Theory

Examples for analysis (*The Moral Maze* programme)

Ex1.
LA: *It was a ghastly aberration.*
CL: *Or was it in fact typical? Was it the product of a policy that was unsustainable that could only be pursued by increasing repression?*

Ex2. (p6)
MB: (...) *If there is an element, if you like, of retrospective moral judgments, are there problems with that?*
LA: *I always have a problem of judging the past by our values. It seems to me a mixture of arrogance and absurdity.*

Ex3. (p9)
MT: *Can we agree there should have been court martials?*
LA: *Certainly, yes. Crime is not a debt. Punishment has not been inflicted, that's one question, a court martial would have inflicted punishment, and then there is a second question of a debt is legal redress by the civil courts which is being sought now, that's something quite different.*

Ex4. (p6)
MP: (...) *Isn't that a source of injustice?*
ES: *Definitely not. They do bear responsibility. Because those liabilities actually transferred back to the British Government, (...)*

Ex5. (p5)
Michael Portillo: But let's think about what things would look like if they were going right. If they were going right, then across a person's life a person would sometimes be a saver, at other times a borrower, and maybe a saver again, thinking about the normal pattern across a lifestyle. And if you put money into a building society, that would be on the basis that other people were taking the money out of the building society, to buy a house for example. That would be the normality, wouldn't it? Simon Rose: Yes. The building societies claim that there are about six times more savers than borrowers. But I suspect, as you say in your own experience, that many people are a mixture of the two.

IAT structures:
- **inferential structures (on the left)**
- **dialogical structures (on the right)**
- **illocutionary structures (in the middle)**
- **ethotic structures (in red)**

The government will inevitably lower the tax rate. ← *asserting* ← Bob says, The government will inevitably lower the tax rate.

Bob is credible

challenging

Transition by challenging

An application of the argument scheme for Argument from Positive Consequences ← *arguing* ← Wilma says, Why?

Transition by substantiating

Bob is credible

Lower taxes stimulate the economy ← *asserting* ← Bob says, Because lower taxes stimulate the economy