A Pragma-Dialectical Study of The Argumentative Indicators in American Electoral Campaign Debates

Mohammed Jasim Betti, Amal Odeh Ghadhab

Dept. of English/ College of Education for Humanities/ University of Thi-Qar

ABSTRACT

This study is a pragma-dialectical study of the argumentative indicators as used in American electoral campaign debates. The topic in question has not received sufficient attention by researchers.

The study aims at the following: (1) investigating Trump's argumentative indicators and their functions in his electoral campaign debates, (2) investigating Clinton's argumentative indicators and their functions in her debates, (3) finding out the similarities and differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of argumentative indicators and their functions.

The study hypothesizes that there are no significant differences between Trump and Clinton in: 1. The use of confrontation stage indicators regarding: (a) propositional attitude indicators, (b) force modifying indicators, and (c) dispute indicators. 2. The use of argumentation stage indicators of: (a) subordinative, (b) coordinative (c) cumulative, and (d) multiple argumentations . 3.The total number of the indicators of: (a) confrontation, (b) opening, (c) argumentation, and (d) concluding stages. 4. The use of the functions of argumentative indicators of confrontation stage concerning）:a) present a standpoint, (b) express an opinion, and (c) show a suspicion of the other arguer's opinion .5The functions of opening stage indicators as: (a) a challenge to defend a standpoint, (b) an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof, (c) a denial of a one-sided burden of proof, and (d) an agreement with the other arguer's proposition .6The use of the functions of argumentation stage indicators as: (a) presenting two serial reasons to support a standpoint subordinative, (b) combining two arguments to develop an opinion (coordinative), (c) providing the arguer with more than two reasons which are of less or great importance (cumulative), and (d) using separate reasons to support an opinion multiple 7. The functions of concluding stage indicators which are: (a) presenting the result of discussion ,and (b) maintaining an opinion till the end of discussion. 8. The total number of functions of the indicators of）:a) confrontation, (b) opening, (c) argumentation, and (d) concluding stages.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pragma-dialectics is a theory of argumentative discourse developed by van Eemeren and Grootendorst at the end of the 1970s. It aims at "resolving the difference of opinion in accordance with the critical norms of reasonableness" (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 53). Van Eemeren (2015: 226) points out that pragma-dialectics is concerned with the communicative aspects (pragmatics) and the rules of logical discussion (dialectics). The argumentative indicators are the expressions which are found in the discussion which represent a sign of the development of the discussion (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 1-2).

27

Despite all the studies of pragma-dialectics, the argumentative indicators in American electoral campaign debates have not been investigated yet. This study has set itself to fill this gap by attempting to answer the following questions:

1. What are the argumentative indicators and their functions which are found in Trump's electoral campaign debates?

2. What are the argumentative indicators and their functions which are found in Clinton's electoral campaign debates?

3. What are the similarities and the differences concerning Trump's and Clinton's argumentative indicators and their functions?

The study aims at:

1. Identifying Trump's argumentative indicators and their functions in his campaigning debates.

2. Investigating Clinton's argumentative indicators and their functions in her campaigning debates.

3. Finding out the similarities and the differences concerning Trump's and Clinton's argumentative indicators and their functions in the debates.

The study hypothesizes that there are no significant differences between Trump and Clinton in:

1. The use of confrontation stage indicators regarding: (a) propositional attitude indicators, (b) force modifying indicators, and (c) dispute indicators.

2. The use of argumentation stage indicators concerning:

 (a) subordinative, (b) coordinative, (c) cumulative, and (d) multiple argumentations.

3. The total number of the indicators of: (a) confrontation, (b)opening, (c) argumentation, and (d) concluding stages.

4. The use of the functions of argumentative indicators of confrontation stage concerning: (a) presenting a standpoint, (b) express an opinion, and (c) show a suspicion of the other arguer's opinion.

5. The functions of opening stage indicators as: (a) a challenge to defend a standpoint, (b) an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof, (c) a denial of a one-sided burden of proof, and (d) an agreement with the other arguer's proposition.

6. The use of the functions of argumentation stage indicators as: (a) presenting two serial reasons to support a standpoint (function of subordinative argumentation indicators), (b) combining two arguments to develop an opinion (function of coordinative argumentation indicators), (c) providing the arguer with more than two reasons which are of less or great importance (function of cumulative argumentation indicators), and (d) using separate reasons to support an opinion (function of multiple argumentation indicators).

7. The functions of concluding stage indicators which are: (a) presenting the result of discussion, and (b) maintaining a viewpoint till the end of discussion.

8. The total number of functions of the indicators of: (a) confrontation, (b) opening , (c) argumentation, and (d) concluding stages.

The study is limited to:

1. The investigation of Trump's and Clinton's argumentative indicators and the functions of these indicators in the American electoral campaign debates 2015-2016.

2. The number of the analyzed debates is six: Trump is the representative figure in three Republican campaign debates and Clinton is the representative figure in three Democratic ones.

3. The online data is written scripts so that they can be reread.

4. The data is analyzed and compared by using the model of critical discussion.

It is hopeful that this study will be of value in the fields of politics, pragmatics, pragma-dialectics, and applied linguistics. Teachers, students, and textbook writers can get benefits of the findings of the study.

This study adopts percentages and Chi-square as statistical tools for analyzing the data quantitatively in order to find out the similarities and differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of argumentative indicators and their functions. If the statistical significance is more than 0.05, then there are no significant differences (similarities). If it is less than 0.05, then the differences are significant (differences). Chi-square is used in the analysis in order to test the validity of the hypotheses.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Definitions of Pragma-dialectics, Argumentation, and Argumentative Indicators

This section includes definitions of pragma-dialectics, argumentation, and argumentative indicators as follows:

2.1.1 Pragma-dialectics

Pragma-dialectics is a theory of argumentative discourse developed by van Eemeren and Grootendorst at the end of the 1970s. It aims at "resolving a difference of opinion in accordance with the critical norms of reasonableness" (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 53). Pragma-dialectics is a theory which deals with the communicative and the critical aspects of the critical discussion. The communicative aspect of the discussion is demonstrated by the pragmatic perspective such as speech act theory. The critical aspect deals with the rules of the discussion which can be regarded as the norms to manage the discussion and make it more organized (van Eemeren, 2015: 129). According to Bonevac (2003: 451), pragma-dialectics is "dynamic, context-sensitive, and multi-agent; it promises theories of fallacy and argumentative structure.". It is dynamic in that it deals with the pragmatic aspect and the rules of the sensible discussion and it is context-sensitive in determining the context as the most important aspect in the discussion. It is also multi-agent in the sense that there must be two or more than two participants in the reasonable discussion.

As van Eemeren (2015: 226) points out, the word "pragma" is related to the pragmatic aspect of the theory, and "dialectics" deals with the dialectical aspect which focuses on the rules of the reasonable discussion. According to Zarefsky (2014: xv) and O'Halloran (2017: 15-6), dialectics is concerned with the obligations that the participants admit themselves to in the discussion. Dialectics is either a spoken or a written discourse. Dialectics of a spoken discourse is represented by the debate between two or more than two arguers.

2.1.2 Argumentation

Argumentation is a reasonable activity that is socially and verbally meant to increase or decrease the acceptance of the participants of a controversial position by producing a rational clarification for such a position (van Eemeren et al., 1996: 1; and van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 1). Argumentation is one of the most important concepts of human cognition and

29

interaction (Besnard and Hunter, 2008: 1). According to Lugue (2011: 4), argumentation has its origin in philosophy. Philosophers point out that there are two conditions for a discourse to be argumentative: the first is the political context which has important roles in the public argumentative discourse. The second is the type of discourse which is weak and fragile and not meant to be for the public.

Wenzel (2006: 9) and Lugue (2011: 81) mention three dimensions of argumentation: rhetoric, logic and dialectics. Rhetoric deals with the way to convince the other participant of the viewpoint, logic views argumentation as the product of the arguers' argumentations, and dialectics views argumentation as a process of the interaction between two participants to settle the disagreement of the opinions.

2.1.3 Argumentative Indicators

Argumentative indicators can be defined as "a sign that a particular argumentative move is in progress, but it does not constitute a decisive pointer." (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 1). Argumentative indicators are the expressions which are utilized in the advancement of the discussion and the way the latter is structured and arranged (Houtlosser, 2002: 169-70). According to Snoeck-Henkenmans (2001: 231), the argumentative indicators are the relevant component items in the text and the connections between these items. The research project, which begins in the University of Amsterdam aims at creating an inventory of these expressions and the functions of these indicators in the model of critical discussion.

There are two senses of argumentative indicators: the limited and the wide senses. The limited sense of argumentation refers to the specific expressions that are used in the moves of the discussion, for instance, " in my opinion", "thus", and "because". The wide sense of the term is related to any word or articulation which is utilized by the participants in the discussion (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 1-2).

2.2 Dimensions of Pragma-dialectics

This section deals with the dimensions of pragma-dialectics, the main concern of each dimension, and its relation to pragma-dialectics.

2.2.1 The Pragmatic Dimension

The pragmatic dimension of pragma-dialectics deals with speech acts, Grice's cooperative principle, and communication principle. It represents the communicative aspect of pragma-dialectics (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 52; and Gascon, 2017: 3).

2.2.1.1 Speech Acts

The pragmatic dimension, which is concerned with speech act theory in connection with stages of critical discussion, is different from Searle's account of the theory (kauffeld, 2006: 151). Searle was dissatisfied with Austin's classification of speech acts. He sees that Austin is just classifying performative verbs. Searle adopts in his classification the felicity conditions after developing Austin's felicity conditions (Al-Obudi and Betti, 2013: 20 and vi).

According to Searle (1979: 8, 13, 14), assertive speech acts include the facts that are stated by the parties. In them "the speaker asserts a proposition that represents a condition or a state of affairs" (Jehad, Betti and Attia, 2015: 64 and iv). (Directives view requesting the members to accomplish something. In other words, in directives, "the speaker directs the hearer to perform or not perform a certain act" (Jehad, Betti and Attia, 2015: ibid). Commisives are about promising. They express an intention, making the world fit the words and engage in a future course of action" (Al-Obudi and Betti, 2013: 20 and v1). This is clear in the following examples:

30

a. Jim **reported that** no one had arrived (assertive speech acts) (Leech, 1983: 211)

b. Shiela **urged** me to do the shopping (directives) (ibid.: 212).

c. Bill **offered** us to drive us home (commissives) (ibid.).

The purpose of speech in a given context is to generate some kind of action. Every sentence is structured to carry certain intention. Intentional human action is the concern of pragmatics. Intentional action is intended to achieve a goal, through some kind of plan, give some beliefs about state of things (Betti, Igaab and Al-Ghizzi, 2018: 43).

The theory of SAs indicates that the performance of a SA, in addition to meaning, means the performance of three kinds of acts at once:

1. the locutionary act (LA) "the act of saying something with full sense of 'say'",

2. the illocutionary act (IA) "the act performed in saying something", and

3. the perlocutionary act (PA) "the act performed by or as a result of saying" (Betti and Hasan, 2020: 4).

According to van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984: 41), the role of speech acts in critical discussion is represented by each speech act which has more than one function. According to van Eemeren et al. (2014: 533), each stage of the critical discussion has speech acts which have different functions from the speech acts of the other stage. To declare the matter well, the following represent each stage with the specific speech acts:

1. The Role of Speech Acts in the Confrontation Stage

The confrontation stage is concerned with the disagreements of the points of view of the participants. In this stage, one of the arguers expresses his or her standpoint and the other shows his or her suspicion of the former's viewpoint (van Eemeren, 2010: 10). The role of speech acts in the confrontation stage, as van Eemeren et al. (2014: 533) mention it, is as follows:

a. Assertives are shown by the way to express the point of view.

b. Commissives are represented by the agreement or the disagreement of the participants of the opinion.

c. Directives are concerned with demands to declare the viewpoint.

d. Usage Declaratives are represented by definitions, clarification and the specification of the point of view.

2. The Role of Speech Acts in the Opening Stage

The opening stage is concerned with the participants' commitments to the rules of the discussion and the arguers' roles are also specified in this stage. One of the participants takes the protagonist's role who defends his or her opinion, and the other takes the antagonist role who shows his dispute of the participant's viewpoint (van Emeren et al., 2014: 350; and van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2015: 157). Van Eemeren et al. (2014: 533) mention the role of speech acts in the opening stage as follows:

a. Directives are represented by the challenge to defend the viewpoint by the proponent.

b. Commissives are viewed as the opponent's agreement or disagreement of the proponent's standpoint.

c. Usage Declaratives are about the clarification and the specification at the opening stage.

31

3. The Role of Speech Acts in the Argumentation Stage

The argumentation stage is concerned with the development of the critical discussion. The protagonist advances his or her standpoint by providing the other participant with reasons for his or her opinion (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1989: 370). Van Eemeren et al. (2014: 233) mention the role of speech acts in the argumentation stage as follows:

a. Directives are asking the participant to advance the viewpoint.

b. Assertives are about the way to improve the point of view by the participants in the discussion.

c. Commissives are about the agreement or the disagreement of the arguers of the standpoint.

d. Usage Declaratives are about the specification and the definition of the standpoint.

4. The Role of Speech Acts in the Concluding Stage

The concluding stage represents the end of the discussion in which the conclusion or the result of the discussion is established. It is concerned with the way to settle the difference of opinion among the parties (van Eemeren and Garssen, 2008: 9; and van Eemeren, 2010: 10). Van Eemeren et al. (2014: 533) mention the role of speech acts in the concluding stage as follows:

a. Assertives are about the statement of the result of the discussion.

b. Commisives are about the agreement or the disagreement of the participants of the viewpoint.

c. Usage Declaratives deal with specifying whether the difference of opinion is settled or not.

2.2.1.2 Grice's Cooperative Principle

Grice (1975: 45) defines the cooperative principle as "make your conversational contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the exchange in which you are engaged.". The maxims of the cooperative principle can be used to describe how participants in a conversation derive implicatures (Hlail, Betti and Ajeel, 2014: 43).

Maxims observing and non-observing depend on the speakers whether they observe or do not observe the Gricean maxims. In observing the maxims, the speaker does not breach up any conversational maxim (Betti and Yaseen, 2020: 48-49).
S/he can straightforwardly succeed in observing all the maxims.

The failure to do so can take various forms (Betti and Yaseen, 2020: 48-49):

1). Violating: the unostentatious non-observance of a maxim with the aim of misleading the hearer.
2). Flouting: is the deliberate and intentional non-observance of a maxim that the hearer is expected to be aware of the non-fulfillment with no intention of deceiving the other person.
3). Opting out: opting out the maxims altogether, in a sense, means that one refuses to cooperate in a conversation for some reason.
4) A clash between maxims: on some occasion, there is an overlap between maxims. An utterance may be both unclear and prolix, breaching the maxims of quality and quantity.

The four maxims or rules of conversation are as follows:

1. Maxim of Quantity

Maxim of quantity deals with how to be informative for the purpose of interaction (ibid.). It is concerned with how the participants should not say more or less than what they are asked in the discussion. If someone asks "who is that person with Bob?", the interactive response is "That's his new girlfriend, Alison." (Atchison, 2010: 9-10; and Yule, 2010: 147).

2. Maxim of Quality

Maxim of quality is   "to be truthful and don't say what you believe to be wrong" (Grice, 1975: 45-46).

3. Maxim of Relevance

Maxim of relevance is to be relevant in the discussion (ibid.). If someone asks "what's for supper?", the cooperative answer is "Fish and chips." (Atchison, 2010: 10).

4. Maxim of Manner

Maxim of manner is to "avoid obscurity, avoid ambiguity, be brief, be orderly" (Grice, 1975: 47). It is concerned with representing the arrangement of the events and about the clarity of the speech (Leech, 1983: 8; and Thomas, 1995: 63-4).

2.2.1.3 The Communication Principle

The communication principle is "the combination of the communicative aspect 'Searle's speech acts' and the interactional aspect 'Grice's cooperative principle' in argumentative discourse" (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 76). According to (ibid.), it is necessary to redefine the cooperative principle as wider interactional principles which the participants follow in communication. These principles are "clarity, honesty, efficiency, and relevance". However, there are five particular rules which the participants follow as alternative to speech acts and Gricean maxims:

1. Do not perform any speech acts which are not inclusive.

2. Do not perform any insincere speech acts in conversation.

3. Do not utter unimportant speech acts.

4. Do not perform pointless speech acts.

5. Do not utter speech acts which have no relation to the previous speech acts.

According to van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2015: 551), these five rules are similar to Searle's conditions concerning communication as follows:
1.   The   first   rule   is   similar   to   Searle's   propositional   and   essential conditions.
2. The second rule corresponds to Searle's sincerity condition.
3. The third and the fourth rules are similar to the preparatory condition.
4. The fourth rule does not resemble to any of Searle's conditions.

According to (ibid.), the advantages of combining Searle's speech acts and Grice's cooperative principles are as follows:
1. The communication principle is more specific than Grice's maxims as a result of the integration with Searle's speech acts.

2. It is more general since it is not limited to assertions.

3. The conditions of speech acts make speech acts definite in comparison to the broad principles of interaction.

2.2.2 The Dialectical Dimension

Dialectics is "the study of the regimentation of critical exchanges" (ibid.: 150). Dialectics is a concept that   refers to the rules of the discussion which the participants commit themselves to. These rules manage the discussion and make it systematic (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1988: 507; and Jacobs, 2000: 261). Wenzel (2006: 9) mentions that dialectics views argumentation as a process of interaction among participants who try to settle their differences of opinion. The dialectical dimension is concerned with the concept of reasonableness. The discussion should be reasonable. The concept of reasonableness is different from rationalism. Reasonableness means sensibility which is tied in to thinking and consideration. On the other hand, rationalism means being logical in the discussion (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2015: 204). Both van Eemeren (2007: 392) and Bermejo-Luque (2011: 117) state that the idea of sensibility in relation to pragma-dialectics is so evident, and is related to the principles of discussion.

These principles are represented by the rules of the discussion which are the guidelines to direct, manage and systemize the discussion. The participants try their best to follow these guidelines and submit themselves to these rules. In relation to pragma-dialectics, reasonableness has two concepts: the analytical and empirical dimensions. The former is called the external dimension which deals with the way to solve the disagreement of viewpoints in the discussion. The latter dimension, which is called the internal one, deals with the agreement of the arguers to submit themselves to the norms of the discussion (van Eemeren, 2015: 224). The other dimensions of reasonableness in relation to rational philosophy are: the problem validity and the inter-subjective validity. The problem validity is the way to be effective in the discussion. It is the way to affect the audience of the point of view. The other dimension, the inter-subjective validity, which is related to the rhetorical perspective to convince the other participant of the standpoint (van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2015: 245).

2.2.3 The Rhetorical Dimension

 Rhetoric is the study of "persuasive arguments based on the believes, commitments or the values of the target audience to be persuaded" (Walton, 2007: 7). Simons (1990: 5) defines rhetoric as the study and the application of convincing the other participant of the point of view in the interaction. Leech (1983: 12) defines rhetoric as "the art of using language skillfully for persuasion, or for literary expression, or for public speaking". According to Bermejo-Luque (2011: 148) rhetoric is the study of the improvement of persuading the audience of the standpoint. This definition is related to the logical point of view and excludes the interaction among the participants. Leech (1983: 15) states that rhetoric is the way to be effective in the interaction. This is related to the communicative aspect of using language.

The rhetorical dimension of pragma-dialectics is demonstrated by two concepts: effectiveness and persuasiveness. First, effectiveness deals with the way which makes the addressee understands the point of view. Second, the persuasive perspective is related to the way to convince the audience of the validity of the opinion. It is the way to change the ideas of the other arguer (Jacobs, 2000: 261; Jorgersen, 2007: 166; and van Laar, 2007: 495).

 The rhetorical devices, which are used for convincing the addressees, are: ethos, pathetic and logos. The ethotic rhetorical devices are the ways to make the listeners trust the speakers. The pathetic devices of persuasion are achieved by making the audience adhere to the feelings of the protagonist. They are related to the speaker's attitude and behavior to convince the audience of the point of view. The last rhetorical devices are the logistic means of persuasion which are concerned with the facts presented to the addressees in the discussion. The way to convince the audience is to present different proofs to them. The previous three rhetorical devices are mentioned by Aristotle(cited in Luque, 2017: 64). The rhetorical dimension of pragma- dialectics deals with the ways to evaluate discourse and its contribution within strategic maneuvering.

Strategic maneuvering is a term used in the extended theory of pragma- dialectics which deals with the combination of the dialectical and the rhetorical dimensions (Hohmann, 2002: 41; and Kock, 2009: 93). Thus, strategic maneuvering refers to all the attempts made by those people participating in the argumentative activity to persuade each other while maintaining reasonableness (Houtlosser and Eemeren, 2009: 4-5).

2.3 The Meta-Theoretical Principles

There are four meta-theoretical principles of pragma-dialectics as follows:

2.3.1 The Externalization Principle

The externalization principle deals with the obligations and the commitments which the participants submit themselves to in the discussion. It is called externalization because pragma-dialectics is not only about thinking and logic, but also about the way to externalize thoughts into the cooperative and communicative senses among participants (Walton and Krabbe, 1995: np.; van Eemeren et al, 1996: 122; and Renkema, 2009: 173). This principle aims at the settlement of the disagreement of the points of view among the arguers by the obligations of the discussion (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 157). According to Capone et al. (2013: 517) and van Eemeren (2015: 153), externalization deals with the aspect of interaction among the participants, while internalization deals with the arguers' psychological ideas and logical thinking.

2.3.2 The Functionalization Principle

The functionalization principle deals with the speech acts performed by the participants in the different stages of the critical discussion. It views the importance of context in the discussion (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992: 30-3; and van Eemeren, 2015: 152). This principle according to Renkema (2009:173) and van Eemeren et al. (2014: 533) does not deal with one speech act. It views more than one speech act and the term is called complex speech acts which deal with one speech act having more than one function in each stage. For instance, assertive speech acts have following functions:

1.The statement of the points of view in the confrontation stage.

2. The improvement of the standpoint in the argumentation stage.

3. The statement of the result of the discussion in the concluding stage.

The functionalization principle is demonstrated by performing different speech acts, such as" adopting, questioning, rejecting, defending or attacking" a specific point of view. According to this principle, the participants try to settle the disagreement of the standpoints by performing these different types of speech acts (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004:54).

2.3.3 The Socialization Principle

The socialization principle deals with the different roles which the participants take in the discussion. One of the participant states his or her point of view and shows his or her defense of it and other shows his or her suspicion of the standpoint (van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 1999: 167- 8). This principle takes into account the positions of the arguers and the context in which the discussion occurs (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 3). The most important feature of socialization is that it is a two-way type of communication which deals with the cooperative and the interactive principles among the participants (van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2015: 153) .

According to Blair and Johnson (1987: 46), the roles taken by the participants are the questioner and the answerer. The questioner challenges the answerer of the point of view by asking him questions. The answerer tries to reject the standpoint by his reaction to the questions. According to Rescher (1977: 57), the author takes the role of the proponent. The reader has

two roles which are the opponent and the determiner. As van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984: 15) point out that the opponent is called "a rational judge" who raises certain critical questions and doubts about the point of view.

2.3.4 The Dialectification Principle

The dialectification principle deals with the norms which arrange the discussion and make it systematic. These rules represent the way to reach sensibility in order to settle the difference of opinion(Wenzel, 1979: 84). In pragma-dialectics, this principle has two conditions: problem validity and inter-subjectivity or conventional validity. The problem validity is one of the procedures of the dialectification principles of pragma-dialectics which means "how efficient and efficacious it is in further the resolution of a difference of opinion and excludes fallacious norms; its inter-subjective validity depends on its acceptability to the parties involved" (van Eemeren and Houtlosser, 2006: 6).

The rules of critical discussion are valid if each one of them has a role to settle the disagreement of the points of view among the arguers (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 2004: 134). Van Eemeren et al. (2009: 27) point out that "the rules for critical discussion are problem valid because they are instrumental in the resolution process by creating the possibility to resolve the differences of opinion on the merits". The second criterion of the norms of critical discussion is conventional validity which represents the agreement of the participants upon these rules. Thus, the presented criteria are arranged in a hierarchical order (the problem validity and then the conventional validity). It is useless to deal with the conventional validity without demonstrating the instrumental view of resolving the difference of the points of view (van Eemeren et al., 2009: 27).

2.4 Political Discourse

This section deals with the definitions of political discourse, the features of political language, political argumentations, and American electoral campaign debates.

2.4.1 Definition of Political Discourse

Political discourse is a type of discourse which is concerned with the texts or the talk of the professional politicians or the political institutions such as presidents, ministers, and the other members of the government (Chilton and Shaffner, 2002: 6). Political discourse deals with two criteria: functional and thematic. The functional criterion of political discourse deals with the way to convince the audience of the politicians' standpoints in order to vote for a specific party or to satisfy the public opinion. The other criterion is the thematic one which is identified by the political topics such as the political ideas, activities and acts. These topics are all related to politics (Memon, et al.2014).

2.4.2 Features of Political Language

 Political language is the language of authority, of decision-making, and of convincing the audience of the standpoints (Cedroni, 2013: 220- 1). According to Christina (2003: 23), political texts, which are historically and culturally determined; are part of politics. Their topics are related to politics and are meant for the public.

 Another feature of political language is the persuasive characteristic of political discourse which is represented by the way to convince the audience of the validity of politicians' point of view Tosi (2001: 106; and Black , 2005: 1).The aim of this feature is persuasive rather than the presentation of information. Most politicians are interested in the spoken political discourse rather than the written one because the former has the persuasive feature of using language.

According to Schaffer and Wiesemann (2001: 135), some political texts are argumentative, others are persuasive. From one hand, the argumentative texts are concerned with the way to settle the disagreement of the points of view among participants. On the other hand, the persuasive texts aim at the way to convince the addressees of the politicians' standpoints.

36

2.4.3 Political Argumentation

Political argumentation is winning a dispute, showing authority, making the good decisions for the people, and persuading the audience of the points of view. Political argumentation is dependent upon the institutional situation (Houtlosser and Eemeren, 2009: 4-5). Political argumentation is demonstrated by its institutional characteristic, but there are no guidelines for this feature. Any argumentative activity carried out by any individuals speaking about political issues can be classified as a type of political argumentative activity (Houtlosser and Eemeren, 2009: 116). Political argumentation has the following features:

1. No Time Limits

Political argumentation is characterized by being free of time limits. Argumentative practice has no artificial time to the participants to restrict themselves to (ibid.).

2. No Definite Terminus

The most important characteristic of political argumentation is that it has no definite terminus. There is no evident indication that the argumentation raised is over because the participant defends his or her point of view till the end of the talk (Houtlosser and Eemeren, 2009: 117).

3. Non Homogeneous Audience

Non homogeneous audience is another characteristic of political argumentation. The audience are of various values, believes and opinions. This is one of the problems which faces the politician since he or she has to convince such a non-homogeneous audience (ibid.: 118).

4. Free Access

Free access is the last feature of political argumentation. It is one of the properties that most politicians admit themselves to because their speech is open and meant for the public. The importance of this feature is demonstrated by the fact that most politicians do not use technical terms of politics which make their talk vague to the audience. Thus, most politicians try to express their points of view which they think are accepted by the public (ibid.:120).

2.4.4 American Electoral Campaign Debates

Political discourse can be spoken or written. Spoken political discourse includes political speeches and political debates. On the other hand, written political discourse includes the political documents (Fairclough and Fairclough, 2016: 184). According to Allwood and Ahlsen (2015: 66), a political debate is a conflict of opinion between two politicians about a specific issue in the existence of the public. Most political debates are to be viewed on television in order to be more public.

American electoral campaign debates are "the most well-known political debates. They are also the most followed, viewed, controlled, and the most researched political television programs" (Isotalus, 2011: 31). Barbaros (2013: 142) points out the most noticeable feature of electoral campaign dispute is that the nominees of the parties face each other in the debate. The speech is formal and has a sense of power or authority. The arguers allow the viewers of these televised events to make a kind of comparison among the nominees and to identify their points of view.

According to Benoit (2014: 3-7), these debates are of a great importance to the voters, the candidates, and democracy. First of all, these conflicts provide the votes with the ideas and the opinions of the nominees. The candidates should not bring notes or scripts with them in the debate. Second of all, the candidates utilize debates to represent their points of view, and the promises to the whole nation. These conflicts represent a clash among the nominees. Clash means not only the conflict

among the politicians, but also how to respond to the attack. Lastly, these genres of political discourse provide democracy with another source of information to the voters, and they are an essential part of modern election campaign. They are characterized by being as live events, similar issues are discussed, and the nominees answer the questions addressed to them. These genres of political discourse are the only chance for the voters to see the nominees who express their opinions. These debates are viewed on television to make them public. The time of each American electoral campaign debate is of ninety minutes. The questions directed for the politician are either from one of the audience or from the viewer who asks a question to one of the candidates or it is directed to the candidates. The time to answer each question is two minutes, but sometimes the nominee does not commit himself or herself to the specific time.

According to Bartles and Vavreck (2000: 219), the features of the campaign debates are demonstrated be affecting the audience, and providing the voters the chance to recognize the nominees' political ideas. These debates are necessary for the voters because they provide them with the information about the nominees such as their ideas and their common points of view and the clash of ideologies. Another characteristic of American debates is the question-answer format. The questions are presented by the voters or journalists. The subjects of the questions are of great importance in this political event (Benoit, 2016: 140).

According to Trent and Friedenberg (2008: 314), the American electoral campaign debates have eight effects:

1. They affect the addressees.

2. They encourage the audience to show their ideas by the kinds of questions addressed to the candidates.

3. They contribute in removing a number of candidates from election.

4. Debates contribute in showing the candidates agenda.

5. The voters have great information about the nominees after the formers watch the big political event (the campaign debates).

6. They reflect the nominees' ideas, and plans.

7. They freeze the election till the results, like who wins in the debate?

8. They take part in the audience's confidence in the political institutions and leaders.

2.5 Model of Analysis

Critical discussion is an ideal model of pragma-dialectics in argumentative discourse. This model is used in the analysis of the data. It aims at resolving the disagreement of opinion among the arguers in a sensible discussion by means to discover whether the point of view is acceptable or not (van Eemeren and Snoeck-Henkenmans, 2007: 19).

The model treats argumentative discourse as argumentation which is guided by a reasonable settlement of a difference of the viewpoint. It has two functions: heuristic and critical. The heuristic function represents a means which is used by the analysts in the analysis and the evaluation of the argumentative discourse and text. The critical function reveals the rules of the sensible discussion which the participants commit themselves to. These rules represent a way to settle the arguers' disagreement of opinions (van Eemeren and Grootendorst, 1992: 39; 2004: 58-9). The model aims at presenting two levels: the argumentative indicators of each stage of the model and the functions of these indicators. According to Tindale (2004: 14), the model of critical discussion joins the dialectical and rhetorical dimensions and combines the way to affect the audience in a reasonable way.

According to van Eemeren (2012: 87), the discussion among the participants is based on the critical exchanges which are achieved by the questions asked by the speaker and the answers by the listener. The critical discussion connects the logical view or (the dialectical perspective) and the different exchanges (or the pragmatic perspective) in the argumentative discourse.

According to Jakaza and Visser (2014: 67), the reasonableness concept in critical discussion indicates that each opinion is examined in the model. The viewpoint is tested logically by specifying the dialectical stages and the exchanges to settle the conflict among the participants. According to Palmieri (2014: 29-30), the model of critical discussion guides the analysts to reconstruct and evaluate the argumentative exchanges within the interaction. This model does not deal with describing the communication noticeably. It does not deal with the contextual elements which affect argumentation.

The argumentative indicators represent the expressions which are used in each stage of the critical discussion: the confrontation, the opening, the argumentation, and the concluding stages. The indicators and their functions are as the following:

2.5.1 The Argumentative Indicators and Functions in the Confrontation Stage

This stage has three types of indicators: propositional attitude, force modifying, and dispute.

1. Propositional Attitude Indicators

Propositional attitude indicators are produced by 1st person singular pronoun, "I" (Rocci, 2017: 186). According to van Eemeren et al. (2007: 31), these expressions are:

a. Weak Assertive Attitude

Weak assertive attitude (propositional attitude or force modifying) shows that the participant (speaker) adds to his or her statement what he knows. The speaker states what he or she thinks to be true. It includes these expressions: "I believe that", "I find that", "I think that", "I assume that", "I expect that", "I suspect that", and "it seems to me that" (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 33, 31).

b. Strong Assertive Attitude

Strong assertive attitude (propositional attitude or force modifying) indicates that the participant (speaker) has a sense of certainty of what he or she is asserting. Strong assertive attitude includes these expressions: "I am sure", "I am certain that", and "I am convinced that" (ibid.).

c. Semi-Assertive Attitude

Semi-assertive attitude (propositional attitude or force modifying) refers to a large degree of certainty. Semi-assertive attitude includes "I know that" and "I am certain" (ibid.). For instance:

1. **Marry thinks that** John is qualified (propositional attitude indicator) (Infantido, 2001: 81).
In this sentence, "Marry thinks that" is a weak assertive attitude since Marry believes of what she is asserting "John is qualified".

2. **I believe that** she is coming (weak assertive) (van Eemeren, 2007: 29). "I believe that" is a propositional attitude since it starts with "I". It is weak assertive attitude because the speaker knows what he or she is asserting to be true. Thus, it is certain

that she is coming. The function of the propositional attitude indicators is presenting a standpoint in the discussion (ibid.: 31).

2. Force Modifying Expressions

Force modifying expressions are represented by adjectives, like "It is certain that", or adverbs, like "supposedly" and "suddenly" (Rocci, 2017: 186). According to van Eemeren et al. (2007: 31), force modifying expressions are the following:

a. Weak Assertives

Weak assertives include "in my opinion", "to my mind", "in my view", "as I see it", "it is likely that", "it is probably that", "supposedly", "in fact", and "indeed".

b. Strong Assertives

Strong assertives include "it is clear that", "it is true that" and "it is obvious that".

Force modifying expressions have **the same function** as propositional attitude indicators (ibid.).

3. **In my view**, there's no sense in presenting the point (force modifying expression) (ibid.).

In this sentence, "in my view" is a force modifying expression since it does not begin with "I". This expression is a weak assertive attitude since the participant believes that it is useless to state the point.

4. **It is true that** TV makes life fun, because since we have had television, we do not play games anymore (van Eemeren and Snoeck-Henkenmans, 2007: 31).

In the previous sentence, "it is true that" is a strong assertive attitude since there it is a sense of certainty about the statement which is TV makes life fun.

3. Dispute Indicators

A   dispute   refers   to   the   speaker's   suspicion   of   the   listener's   viewpoint.   Dispute   indicators   are   as follows:

(I am not so sure about that, one can disagree about that, I do not know, I do question/ have doubts about that, I am not completely sure about that, could not it be different? , could not it be so that…?, I do not care, and as a matter of fact) (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 45-6).

5. **I do not care** whether John has stopped smoking or not (ibid.: 56).

6. **As a matter of fact**, he has not stopped cigarettes for himself (ibid.).

2.5. 2 The Argumentative Indicators and Functions in the Opening Stage

The opening stage indicators, "go ahead and prove it", "perhaps you can clarify this matter", "please make it clear for us", "can you explain that?", indicate a challenge to defend a viewpoint. The expression, "go ahead and prove it", refers to a direct challenge to defend the opinion. The other expressions are used as indirect challenge to defend the standpoint. The expressions, "I will tell you that", "there are two arguments", "also based on certain signals", "I will clarify this", refer to the participant's agreement of a one-sided burden of proof. The indicators, "I have nothing at all to add to", "I can only take a

40

note of that", "I can hardly force you to regard my explanation as logical", "latter I will explain why", refer to deny a one-sided burden of prove (ibid.: 72).

The other expressions, "I/we agree that", "you agree with me that", "as we agreed", "and that", "everybody knows that", "nobody in his right mind would deny that", "it is clear that", "obviously", "naturally", "of course", "fortunately", "let us see if we cannot agree all", "would you agree to the following points to start with", "well, why do not you start considering them then?", indicate the participant's agreement of the other arguers proposition at the beginning of the discussion (van Eemeren, 2010: 242). The expressions, "no", "I do not think so", "I do not agree with that", "you cannot just assume that", indicate denying a proposition by one of the participants (ibid.: 343; and van Eemeren et al., 2007: 131).

7. Van Trra (Chairman): How many indicators do you have of cases (of corruption) outside the police office and where do they occur?

- Mr. Fijnaunt: About the figures I hesitate to speak. **Later I will explain why**. In the domain in question, I can mention two. In the first place, local authorities, apart from the police. In the second place, the position system (Interview Parliamentary Committee Criminal Investigation Pictures, 6 September 1995) (ibid.: 83-4).

In this argumentation, " latter I will explain why" indicates that Mr. Fijnaunt refuses talking about the responsible figures in corruption cases, but he will in another time.

8. Mr. Weigglass (VVD): (…) Why do you think the balance between political democratic and military action is gone? That is after all the main argument for the term the GoenLinks made.

- Mr. Roenmoller (GroenLink): **I will tell you that** (Parliamentary Debate in the Netherlands about the developments in Afghanistan, 15 November 2001) (ibid.: 78).

In the previous argumentation, Mr. Roenmoller uses the expression "I will tell you" to represent an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof.

9. Mrs. Vos (GroenLink): The Prime Minister has said: at this time it is too delicate to exchange this with anyone. So, it was too delicate to exchange it with you. I understand that you have reconciled yourself to this fact. Is that the case? And if it is, does not it mean that the order of rank is clear now, and that the Prime Minister is the one who runs the tracked, as far as this is concerned?

Secondary van Aartsen: **I have nothing at all to add to** what I answered earlier (Lower House Debate in the Netherland about the High Commissioner for Refugees, 31 October 2000) (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 82).

10. **Everybody knows that** the crucial mistake was made in 1993.   – **Everybody knows that** the Serbians committed to the murders.   – **Everybody knows that** it was impossible for Dutch bat to defend the enclave. Why on top of that a Parliamentary inquiry? What information is missing to be able to have a standpoint on this? (Arno Visser, candidate MP for the VVD on Politiek-Digitaal, nl, 15 December 2003) (ibid.: 106).

2.5.3 The Argumentative Indicators and Functions in the Argumentation Stage

Richards (2006: 74) points out that the following points about argumentation stage:
a. The development of the discussion,
b. The agreement or the disagreement of the points of view, and
c. The request for clarifications and justifications to support the viewpoints.

This stage deals with the argumentation structure which can be defined as " the way in which the reasons advanced, hang together and jointly support the standpoint that is defended" (van Eemeren, 2002: 23). 23). The argumentative indicators of this stage include: the indicators of subordinative, coordinative, cumulative coordinative, complementary coordinative, and multiple argumentations. These expressions are as the following:

1. Subordinative Argumentation

According to van Eemeren et al. (2002: 74) and van Eemeren et al. (2007: 192), the argumentative indicators of the subordinative argumentation, which are (because, for, therefore, thus, since because, for because, after all because, as since, that is why, and in view of), refer to using more than two reasons to support the participant's viewpoint. The reasons are in a serial order which means one reason comes after another in the discussion (ibid.: 74).

11. I would better not stay any longer, **for because** I am so tired you just find me boring company (van Eemeren et al., 2002: 74).   "For because" is used to represent subordinative argumentation. Two serial reasons are used to support the speaker's viewpoint. The speaker states that he or she wants to go home (standpoint) because " he is tired" and "you just find me boring company".

12. I lent him the money **because** he needed it (Quirk and Greenbaum, 1973: 227).

13. I think it is so cool, **because** the color is bright it is flashing (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 74).

14. Paula: I do not think we should go and see him in Seville, **because** that would be far too expensive.

 - Auton: What non-sense! You can fly to Spain for almost nothing.

 - Paula: Not to Seville, **because** there are only scheduled fighters to Seville (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 122).

In this argumentation, Paula uses "because" to indicate that he supports his opinion by using two serial reasons. His viewpoint is "I don't think we should go and see him in Seville" because "that would be far too expensive" and "there are only scheduled fighters to Seville".

2. Coordinative Argumentation

According to van Eemeren et al. (2002: 73), the indicators of coordinative argumentation are as the following:

(In addition, as well as, on top of that, even, plus, not only, but, also, and more importantly).

The expressions of coordinative argumentation refer to gathering two or more than two arguments to support the participant's viewpoint (Hietanen, 2007: 64):

15. You should give me an allowance. **In addition to ** the fact that I would like to buy lunch in the cafeteria, like the other kids, it's a pain to always to have to ask you for money for school supplies. And you do not have to save for entertainment and presents for my friends (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 73). In this sentence, the argumentative indicator of coordinative argumentation is "in addition to".
16. Paula: It must be a good film, because it is playing at the Rialto.
Auton: It is not as if I never saw a bad film at the Rialto.
 - Paula: Yes, **but** Theo was also very enthusiastic about it (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 110).

In this argumentation, Paula uses the expression "but" to indicate gathering two arguments to support her viewpoint. The standpoint is "it must be a good film". The two arguments are "because it is playing at the Rialto" and "Theo was very enthusiastic about it".

3. The Cumulative Coordinative Indicators

The expressions which are used to indicate cumulative coordinative argumentation, as Snoeck-Henkenmans (2003: 5) mentions, are: secondary reason is, an added reason is, less importantly, and all the more since/ because, the more so since, especially/ particularly, to top that off, and even). The indicators of cumulative coordinative argumentation indicate providing the other participant more reasons to support the standpoint. The reasons are of great or less importance than the other reasons in the discussion (ibid.).

17. A flight must be well-prepared. The luggage, which you have to learn when you check in, may end up lost or may arrive at the destination with a delay. Therefore, it is best to keep all necessary objects for treating and checking your diabetes with you onboard. (…) **An additional reason** to keep the insulin in your hand-luggage is that the temperature in the luggage area of an airplane can become very low, which means the insulin could freeze (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 212).

In the previous argumentation, "an additional reason" is used to represent cumulative coordinative argumentation. The participant provides the listener with another justification to support his viewpoint.

18. Because the size of the archives (an inventory showed them to measure 0.5 metres), destruction did not take place. **A secondary reason** for keeping all the existing material **is** the fact the financial data have a great supplementary value for historical research into the work of rationing service (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 212).

4. Complementary Coordinative Argumentation

The indicators of the complementary coordinative argumentation, as (ibid.: 218-9) mention, are (while, whereas, not even, and yet).

The function of complementary coordinative argumentation indicators is the viewpoint is criticized by the other arguer. Thus, the protagonist tries to express another viewpoint to support his or her standpoint (Snoeck-Henkenmans, 2003: 6).

19. Paula: I had choice but to stay the night at Eric's because the last bus had not arrived **yet**.

 - Auton: But you could have asked me to come and pick you up.

- Paula: But I did not want to wake you up (ibid.: 5).

"Yet" indicates that Paula uses another viewpoint because her first standpoint is rejected be Auton. Paula's first statement is "the last bus has not arrived yet". Then, she uses another viewpoint which is "but I didn't want to wake you up" because her first statement is rejected by Auton "but you could have asked me to come and pick you up".

5. Multiple Argumentation

The multiple argumentation is concerned with the defense of the arguer of his or her viewpoint by providing the other arguers with more reason. The reasons are with separate lines of the defense (van Eemeren, 2002: 23; and van Eemeren et al., 2007: 73). Snoeck-Henkenmans (2003: 3-4) mentions that this type of argumentation is called multiple because the speaker has more than one justification to support his or her viewpoint. The indicators of multiple argumentation are: Anyway, anyhow, even if, whatever, the case maybe, in any case, leaving aside that, and then I even mention, not to mention the fact that, needless to say, but that's not the only reason, just as important, at least as important, firstly, secondly, to begin with, lastly, finally, another argument, and furthermore. According to van Eemeren et al. (2002: 73), the argumentative indicators of

43

multiple argumentation are the following: (Needless to say, not to mention, another reason for this is, one argument for this is, secondly, by the way, quit apart from, and aside from. According to Bach (1999: 356-8), the expressions of multiple argumentations are: (First of all, next, last, by the way, above all, most importantly, and to say the case).

The indicators of multiple argumentation, as Bach (ibid.: 3-4) mentions, refer to more reasons are used to support the standpoint. The expressions "anyway", "anyhow", "even if", "whatever", "the case maybe", and "in any case" refer to the fact that the new reason is enough for supporting the viewpoint. The expressions "leaving aside that", "and then I even mention, "not to mention the fact that", and "needless to say" are used to indicate that it is important to mention the justification in the discussion. The expressions "but that is not the only reason", "but there is another reason", "just as important", and "at least as important" are used to indicate that the participants provide more reasons for the standpoint. The expressions "firstly", "secondly", "to begin with", "next", "lastly", "finally", "another argument", and "furthermore" are used to indicate advancing more than one opinion in conversation.

According to Snoeck-Henkenmans (1996: 81), "anyway" indicates that the protagonist provides the antagonist by a new and a strong viewpoint.

20. Paula: I think that you should stop taking herbal pills. They don't work **anyway**.

- Auton: That is not true; I have already lost a couple of pounds.

- Paula: But is not it dangerous to take something without having any kind of the side-effect (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 200).

"Anyway" indicates that Paula provides Auton with a new and a strong standpoint other than the previous one. Paula's previous standpoint is "I think you should stop taking herbal pills, "they do not work anyway". While the stronger standpoint is " is not it dangerous to take something without having its side-effect".

2.5.4 The Argumentative Indicators and Functions in the Concluding Stage

The indicators of this stage, as Perkins (1995: 6) and Backinbach and Davies (1997: 39) mention, are: Therefore, in conclusion, so, it follows that, consequently, hence, this shows that accordingly, thus, we may show that, and for that reason:

21. Tom: Bob, why didn't you go to the concert last night?

 - Bob: I had the flu. **Therefore**, I did not go (Furnan, 2011: 4).

In this argumentation, Bob uses the expression "therefore" as an indicator of concluding stage. Bob states he is sick, thus, he cannot go anywhere. The other expressions, which are used to indicate this stage, as mentioned by Lepore and Cummming (2009: 6-7); and Fisher (2004: 16), are the following: It follows, we cannot fail to be, this implies, these facts indicate, this supports the view of, … Which implies that, which allows us to, establishes the fact that, and demonstrates that.

Van Eemeren et al. (2007: 2, 228, 230) mention the indicators of this stage as follows: I maintain that, I stand by my opinion, I stick to my opinion, I contend that, I still insist, If that is the case, then, If that is true, then you are, then, that is indeed the case, I still disagree with you, I still do not agree, you have not convinced me, I have nothing to say against this, and I gave up:

22. No, Wendi, **you have not convinced me yet**. I think I will come with some additional criticism (ibid.: 230).

"You have not convinced me yet" is used as an expression to represent the concluding stage. The listener's argument is not enough to persuade the speaker.

The expressions "therefore", "in conclusion", "so", "it follows that", "consequently", "hence", "this shows that accordingly", "thus", "we may show that", "and for that reason", "we cannot fail to be", "this implies", "these facts indicate", "this supports the view of", "which implies that", "which allows us to", "establishes the fact that", and "demonstrates that" indicate the result of the discussion (Perkins, 1995: 6; and Beckinbach and Davies, 1997: 39).

According to van Eemeren et al. (2007: 227-8); and Fraster (1995: n.p.), the expressions "I stand by my opinion", "I stick to my opinion", "I contend that", "I still insist", and "I maintain that" are used to indicate that the protagonist maintains his or her opinion till the end of the discussion.

According to van Eemeren et al. (2007: 228), the expressions like "if that is the case, then", "if that is true, then you are…", and "then, this is indeed the case" indicate that the addressee changes his or her viewpoint at the end of conversation. The expressions, "I still disagree with you", "I still do not agree", and "you have not convinced me" are used to indicate that the antagonist keeps his or her suspicion at the last stage of the discussion. The indicators, "I have nothing to say against this" and "I gave up", are used to show that the speaker removes his suspicion of the listener's standpoint. Thus, the listener wins the discussion.

23. Tom: Bob, why did not you go to the concert last night?

- Bob: I had the flu. **Therefore**, I cannot go (Furnan, 2011: 4).

24. **I contend that** the controversy with the Bush government has had a stimulating rather than a demoralizing effect on both the military and the non-military European increase of power (van Eemeren et al., 2007: 227).

25. I am no match for the strong arguments, **I gave up** (ibid.: 230).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Collection

The data are six American electoral campaign debates during the American presidential election 2016. Only one of the debates occurs in 2015, while the others are in 2016. The debates are randomly collected from six websites. The data are collected on 2017-2018. These debates are as the following:
1. The Republican Presidential Debate in Detroit. The date of the debate is March 2, 2016 published by New York Times/ Richard Perry. Accessed at November 10, 2017. Available at: **www.nytimes.com**

2. The Second Republican Debate. The date of the debate is September 18, 2015 published by Ryan Teague Beckwith. Accessed at December 2, 2017. Available at: **www.time.com**

3. The 5th Republican Debate transcript, annotated: Who said what and what it meant. The date of the debate is December 15, 2015 Published by Team Fix. Accessed at January 2, 2018. Available at: **www.washingtonpost.com**
4. The Democratic Presidential Debate in Flint, Mich. The date of the debate is March 6, 2016 published by Richard Perry, New York Times. Accessed at January 6, 2018. Available at: **www.nytimes.com**
5. MSNBC 2016 Democratic Candidates Debate. Published by Chuck Tood and Richel Maddow. Accessed at November 5, 2017. Available at: **www.nbcnews.com**

6. CNN Democratic Debate. The date of the debate is April 15, 2016 published by CNN. Accessed at January 15, 2018. Available at: **www.cnn.com**

The choice of the websites as the source of the data to be analyzed by the present study is justified as follows:

1. The websites represent the necessary needs of the researchers who want to study the argumentative indicators in the American electoral campaign debates.
2. They contain the argumentative indicators of the four stages of the model of critical discussion and the functions of the indicators.
3. They fulfill the aims of the study.

3.2 Data Description

Data description includes features of data and data context as follows:

3.2.1. Features of Data

1. Genre

American electoral campaign debates are genres of political discourse. A political debate is a conflict between two or more than two politicians. Political debates are televised in the existence of the audience (Allwood and Ahlsen, 2015: 66).

Christina (2003: 23) views the characterization of a political text which is based on functional and thematic criteria. Political texts are part of politics. They are historically and culturally determined, and they fulfill different functions due to different political activities. The topics are primarily related to politics; i. e. political activities, political ideas and political issues. Another feature is that, in the majority of cases, they are meant for the public.

2. Length

The data are six American electoral campaign debates. Three debates are for Trump and three debates are for Clinton. There is no sex factor in this study because the theory of pragma-dialectics does not deal with gender factor. The total pages of these debates under study are (69) pages distributed to Trump (31) and to Clinton (38). They are different   in length according to what the nominees' have of ideas. Thus, this is related to the candidate's personality, for instance, some of them try to express his or her thoughts by using more reasons to state one viewpoint. Others use only one strong justification to support his or her standpoint.

3. Themes

The American electoral campaign debates are of various issues facing America and the world like terrorism, peace, health, education, war, and ISIS.

4. Form

The debates are written scripts. The written data of Trump's and Clinton's argumentations are more preferable for the researchers because they provide them with comprehensive information of the topic under the study. Another reason is that these scripts can be reread again.

3.2.2 Data Context

Context of speech refers to the rhetorical situations which include: the speaker, the audience, the message, the channel, and the goals (Brydon and Scott, 2008: 133). It is necessary to introduce some details about the context of American election campaign debates because of its importance in understanding the construction of the meaning of speech.

1. The Speaker

The speakers in the political debates are politicians and they are Trump and Clinton.

2. The Addressee

The addressee indicates the person to whom the debate is directed. The addressees of the debates are the American audience (ibid.).

3. The Topic

The topic refers to the content of the debates and the issues which are taken into the politicians' considerations.

4. The Settings

The settings refer to the time and the place of the debates. The American campaign debates under the study occur in 2015-2016 before the American election 2016. They occur in different cities: New York, Detroit, Miami, New Hampshire, and Michigan.

5. The Purpose

The debates are of many purposes. They are meant for the public which means to the audience, and these debates are chance to the politicians to express their points of view, their ideas and their promises to the people before election. They provide the voters with the nominees' ideas and opinions (Benoit, 2014: 3, 4, 5, 7).

3.3 Procedure of the Study

The procedure adopted to achieve the aims of the study and test its hypotheses includes the following:

1. Reviewing the literature about pragma-dialectics as a theory of argumentative discourse, political discourse, and the American electoral campaign debates as the genre to be taken in data analysis.

2. Choosing a model of pragma-dialectics to pragmatically analyze the data under study.

3. Collecting and describing the data in relation to the genre under study.

4. Identifying the argumentative indicators and their functions in Trump's and Clinton's argumentations by using the model adopted.

5. Showing the similarities and the differences of Trump's and Clinton's argumentative indicators and their functions by using the quantitative analysis achieved by the Chi-square.

3.4 Model of Analysis

The model of analysis is Critical Discussion. It is an eclectic model taken from van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1989, 1992, 2004), van Eemeren et al. (2002, 2007); and van Eemeren (2002, 2010, 2012). This model of analysis is chosen because it is suitable to analyze the data, achieve the aims, and because it contains the argumentative indicators and their functions.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Data Analysis and Discussion

4.1.1. Method of Analysis

The data analysis is a pragma-dialectical one. It is done by the model of critical discussion. The analysis is concerned with the argumentative indicators of each stage and the functions of the indicators. The analysis starts with the argumentative indicators of Trump's argumentations and the functions of the indicators followed by Clinton. The analysis is mixture of a qualitative and a quantitative analyses. It is qualitative in the sense that analyzing the data by using model of analysis which is a pragma-dialectical analysis. It is quantitative by using the chi-square to test the validity of the hypotheses and find out the similarities and differences.

4.1.2 Pragma-dialectical Analysis

The analysis in this study starts with analyzing Trump's argumentations followed by Clinton's ones. The work starts with the analysis of Trump's debates because he wins the American election 2016 and becomes the president. Pragma-dialectical analysis in this study is not concerned with the factor of gender because Trump's argumentative indicators are not generalized to all men, and Clinton's indicators are not generalized to all women. The study deals with the indicators which are only used by Trump and Clinton.

4.1.2.1 A Pragma-dialectical Analysis of Trump's Debates

A pragma-dialectical analysis of Trump's debates includes the argumentative indicators and their functions as below:

4.1.2.1.1 Trump's Argumentative Indicators

Trump's argumentative indicators include the expressions which are found in the four stages as follows:

1. Confrontation Stage Indicators

The indicators of confrontation stage are divided into: propositional attitude, force modifying, and dispute indicators. The frequencies and the percentages of these indicators are available in Table (1):

Table 1 :Trump's Confrontation Stage Indicators

Propositional Attitude	Freq.	%	Force Modifying	Freq.	%	Dispute Indicators	Freq.	%
I think that	21	58.3	In my opinion	3	8.6	I am not sure	0	0

I find that	0	0	To my mind	0	0	One can disagree about that	0	0
I assume that	0	0	In my view	0	0	I don't know	3	8.3
It seems to me that	0	0	As I see it	0	0	I have doubts about that	1	2.7
I am sure	0	0	It is clear that	1	2.7	I am not completely sure about that	0	0
I know	2	5.55	In fact	3	8.3	Couldn't it be different	0	0
I believe that	2	5.55	It is obviously that	0	0	I don't care	0	0
Total	25	69.4		7	19.6		4	11
Total	100							

The most frequent confrontation stage indicators are "propositional attitude indicators" (69.4 %), and the least frequent indicators are "dispute indicators" (11 %). As a candidate, Trump wants to express his personal opinions and ideas more than showing his doubts of the other nominees' standpoints. The highest percentage of the propositional attitude indicators is for "I think that" (58.3 %):

26. **I think** being off the record is a very important thing (Detroit debate) (www.nytimes.com)

(used by Trump).

27. **I   think** the   thing   about   the   flat   tax   was   very   well   (the   Second   Republican   debate) (www.time.com).

"The tax" represents an important issue in Trump's campaign agenda. In this argumentation, he expresses his viewpoint about "the flat tax".

The indicators, which are not used by Trump, are "I find that", "I assume that", "it seems to me that", "I am sure", and "I am certain". The reason is that Trump does not present strong viewpoints during his debates. He utilizes "I think" which is "weak assertive propositional attitude" more than using strong assertive propositional attitude "I am sure", and "I am certain" because he never gets any political position previously, and he is a businessman. Thus, his opinions are weak and random. The most prominent force modifying expressions are "in fact and in my opinion" which get the same percentage (8.6 %). The situations are:

28.   We   should   go   tougher   than   waterboarding,   **that's   my   opinion**   (in   Detroit   debate) (www.nytimes.com).
29. **In fact**, today, on the front page of the Wall Street journal, they fired another 25, or 30,000 people saying we still haven't recorded the catastrophe (the 2nd Republican debate) (www.time.com).
30.**I don't know** if he lied or not (in Detroit debate) (www.nytimes.com). 40. **I don't know**, you feel safe now? (in the 2nd Republican debate) (www.time.com).

The dispute expressions, which are not used in the debates, are "I doubt" (2.77 %), "one can disagree about that", I am not sure", "couldn't it be different?", and "I don't care". The reason is that Trump wants to express his standpoints more than showing his suspicions about the other Republican nominees' viewpoints. "I don't know" is the most frequent dispute expression and the others are of less percentages because Trump rarely shows his suspicion of the other candidates' opinions.

2.Opening Stage Indicators
Trump's opening stage indicators, and their frequencies, and percentages are illustrated in Table 2 as follows:

Table 2: Trump's Opening Stage Indicators

Opening Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
I can/ will tell you	10	23.90
Let me tell you something	3	7. 14
I have nothing to say	1	2.38
I agree with	2	4.78
I don't think so	2	4.78
No	6	14.28
I was against	2	4.76
Obviously	2	4.76
Of course	2	4.76
I will say this	5	11.90
Ok	6	14.2
Go ahead	1	2.3
Total	42	100

The most frequent opening stage indicators are "I can/will tell you" (23. 90 %) , "no", "ok" represent (14.2 %). Some of these situations are:

31. **I can tell you** something, Mexico is going to pay for the wall (in Detroit debate) (www.nytimes.com).
One of the issues, which Trump focuses on in his election campaign program, is to build a big wall between America and Mexico. The purpose of this wall is to prevent the illegal immigrants, who come from Mexico to America. This wall costs billions of dollars. The argumentative indicator in this situation is "I will tell you" which indicates his agreement that Mexico is going to pay for that wall.

32. **I will tell you** this, what I am far and away than an entertainer is a business man (in the 2nd Republican debate) (www.time.com).
 The least frequent indicators are "I agree with", and "I don't think so"(4.78), "obviously", and "of course" which have the same percentage (4.76 %), and "go ahead" is (2.3 %). The reason behind getting these percentages is Trump's agreement which is more than his disagreement with the other candidates' opinions.

33. **I agree with**- what Chris is saying about illegal immigration (in the 2nd Republican debate) (www.time.com).

34. We are the only one of the countries, we're going to take care of those babies for 70, 75, 80, 90 years? **I don't think so** (in the 5th Republican debate) (www.washingtonpost.com).

35. **I was against** going into Iraq (www.nytimes.com).

36. I don't take that, and I guess, **obviously**, he wants to be relevant (in Detroit debate) (www.(www.nytimes.com).

37. **Of course** we are going to buy for things for less money (in Detroit debate)(www.nytimes.com).

38. I get along with all of them, and I did a damn good job in doing it. **Go ahead** (in the 2nd Republican debate) (www.time.com).

3. Argumentation Stage Indicators

Table 3 below shows the indicators of argumentation stage and the frequencies of these indicators as follows :

Table 3: Trump's Argumentation Stage Indicators

Subordinative indicators	Freq.	%	Coordinative Indicators	Freq.	%	Cumulative Indicators	Freq.	%	Multiple	Freq.	%
Because	15	15	But	49	49	Even	1	1	Even if	0	0
So	0	0	even	1	1	A secondary reason	0	0	And yet	1	1
For	0	0	So important	1	1	An added reason is	0	0	Anymore	1	1
Since because	0	0	In addition	0	0	Especially	0	0	By the way	16	16
As since	0	0	As well as	1	1	Particularly	0	0	First of all	7	7
In view of	0	0	But if	1	1				What-ever	1	1
That is why	2	2	Also	2	2				Anyway	1	1
Total	17	17		55	55		1	1		27	27
Total	100										

The most prominent argumentation stage indicators are " the indicators of coordinative argumentation" which represent (55 %). The least prominent indicators are "cumulative coordinative indicator "even" which is (1 %). The reason is that Trump joins two or more reasons to support his standpoint (55 %) than using the reasons which are of less or of great importance (1

%) (
see table 7 which shows the functions of Trump's argumentation stage indicators).

   The expressions of coordinative argumentation are (55 %). The most frequent indicator of coordinative argumentation is "but". The percentage of the frequency is (49 %) because Trump uses two or more reasons to support one viewpoint. The least frequent indicators are "even, so important, as well as, but if" which get (1 %), "in addition" is (0 %), and "also" is (2%).

39. I say free trade is great. **But**, not when they are beating us so badly (in the Presidential Debate in Detroit) (www.nytimes.com).

The indicators of multiple argumentation are (27 %). The notable expression is "by the way" which gets (16 %). It is found in:

40.   **By   the   way**,   Mexico   is   going   to   pay   for   the   wall   (in   Detroit   debate) (www.nytimes.com).

The least frequent indicators are "anymore, whatever, anyway, and yet" (1 %), and "even if" (0 %). The reason is that he rarely utilizes more separate reasons to develop his standpoints. He expresses an opinion and rarely develops it in the argumentation stage.

   The indicators of subordinative argumentation are (17 %). "Because" gets the highest percentage (15 %) because he presents two reasons to develop his opinion. It is used in:

41. I am softening the position **because** we have to have talented people in this country (in the Presidential Debate in Detroit) (www.nytimes.com).

In this situation, "because" indicates two serial reasons which are used to develop the viewpoint ("I am softening the position" and "because we have to have talented people").

42. That's the kind of the minds this country needs to bring it back, because I owe $ 19 trillion right now (in the 2nd Republican debate) (www.time.com).

"Even" as a "cumulative argumentation indicator" gets (1 %). The expressions, which are not used in the debate, are "a secondary reason", "an added reason", "particularly", and "especially". The reason is that Trump rarely provides the other Republican candidates with two reasons of great importance.

4. The Indicators of Concluding Stage

The indicators of the concluding stage and the frequencies are as follows:

Table 4: Trump's Concluding Stage Indicators

Concluding Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
So	13	100
Therefore	0	0
In conclusion	0	0
Consequently	0	0
Then	0	0
Thus	0	0
We may show that	0	0

These facts indicate	0	0
I stand by my opinion	0	0
I still insist	0	0
If that's the case, then	0	0
I still disagree with you	0	0
You have not convince me	0	0
I have nothing to say	0	0
I give up	0	0
Total	**13**	**100**

The highest percentage of Trump's concluding stage indicators is by the use of "so" (100 %), and the lowest percentages are represented by "therefore", "in conclusion", "consequently", "then", "thus", "we may show that", "I stand by my opinion", "I still disagree with you", "you have not convinced me", "I have nothing to say", and "I gave up" (0 %). The reason is that he presents the result of the discussion more than he maintains his opinion, changes a viewpoint at the end of the discussion, and removes the doubt of the other nominees (see table 5 below).

4.1.2.1.2. The Functions of Trump's Argumentative Indicators

1. The Functions of Confrontation Stage Indicators

The functions of confrontation stage indicators, the frequencies, and the percentages of the functions are indicated in the bellow table:

Table 5: Functions of Trump's   Confrontation Stage Indicators

Propositional Attitude	**Freq.**	%	Force Modifying	**Freq.**	%	Dispute	**Freq.**	%
Present a standpoint	25	69.45	Express an opinion	7	19.44	Show doubt of an opinion	4	**11.11**
Total	**36**			**100**				

The prominent function is the function of propositional attitude indicators, is "presenting a standpoint" and the lowest is the function of dispute indicators "show a suspicion of an opinion". In his election campaign debates, Trump expresses his viewpoints of "the fight against ISIS, illegal immigration, the free trade with China, the improvement of the American economy, and the nuclear agreement between America and Iran".

Some of these situations, which illustrate Trump's standpoints, are:

43. **I believe** in free trade. He said free trade, I say free trade great. But not when they are beating us so badly. With China, we are going to lose $ 505 billion dollars in terms of trades. You just cannot do it. Mexico $58 billion dollars (www.nytimes.com) (the Republican Presidential debate in Detroit).

Trump expresses his opinion of free trade with China and Mexico. He states that the trade with these two states costs the American economy billions of dollars. This leads to the collapse of the American economy.

44. **I believe that** a reading of the 4th Amendment allows you to have an interpretation where this is not legal and where it cannot be done. In fact, today, on the front page of the Wall Street Journal, they fired another 25 or 30,000 people saying we still haven't recovered from the catastrophe (www.time.com).

53

The 4th Amendment is "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches, and seizures, shall not be violated" (en.wikipedia.org). Trump uses "I believe that" to express his opinion about the 4th Amendment as "illegal and cannot be done" because people are unsecure "they fired another 25 or 30,000 people saying we still have not recovered from the catastrophle".

2. The Functions of Opening Stage Indicators

The functions of opening stage indicators, their frequencies, and the percentages are available in Table 6 below:

Table 6: Functions of Trump's Opening Stage Indicators

The Functions of Trump's Opening Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
Challenge to defend an opinion	1	2.5
Trump's agreement of a one-sided burden of proof	19	47.5
Trump's denial of a one-sided burden of proof	1	2.5
Trump's agreement with the other arguer's proposition	10	25
Denying the other arguer's proposition	9	22.5
Total	40	100

   The most frequent function is" an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof (% 47.5) "and is represented by 'I will tell you ," "I can tell you ,"and the lowest ones are" a challenge to defend a standpoint "which is produced by" go ahead and prove it ," and" a denial of a one-sided burden of proof .(% 2.5) "The reason is that Trump agrees with most nominees' opinions rather than challenges or denies their viewpoints because their standpoints are considered valid and trustworthy by Trump .

    Some of the situations, which illustrate these frequencies and the percentages (the highest and then the lowest).

45. **I will tell you something**, they (the American economists) don't take the currencies, the devaluation (www.nytimes.com).
This situation is in Detroit debate. Trump uses "I will tell you something" to show his agreement of taking the currencies and the devaluation.

46. **I can tell you something**, Mexico is going to pay for the wall (www.nytimes.com). Trump states his acceptance to build a huge wall between American and Mexico to prevent illegal immigration from Mexico.

47. I get along with all of them, and I did a damn good job in doing it. **Go ahead** (www.time.com).

3. The Functions of Argumentation Stage Indicators

    The functions of argumentation stage indicators, their frequencies, and percentages, as table 7 illustrates, are:

Table 7: Functions of Trump's Argumentation stage Indicators

Subordinataive	Freq.	%	Coordinative	Freq.	%	Cumulative	Freq.	%	Multiple	Freq.	%
Present two reasons to support an opinion	**17**	17	Join two **arguments** to support an opinion	55	55	Provide the arguer with two reasons of great or less importance	1	1	**More separate reasons are used to advance an opinion**	27	27
Total	**100**										

The most frequent function of argumentation stage is that of coordinative argumentation indicators, which is joining two arguments to support an opinion (% 55) " .The least frequent function is" providing the arguer with two reasons of great or less importance (% 1) "because Trump utilizes only two reasons for one standpoint. The following situation illustrates this function.

48. I hate the term politician ,**but** I have been supporting politicians (www.nytimes.com).

 In these argumentations, he uses" but "to state two reasons to support his viewpoint of politicians. These two arguments are "I hate the term politicians "and" I have been supporting politicians.

4. **The Functions of Concluding Stage Indicators**
 The functions of concluding stage indicators, the frequencies, and the percentages are available in table 8 as follows:

Table 8: Functions of Trump's Concluding Stage Indicators

Functions of Trump's Concluding Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
Presenting the result of the discussion	13	100
Trump maintains his opinion till the end of the discussion	0	0
Trump changes his opinion at the concluding stage	0	0
Trump removes his suspicion of the arguer's standpoint	0	0
Total	13	100

 The most prominent function is "presenting the result of the discussion". The percentage of this function is (100 %). The other functions are not highlighted because Trump states the result of the discussion than maintains, or changes his opinion, or removes his suspicion of the other nominee's opinion. Some of the situations, which make the functions clear, are:

49. **So**, we are listening to the all-talk, no-action politician (www.nytimes.com).
In this argumentation, "so" is used to state the result of conversation which is " so we are listening to the all-talk, no-action politicians".

50. **So**, we need highly skilled people, and one of the biggest problems we have is people go to the best colleges (www.nytimes.com).

55

In this argumentation, "so" is used to state the end of the discussion which is "so, we need highly skilled people".

4.1.2.2 A Pragma-dialectical Analysis of Clinton's Debates

Clinton's argumentative indicators of the four stages, and their frequencies, and percentages are mentioned below:

4.1.2.2.1Clinton's Argumentative Indicators

The indicators of the confrontation stage, and their frequencies, and percentages are available as follows:

Table 9: Clinton's Confrontation Stage Indicators

Propositional Attitude Indicators	Freq.	%	Force Modifying Expressions	Freq.	%	Dispute Indictors	Freq.	%
I think that	34	73.91	In my opinion	1	2.17	I am not sure	0	0
I find that	0	0	To my mind	0	0	One can disagree about that	0	0
I assume that	0	0	In my view	1	2.17	I don't know	4	8.70
It seems to me that	0	0	As I see it	0	0	I have doubts about that	0	0
I am sure	0	0	It is probably that	1	2.17	I am not completely sure about that	0	0
I am certain that	0	0	In fact	2	4.34	Couldn't it be different?	0	0
I believe that	0	0	It is obviously that	0	0	I don't care	0	0
I know that	3	6.52	It is clear that	0	0			
Total	37	80.43		5	10.90		4	8.70

The most frequent confrontation stage indicators are "propositional attitude" (80.43 %), and the least frequent ones are "dispute indicators" (8.70 %). In her election campaign debates, she expresses her opinions of "the limit of the number of people who are given access to the firearms, America should support the Arab and Kurdish fighters who fight ISIS, getting rid of Assad, and the violence against women should have an important piece of legislation".

The highest percentage of propositional attitude indicators is (73.91 %) and is indicated by "I think that". The unused indicators in the debates are "I find that, I assume that, it seems to me that, I am sure, I am certain that, and I believe that" because these expressions indicate strong assertive attitudes. Some of the situations, which illustrate propositional attitude and force modifying expressions, are:

51. **I think** we have to try to limit the numbers of people who are given access to firearms (in the Democratic presidential debate in Michigan, Flint). (www.nytimes.com).
Clinton's policy aims at "trying to limit the numbers of people who are given access to firearms". This is one of the issues, which she focuses on in her election campaign program. The indicator, "I think", is used to state her viewpoint about firearms.

52. **I think** what the president understands, and what he is trying to do is **that** we have to support the Arab and the Kurdish fighters on the ground who are actually doing the fighting (in CNN Democratic debate) (www.cnn.com).
Clinton uses "I think that" to express her standpoint, which is the same as Obama's opinion, "support the Arab and the Kurdish fighters on the ground who are doing the fighting". Her policy aims at fighting ISIS by the American troops and providing the Arab and Kurdish fighters with a gun.

53. **I think** if all of us go and look back at where we were, Senator Sanders voted for the crime bill (in MSNBC 2016 Democratic debate) (www.nbcnews.com).
The argumentative indicator "I think" is used to represent a standpoint which is "Senator Sanders voted for the crime bill".

54. **I know that** some of those plans could very well lead to a missile that might reach Hawaii (in MSNBC Democratic debate(www.nbcnews.com).
She uses "I know that" to express her standpoint about the plans which she makes against gun makers who destroy America.

55. **In fact**, the Washington post called it a train-wreck for the poor (CNN Democratic debate) (www.cnn.com).
In this argumentation, The argumentative indicator "in fact" is used as a "force modifying expression".

56. The violence against women which has been a very important piece of legislation, **in my opinion** (www.nbcnews.com).
In this argumentation ,Clinton uses" in my opinion "As a force modifying expression to express the violence against woman in the legislation.

57 **. My view** on this is look at my record, look at what I am proposing, we have a vigorous agreement here (in MSNBC Democratic debate) (www.nbcnews.com).
The argumentative indicator is" my view "which is used as a force modifying expression . The only dispute indicator, which is used by Clinton, is" I do not know " (% 8.70) . There are no occurrences of the other dispute indicators which are" I am not sure, one can disagree about that, I have doubts about that, I am not completely sure about that, couldn't't it be different, and I do not care .

2. Opening Stage Indicators
    The argumentative indicators of opening stage, their frequencies an the percentages, are available at the following table:

Table 10: Clinton's Opening Stage Indicators

Opening Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
I will tell you	3	11.11
Let me tell you something	3	11.11
Of course	5	18. 51
I agree with	6	22.22
I don't agree on that	0	0
No	3	11.11
I was against	5	18.51
Let me just say that	2	7. 40
Total	**27**	**100**

The most frequent opening stage indicators are "I agree with" (22.22 %), "of course" (18.51 %), 'no" (11.51 %), and "I was against" (18.51 %). The least frequent indicator is "I do not agree on that" (0 %). The reason, why these percentages in this order, is Clinton's agreement with the other Republican nominees more than her disagreement.

Some situations, which illustrate the opening stage indicators, are:

58. **I   agree** completely **with** Senator Powell (in the Democratic debate in Michigan debate) (www.nbcnews.com).
In this argumentation, Clinton uses "I agree with" as an opening stage indicator to indicate her agreement with Senator Powell.

59. **Of course**, I believe in raising the minimum wage and equal pay for work(www.nbcnews.com).
"Of course" indicates Clinton's agreement with the other democratic nominee of "raising the minimum wage and equal pay for work".

3. The Indicators of Argumentation Stage
The indicators of argumentation stage, the frequencies, and the percentages are illustrated in table 11 as follows:

Table 11: Clinton's Argumentation Stage Indicators

subordinative	Freq.	%	Coordinative	Freq.	%	Cumulative	Freq.	%	Multiple	Freq.	%
Because	18	**18**	But	29	29	Even	2	2	Even if	0	0
So	13	**13**	even	4	4	A secondary reason	0	0	Any-how	0	0
For	0	0	So important	1	1	An added reason is	0	0	Any-more	0	0
Since because	0	0	In **addition**	0	0	Especially	1	1	By the way	1	1

As since	0	0	As well as	2	2	Particularly	2	**2**	First of all	4	4
In view of	0	0	But if	0	0	Let me just add this	4	4	What-ever	0	0
That's why	10	**10**	Also	8	8				Finally	1	1
Total	41	41		44	44		9	9		6	6
Total			**100**								

The most frequent argumentation stage indicators are "coordinative argumentation expressions" (44 %), and " the indicators of subordinative argumentation" (41 %). The least frequent indicators are "multiple argumentation" which represent (6 %). The reason is that Clinton expresses an opinion and tries to join two reasons to support it more than using three or four or more reasons (see Table 11) which shows the functions of argumentation stage indicators). Some of these situations, which illustrate the use of the argumentative indicators of coordinative argumentation, are:

60. But I know a lot of really hard fighting progressives in the Democratic party (The Democratic Presidential debate in Michigan, Flint) (www.nytimes.com).

61. I also think we have got to do more to stop foreign fighters, foreign funding and take ISIS online, **as well as** doing everything necessary to keep us safe at home (www.nbcnews.com).

Concerning pragma-dialectics, Clinton uses two arguments to support her view of fighting ISIS. These arguments are "we have got more to do to take ISIS online", and "as well as doing everything necessary to keep us safe at home". Regarding her election campaign debates, one of the issues which Clinton focuses on is "getting rid of ISIS". The most frequent indicators of subordinative argumentation are "because" (18 %), "so" (13 %), and "that is why" (10 %). Some of the situations are demonstrated in Michigan, MSNBC, and CNN debates:
62. I do not believe in free colleges, **because** every expert that says how will you ever control the costs (www.nytimes.com).

63. President Obama is not progressive **because** he took donations of Wall Street (www.nbcnews.com).
In this argumentation, "because" is used to join two arguments "President Obama is not progressive" and "because he took donations of Wall Street".

64. **That is why** 500,000 children today have lead-lead their bodies (www.cnn.com).

Concluding Stage Indicators
The argumentative indicators of concluding stage, and their frequencies are available in the table below:

Table 12: Clinton's Concluding Stage Indicators

Clinton's Concluding Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
Therefore	0	0
So	29	96.70
In conclusion	0	0
Consequently	0	0
Hence	0	0
Thus	0	0
We may show that	0	0
These facts indicate	0	0
I stand by my opinion	0	0
I keep to this	1	3.33
If that's the case, then	0	0
I still disagree with you	0	0
Total	30	100

The most frequent concluding stage indicator is "so" (96.70 %). The least frequent indicator is "I keep to this" (3.33 %). The concluding stage expressions, which are not used by Clinton, are "therefore, in conclusion, consequently, hence, thus, we may show that, I stand by my opinion, I still disagree with you, and I have nothing to say". Clinton's highest concluding indicator is "so" because she states the result of the discussion more than maintains, and changes her viewpoint at this stage (see table 16 which shows the functions of concluding stage indicators).

4.1.2.2.2 The Functions of Clinton's Argumentative Indicators

1.The Functions of Confrontation Stage Indicators
The functions of confrontation stage indicators, their frequencies, and percentages are available in Table 13:

**Table 13: Functions Clinton's
Confrontation Indicators**

Propositional Attitude	Freq.	%	**Force Modifying**	Freq.	%	Dispute	Freq.	%
Present a **standpoint**	37	80.43	Express an opinion	5	10.90	Show doubt of an opinion	4	**8.70**
Total	**46**			**100**				

The most prominent function of Clinton's confrontation stage indicators is the function of propositional attitude "present a standpoint" (80.43 %). As a candidate, Clinton tries to express her standpoints so that the American people can vote for her and they know more about their candidate. The least frequent function is "dispute" (8.70 %). The reason is that Clinton tries to express her opinions more than showing her suspicion of the other nominees' propositions. Some of the situations, which are used to indicate the function of propositional attitude and dispute indicators, are:

65. **I think** we have to support the Arab and Kurdish fighters on the ground who are actually doing the fighting (www.nbcnews.com).
The argumentation is taken from MSNBC Democratic debate. Clinton uses "I think" to express her opinion which is "to support the Arab and the Kurdish fighters".

66. **I** also **believe that** giving immunity to gun makers and sellers was a terrible mistake (www.nytimes.com).
This argumentation is taken from the Democratic debate in Michigan. Clinton uses "I believe" to state her viewpoint of "giving immunity to gun makers which was a mistake".

67. **I don't know** how high it (it refers to the fight between the Arab and the ISIS fighters) goes (www.nytimes.com).
"I do not know" is a dispute indicator which indicates "Clinton's doubts of solving the problem of the Arab and the ISIS fighting".

2. The Functions of Opening Stage Indicators
   The functions of opening stage argumentative indicators, their frequencies, and percentages are shown in table 14 as follows:

Table 14: Functions of Clinton's Opening Stage Indicators

The Functions of Trump's Opening Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
Challenge to defend a standpoint	0	0
Clinton's agreement of a one-sided burden of proof	8	29.62
Clinton's denial of a one-sided burden of proof	0	0
The agreement with the other arguer's proposition	11	40.74
Denying the other arguer's proposition	8	29.62
Total	27	100

   The most prominent functions of opening stage indicators are "the agreement with the other arguer's proposition" which represent (40.74 %), "agreement of a one-sided burden of proof, denying the other arguer's proposition (29.62 %). The lowest percentage, (0 %), which is demonstrated by two functions: "a challenge to defend a standpoint, and denying a one-sided burden of proof". Some of the situations, which illustrate the functions of the opening stage indicators, are:

68. **Of course**, I believe in raising the minimum wage and equal pay for work (www.nbcnews.com).
This argumentation is taken from MSNBC Democratic debate. The expression, "of course", indicates Clinton's agreement with Senator Sanders' (the other Republican candidate) opinion concerning "raising the minimum wage and equal pay for work".

69. **I agree** the Governor should resign, or be recalled
(www.nytimes.com).
This situation is taken from Michigan debate. The indicator, "I agree" indicates Clinton's agreement concerning "the Governor should be resigned, or be recalled".

70. **I agree with** the President, I have said myself, we will not send American combat troops back to either Syria or Iraq—that is off the table (The MSNBC Democratic debate) (www.nbcnews.com).

61

In this situation, "I agree with" indicates Clinton's agreement with Obama's decision about "we will not send American combat troops to Syria and Iraq".

3. The Functions of Argumentation Stage Argumentative Indicators

The functions of argumentation stage argumentative indicators, their frequencies, percentages are available in table 15 as follows:

Table 15: Functions of Clinton's Argumentation Stage Argumentative Indicators

Subor-dinative	Freq.	%	Coordinative	Freq.	%	Cumulative	Freq.	%	Multiple	Freq.	%
Present two serial reasons to support an opinion	41	41	Join two arguments to support an opinion	42	42	Provide the arguer with two reasons of less or great importance	9	9	More separate reasons are used for an opinion	6	6

The most frequent functions of argumentation stage indicators are "coordinative (42 %), and subordinative (41 %). The less prominent functions are those used for "cumulative (9 %), and multiple (6 %) because Clinton uses two reasons rather than more separate reasons to support an opinion. Some of these situations, which explain the functions of the argumentation stage indicators, are:

71. We will get to what we need to do to help the children and the people when I have time **because** that is as important as trying to fix the water pipes (www.nytimes.com).   The argumentation is taken from the Democratic debate in Michigan. "Because" is an indicator of subordinative argumentation. Clinton expresses her standpoint "we will get to what we need to do (to serve American people". The two reasons, which are used to support her opinion, are " help the children and the people", and "that is as important as fixing the pipes".

72. I want people-**especially** white people to recognize that there is a systematic racism (www.nytimes.com). This argumentation is taken from the democratic debate in Michigan. "Especially" is an indicator of cumulative argumentation. The two arguments are "I want people (in general)", and "especially white people". Clinton's opinion is "there is racism in America".

73.   **First   of   all**,   I   do   have   a   very   comprehensive   plan   to   create   jobs (www.cnn.com). In CNN Democratic debate, the expression "first of all", is used to indicate more separate reasons to support Clinton's standpoint "I have a plan to create jobs".

74. I did go in so many places around the world to sell American products **because** the alternatives were usually European, Asian, primarily Chinese products (www.nytimes.com).   In this argumentation, Clinton uses "because" to indicate "subordinate argumentation" which means using two reasons to support her viewpoint of the American products. These two reasons are "selling American products" and "because the alternatives were European, Asian products".

4. The Functions of Concluding Stage Indicators

The functions of concluding stage indicators, and their frequencies, and percentages are available as the following:

Table 16: Functions of Clinton's Concluding Stage Indicators

Functions of Clinton's Concluding Stage Indicators	Freq.	%
Presenting the result of the discussion	29	96.70
Clinton maintains her opinion till the end of the discussion	1	3.30
Clinton changes her opinion at the concluding stage	0	0
Clinton removes her suspicion of the arguer's standpoint	0	0
Total	30	100

The prominent function of concluding stage indicators is "presenting the result of the discussion" (96.70 %). The other functions are (0 %) because Clinton tries to end the discussion more than changes her standpoint, and removes her suspicion of the nominee's opinion. Some of these situations are:

75. **So** when I heard about it, I immediately sent people here to find out what was going on (www.nytimes.com).
In Michigan debate, she uses "so" to state the result of discussion concerning Wall Street issue.

76. **So**, we have got to do a branch of things (www.nbcnews.com).
In MSNBC Democratic debate, "so" indicates the result of conversation concerning "we have got to do a branch of things".

4.2 A Comparison Between Trump and Clinton in the Use of the Argumentative Indicators and their Functions

The comparison between Trump and Clinton in the use argumentative indicators and their functions is illustrated by the use of chi-square. Chi-square is the statistical tool which is used to find out the similarities and differences as the following:

1. Confrontation Stage Indicators
The chi-square of Trump's and Clinton's argumentative indicators is as follows:

Table 17: Chi-Square of Trump's and Clinton's Confrontation Stage Indicators

Confrontation Stage Indicators	Trump Freq.	Clinton Freq.	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Propositional Attitude	25	37	2.23	0.128	Non
Force Modifying	7	5	0.33	0.564	Non
Dispute	4	4	0.00	1.000	Non

The table above shows that the statistical significance of propositional attitude, force modifying, and dispute indicators is more than 0.05. Thus, the differences are not significant. This result accepts hypothesis (1-a, b, and c). The table indicates that frequencies are independent. Thus, this table shows that there are similarities between Trump and Clinton in the use of confrontation stage indicators.

Both Trump and Clinton express their viewpoints of foreign policies, control, fight against terrorism and illuminate it, not contain it, protect Israel's security, and fight ISIS in Syria and Iraq.

2. Argumentative Stage Indicators

The chi-square of Trumps and Clintons argumentation stage indicators is below:

Table 18: Chi-Square of Trump's and Clinton's Argumentation Stage Indicators

Argumentation Stage Indicators	Trump	Clinton	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Subordinative	17	41	9.93	0.002	Yes
Coordinative	55	44	1.22	0.269	Non
Cumulative	1	9	6.4	0.011	Yes
Multiple	27	6	13.36	0.000	Yes

The table shows that the statistical significance of subordinative indicators is less than 0.05. Thus, the difference is significant. Thus, hypothesis (2-a) is rejected. The result proves the alternative one which states there are significant differences in Trump's and Clinton's argumentative indicators of subordinative argumentation stage.

Concerning pragma-dialectics, Clinton uses the argumentative indicators of subordinative argumentation more than Trump does because she combines two serial reasons to support her views of education, fighting terrorists, and violence against women. In her political debates, she has an experience with having debates. She states an opinion and clarifies it at the argumentation stage.

The table illustrates that there are no significant differences between Trump's and Clinton's coordinative indicators. The hypothesis (2-b) is accepted. Concerning pragma-dialectics, Trump uses the argumentative indicators of coordinative argumentation to support his viewpoints and develop his ideas in the discussion. In the Republican presidential debate/ Detroit, Trump expresses his viewpoint of free trade as "I believe in free trade". He supports his viewpoint by using two arguments which are " he said free trade, I say free trade great" and "**but**, not when they're beating us so badly" (www.nytimes.com). Trump's policy of free trade with China and Mexico is " with China, we're going to lose $505 billion dollars in terms of trades. You just can't do it. Mexico, $58 billion dollars".

In CNN Democratic debate, Clinton states her opinion which is" I think we have to make college affordable. We are pricing out middle-class, working, and poor families. There's no doubt about that ."She supports her view by using two arguments" **but** I do think when you make proposals and you're running for president "and" you should be held accountable for whether or not the numbers add up and whether or not the plans" (www.cnn.com)

The table illustrates that the difference in the indicators of cumulative argumentation is significant. Thus, the hypothesis (2-c) is invalid and proves the alternative which states that there are significant differences of Trump's and Clinton's cumulative argumentative indicators**.** The difference in the multiple argumentation indicators is significant.

The result also indicates that the hypothesis (2-d) is invalid. The alternative one is there are significant differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of argumentative indicators of multiple argumentation. Trump utilizes the indicators of multiple argumentation more than **Clinton** does.

Concerning pragma-dialectics, Trump utilizes the argumentative indicators of multiple argumentation to provide the other arguers with separate reasons to support his viewpoint. Regarding his electoral campaign debate in Detroit, his policy of" the devaluation of the currencies "is " **by the way** ,I have been doing it more and more, but they devalue their currencies, in particular China. Mexico is doing a big number now ,and also Japan is unbelievable what they're doing" (www.nytimes.com).

3. The Total Number of Argumentative Indicators in Four Stages

The chi-square of the total of argumentative indicators in the four stages is as follows**:**

Table 19 :Chi-Square of the Total Number of Trump's and Clinton's Argumentative Indicators in Four Stages

Total of argumentative indicators	Trump Freq.	Clinton Freq.	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Total of confrontation stage indicators	36	46	0.00	1.000	Non
Total of opening stage indicators	42	27	2.88	0.090	Non
Total of argumentation stage Indicators	100	98	0.020	0.889	Non
Total of concluding stage indicators	13	30	6.721	0.010	Yes

The table shows that there are no significant differences in the numbers of the argumentative indicators of confrontation, opening, and argumentation stages. Thus, the hypothesis (3-a, b, and c) is accepted .The statistical significance of the total number of concluding stage indicators is (0.010) which means less than 0.05. Thus, the hypothesis-3) d) is rejected and the alternative one is there are significant differences in the total number of Trump's and Clinton's concluding stage indicators .

Concerning pragma-dialectics, Clinton utilizes concluding stage indicators more than Trump does because she expresses her views, develops them, and tries to put a result to her argumentations . Regarding her electoral campaign debates, she develops her viewpoint of" the violence against women "and states the result to her argumentation by" **so** ,the violence against women should have a great importance in legislation ."She is the only woman who beats the other Democratic candidates to face Trump in the presidential debates 2016 .she defends women in the whole world and she says that" women are the largest untapped reservoir of talent in the world."

4. Functions of Confrontation Stage Indicators
The chi-square of the functions of confrontation stage indicators is as follows:

Table 20 :Chi-Square of Functions of Trump's and Clinton's Confrontation Stage Indicators

Functions of confrontation stage indicators	Trump Freq.	Clinton Freq.	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Present a standpoint	25	37	2.232	0.128	Non
Express an opinion	5	5	0.000	1.00	Non
Show suspicion of the other arguers viewpoint	4	4	0.000	1.00	Non

The table indicates that the differences in the use of the functions of confrontation stage indicators (present a standpoint, express an opinion , and show suspicion of the other arguer's opinion) are not significant. Thus ,hypothesis (4-a, b, and c) is accepted .In his three electoral campaign debates, Trump expresses his standpoints of" flat tax, Assad as a bad president, illegal immigration to America, building a huge wall between America and Mexico to prevent illegal immigration, prevent buying Chinese goods to fresh the American economy, and fighting ISIS in Syria and Iraq is an important issue to get rid of terrorists ."These views show Trump's political program when he becomes the President of the United States. Trump's viewpoints are highly supported by his Allies in Israel because his ideas are of good benefits to them .

In Woodward's (2018 (**Fear: Trump in the White House** ,the aids of Trump in the White House express their viewpoints of Trump's political standpoints. John Kelly, White House Chief of Staff, says" he is an idiot. It is pointless to convince him ."James Mattis, Offense Secretary, states" he had the understanding of a fifth-or sixth grade ."Woodward mentions that "his inability to learn, as well as, what they considered his dangerous views ."Trump describes the book as" a fabricated fiction "and" I assume it is going to be a negative book ."

65

Clinton, in her three electoral campaign debates, shows her views of" the limit of the number of people who are given access to the firearms, America should support the Arab and the kurdish fighters who fight ISIS, getting rid of Assad, and the violence against women should have an important piece of legislation.

5. Functions of Opening Stage Argumentative Indicators
The chi-square of the functions of opening stage indicators is available as follows:

Table 21 :Chi-Square of Functions of Trump's Clinton's Opening Stage Indicators

Functions of opening stage indicators	Trump Freq.	Clinton Freq .	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
A challenge to defend a standpoint	1	0	0.000	1.00	Non
An agreement of a one- sided burden of proof	19	8	2.469	0.116	Non
A denial of a one-sided burden of proof	1	0	0.000	1.00	Non
An agreement with the other arguer's proposition	10	11	18.84	0.000	Yes

The table shows that there are no significant differences in the use of the functions of opening stage indicators (a challenge to defend a standpoint, an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof, a denial of a one-sided burden of proof). Thus, the hypothesis (5-a, b, and c) is accepted and valid. So, there are no significant differences in the use of these functions.
The table shows that there are significant differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of the function" an agreement with the other arguer's proposition ."Thus, the hypothesis (5-d) is invalid. As candidates, Trump and Clinton agree with the other nominees' viewpoints because these two candidates have nothing to say to defend their standpoints .Regarding pragma-dialectics, both of them use the function" a challenge to defend a standpoint ."The protagonist's role, which is taken by Trump and Clinton, does not only deal with defending a viewpoint as much as challenging to win the debate. Concerning their electoral campaign debates ,they challenge the rest of the nominees just to win the political debate.

Both of them utilize the function" an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof ."Trump and Clinton agree with the other nominees' standpoints at the opening stage if they have nothing to say or the other democratic and republican nominees' opinions if these opinions are true .Both of them use the function" a denial of a one-sided burden of proof ."Trump and Clinton refuse the other candidates' viewpoints by interruption, persistence to their opinions, and not providing the other candidates the opportunity to express their ideas. In CNN Democratic debate, Clinton shows her refusal of changing her view of" the importance of coal and oil "by saying" **no** ,well, I don't think I've changed my view on what we need to do to go from where we are, where the world is heavily dependent on coal and oil) "www.cnn.com .(As a candidate, if she changes her ideas, the consequences are (the American people lose their trust of her as a nominee, and weaken her chances to win the election.

Clinton uses the function" an agreement with the other arguer's proposition "more than Trump does. In pragma-dialectics, the purpose of having a critical discussion is to reach to an agreement with the other participants' viewpoints. Concerning the electoral campaign debates, the other candidates' viewpoints are stronger than those of Clinton's or her viewpoints are similar to the other candidates' standpoints that is why she accepts their standpoints.

6. Functions of Argumentation Stage Indicators
The chi-square of the functions of argumentation stage indicators is available in the table below :

Table 22 :Chi-Square of Functions of Trump's and Clinton's Argumentation Stage Indicators

Functions of argumentation stage indicators	Trump Freq .	Clinton Freq .	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Presenting two serial reasons to support a viewpoint (subordinative(	17	41	1.22	0.269	Non
Using two arguments to develop an opinion (coordinative (	55	42	1.742	0.187	Non
Providing the arguer with more than two reasons which are of less or great importance (cumulative(	1	9	6.40	0.01	Yes
Using separate reasons to support a standpoint (multiple(	27	6	13.36	0.000	Yes

The table shows that that there are no differences in the use of the functions of subordinative and coordinative argumentative indicators since the significance is more than 0.05. Thus, the hypothesis (6-a, and b) is accepted. Both of them use of the function of subordinative argumentation indicators which is" presenting two serial reasons to support a viewpoint ."In the political debates, the audience can ask one of the candidates to make his or her standpoint clear. The nominees try to clarify their standpoints by providing the audience with two serial reasons and make a connection between them.

Both of them utilize the function of coordinative argumentative indicators" using two arguments to develop an opinion ." As candidates, Trump and Clinton defend their standpoints no matter how. Concerning pragma-dialectics, the socialization principle deals with the fact that one of the participants takes the protagonist's role who (expresses his or her opinion and tries to defend it). In MSNBC 2016 Democratic Candidates Debate, Clinton supports her viewpoint of" free college "by using two arguments " **but** I do not believe in free colleges "and" every expert that I have talked to says, look, how will you ever control the cost "(www.nbcnews.com).

The table also views that there are significant differences in the use of the function of cumulative argumentative indicators. The hypothesis (6-c) is rejected and proves the alternative one is there are significant differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of the function of cumulative argumentative indicators. Clinton utilizes the function of the argumentative indicators of cumulative argumentation more than Trump does.

Concerning pragma-dialectics, she supports her standpoints by using strong reasons .Regarding her electoral campaign debates, she expresses her viewpoint of" racism "and tries to support this viewpoint by saying" I want people -**especially** white people to recognize that there is a systematic racism" (www.nytimes.com).

The table also shows that there are significant differences in the use of the function of multiple argumentative indicators. Thus, hypothesis (6-d) is rejected and the alternative one is there are significant differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of the function of multiple argumentative indicators. Trump uses the function" using more separate reasons to support a standpoint "more than Clinton does. Concerning pragma-dialectics, the use of this function indicates supporting a standpoint and develops the discussion in the argumentation stage. In his electoral campaign debates, the interviewer asks Trump about" the way to get rid of illegal immigration ."Trump clarifies his viewpoint of" illegal immigration "by using separate reasons which are" building a huge wall between America and Mexico,"Mexico is going to pay for the wall ,"and "separate babies from their parents who are immigrants to the United States ."Clinton has a various viewpoint of immigration which is" we are a country where people of all the grounds, all nations of origin, all languages, all religions, all races, can make a home. America is built of immigrants ."

7. Functions of Concluding Stage Argumentative Indicators
 The chi-square of the functions of concluding stage argumentative indicators is as follows:

Table 23 :Chi-Square of Functions of Trump's and   Clinton's Concluding Stage Indicators

Functions of concluding stage indicators	Trump Freq .	Clinton Freq .	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Present the result of the discussion	13	29	6.095	0.014	Yes
Maintain an opinion till the end of the discussion	0	1	0.000	1.00	Non

The table shows that the significance of using the function (present the result of the discussion) is 0.014 which means that the differences are significant. Thus, hypothesis (7-a) is invalid and rejected. The alternative one is there are significant differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of the function" presenting the result of the discussion ."Clinton utilizes this function more than Trump does because she wants the other nominees to recognize that she ends her argumentation. Thus, Clinton's argumentations are more organized concerning the four stages of critical discussion. Trump uses the technique of interrupting the other candidates more than showing the end of his argumentations. The statistical significance of" maintain an opinion till the end of discussion "is (1.00) which means more than 0.05 .There are no significant differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of this function. Thus, this result proves that hypothesis (7-b) is valid and accepted .

8. Total of the Functions of Argumentative Indicators in the Four Stages

The chi-square of the total number of the functions of argumentative indicators in the four stages is as follows :

Table 24 :Chi-Square of the Total Number of Functions of Trump's and Clinton's Argumentative Indicators in Four Stages

Total of the functions of argumentative indicators in four stages	Trump Freq.	Clinton Freq.	Chi-Square	Statistical Significance	Significance
Total of functions of confrontation stage indicators	36	46	1.22	0.269	Non
Total of functions of opening stage indicators	40	27	2.522	0.112	Non
Total of the functions of argumentation stage indicators	100	98	0.020	0.889	Non
Total of the functions of concluding stage indicators	13	30	6.721	0.010	Yes

The above table shows that there are no significant differences in the use of the total numbers of the functions of the argumentative indicators of confrontation, opening, and argumentation stages. Thus, hypothesis (8-a, b, and c) is valid and accepted. Concerning pragma-dialectics, both of them express their ideas in the confrontation stage and develop them in the argumentation stage. In their election campaign debates, Trump and Clinton utilize these functions in order to give a hint to the other nominees of the start of argumentation and its advancement .

The result also illustrates that the significance of the total functions of concluding stage indicators is (0.010) which means less than 0.05. The difference is significant. Thus, hypothesis (8-d) is invalid and rejected. The alternative one is there are significant differences in the total of the functions of concluding stage indicators. Clinton utilizes the functions of concluding stage indicators more than Trump. Regarding her electoral campaign debates, she previously face Obama in the American presidential election 2008. Thus, she has an experience of having such debates. She follows the strategy of intelligent force which is the combination of diplomacy, intelligence, and military force .Concerning her argumentation of" Assad ,"she follows these steps just to reach to a result to her discussion: having a negotiation with him (diplomacy), working hard with

68

American intelligence agency to keep an eye on him (intelligence), and getting rid of him by military force. Thus, the result of her speech is" getting rid of Assad.

5. CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

5.1 Conclusions

The conclusions include the similarities and differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of argumentative indicators and their functions as follows:

5.1.1 The Similarities Between Trump and Clinton in the Use of the Argumentative Indicators and their Functions

The similarities between Trump and Clinton in the use of argumentative indicators and their functions are illustrated below:

1. Both Trump and Clinton use the argumentative indicators of confrontation stage (propositional attitude, force modifying, and dispute indicators). As candidates of the American election2016 , they express their ideas to the American people and to the whole world, and show their doubts of the other nominees' standpoints.

2. Both of them utilize the argumentative indicators of coordinative argumentation. Regarding pragma-dialectics, they take the role of 'protagonist' who tries to defend his or her viewpoint. As candidates, they use two arguments to support their viewpoints because sometimes one argument is not enough to make their ideas stronger. Concerning their electoral campaign debates, Clinton uses two arguments" fighting ISIS in Syria ,"and" removing Assad from his position "to strength her standpoint" fighting terrorists ."Trump shows two different arguments" fighting ISIS in Syria and Iraq "and" there is no need to fight Assad because the latter is fighting ISIS in Syria "to support his opinion" fighting terrorists.

3. The use of the total numbers of the argumentative indicators of confrontation, opening, and argumentation stages between Trump and Clinton is similar. As candidates, they use the indicators of the first three stages because they express an opinion in the confrontation stage and develop it in the argumentation stage. Regarding their debates, they want the other nominees to recognize the start of argumentation and its development in the debate.

4. Both of them utilize the functions" present a standpoint "and" express an opinion "because they want to state their viewpoints, and ideas of various political issues such as education, war, terrorism, and peace. They utilize the function" show suspicion of the other arguer's opinion "in order to show what they believe of is true and the other candidates' standpoints are not sensible.

5. Both of them use the function" a challenge to defend a standpoint ."The protagonist's role, which is taken by Trump and Clinton, does not only deal with defending a viewpoint as much as challenging to win the debate. As candidates, the way to win the debate is by using this function. Without a challenge to defend a viewpoint, there is no debate. They try to insist on their opinions and do not give the opportunity to the rest of the nominees to express their views in the political debate. In this way, this is not a dialectical discussion.

6. Both of them utilize the function" an agreement of a one-sided burden of proof ."Concerning pragma-dialectics, the purpose of having a critical discussion is to reach to an agreement to solve the difference of opinion. In the electoral debates, Trump and Clinton agree with the other nominees' standpoints at the opening stage because they have nothing to say or the other nominees' opinions are true.

7. Both of them use the function" a denial of a one-sided burden of proof ."Regarding their electoral debates, Trump and Clinton refuse the other candidates' viewpoints by interruption, persistence to their opinions, and do not give the other candidates the opportunity to express their ideas.

8. Both of them use the function of subordinative argumentation indicators which is" presenting two serial reasons to support a viewpoint ."In the political debates, the audience can ask one of the candidates to make his or her standpoint clear. The nominees try to clarify their standpoints by providing the audience with two serial reasons and make a connection between them.

9. Both of them utilize the function of coordinative argumentative indicators" using two arguments to develop an opinion ." Regarding their electoral campaign debates, Trump and Clinton try to defend their standpoints by providing the other nominees with two arguments. Trump's policy of getting rid of ISIS is by preventing them using Internet. He utilizes two arguments to support his view" these are terrible people in ISIS, not masterminds. And we have to change it from every standpoint "and" but we should be using our brilliant people, our most brilliant minds to figure a way that ISIS cannot use the Internet "In her electoral campaign debates, Clinton expresses her viewpoint of" election "as " I think that every election is about the future ."She uses two arguments to support her view" you all deserve to know what we will do to help you have a brighter future "and" but ,if we are going to talk about the 1990's I think it's only fair to say that at the end of the 1990's, after two terms of my husband's presidency, the unemployment rate in Michigan was 4.4 percent. There had been a net increase of 54,000 manufacturing jobs. There had been a net increase of 653,000 jobs overall.

10. " Both of them use the function" maintaining an opinion till the end of the discussion ."Regarding pragma-dialectics, the socialization principle views the role of the protagonist as the one who defends and keeps his or her standpoint till the end (till he or she wins the discussion). As candidates, both Trump and Clinton have one purpose of having a debate which is winning the debate.

11. Both Trump and Clinton utilize the functions of the argumentative indicators of confrontation, opening, and argumentation stages. Regarding pragma-dialectics, they express their viewpoints and develop these opinions in the debate.

5.1.2 The Differences Between Trump and Clinton in the Use of the Argumentative Indicators and their Functions

The differences between Trump and Clinton in the use of argumentative indicators and their functions are mentioned below:

1. Clinton's argumentative indicators of subordinative argumentation are more frequent than Trump's. As a democratic candidate, Clinton has a long history with politics. Thus ,she expresses an opinion and develops it by presenting two serial reasons to improve it.

2. Clinton utilizes the argumentative indicators of cumulative argumentation more than Trump does. Clinton makes her viewpoints strong by providing the other nominees with reasons of great importance to develop her political ideas.

3. Trump's multiple indicators are more frequent than Clinton's. The reasons are related to the facts that he has no comprehensive information about politics (he is a comic actor, a business man, and never gets any political position before) (mine). Thus, he tries to use more separate reasons, which are incoherent and irrelevant ,to strength the viewpoints he stated earlier in the discussion.

4. The total number of Clinton's concluding stage indicators is more frequent than Trump's. In the political debates, she gives an indication to the other candidate that her argumentation ends by using the indicators of concluding stage.

5. Clinton uses the function" an agreement with the other arguer's proposition "more than Trump does. Regarding pragma-dialectics, the purpose of having a critical discussion is to reach to an acceptance with the other participants' viewpoints.

6. Clinton utilizes the function of the argumentative indicators of cumulative argumentation more than Trump does. Concerning pragma-dialectics, the protagonist states an opinion and tries to support it by using strong reasons. Regarding her electoral campaign debates, she expresses her viewpoint of" racism "and tries to support this viewpoint by saying" I want people -especially white people to recognize that there is a systematic racism.

7. Trump uses the function" using more separate reasons to support a standpoint "more than Clinton does. Regarding pragma-dialectics, the use of this function indicates supporting a standpoint. Concerning electoral campaign debates, Trump is asked about" illegal immigration ."He clarifies his viewpoint of" illegal immigration "by using separate reasons which are" building a huge wall between America and Mexico" ,"Mexico is going to pay for the wall ,"and" separate babies from their parents who are immigrants to the United States.

8. Clinton utilizes the function" present the result of the discussion "more than Trump does because she expresses an opinion, develops it, and then states the result of discussion. Thus, Clinton's argumentations are more organized concerning the four stages of critical discussion. Trump does not usually end his argumentations. He has the strategy of interruption and starting another argumentation rather than ending his discussion.

9. Clinton utilizes the functions of concluding stage indicators more than Trump does. He starts another argumentation rather than puts an end to his previous discussion because he uses random political ideas.

5.2 Recommendations to the Politicians

   The political recommendations are illustrated below:

1. Politicians ought to be aware of the argumentative indicators and their functions in the four stages of critical discussions: confrontation, opening, argumentation, and concluding stages.

2. Politicians ought to be aware of using the functions of these expressions. For instance" ,I think "has more than one function (present a standpoint, develop a discussion in the argumentation stage, and state the end of the discussion.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

 The suggestions for further studies are mentioned below:

1. A pragma-dialectical study of argumentative indicators in sociolinguistics concerning chatting.

2. A contrastive study of argumentative indicators in English and Arabic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

 Al-Hilali, M.T. and M.M.Khan (2012). *Translation of the Meanings of   the Noble Qur'an in the English Language* . Madinah: king Fahd Glorious Qur'an Printing.

Allwood, J. and Elisabeth Ahlsen (2015)" On Stages of Conflict Escalation ."In *Errico et al. (eds). Conflict and Multimodal Communication: Social   Research   and   Machine   Intelligence* .Amsterdam: Springer.   .

Al-Obudi, H. H. M. and Betti, Mohammed Jasim (2013). The Use of Expressives in Selected Short Stories by Brian Leug and Jhumpa Lahiri. *Unpublished MA Thesis, College of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-Qar.*

Atchison, J. (2010) . *Atchison's Linguistics*. 7.th edn. London: The McGraw-Hill.

Bach, K. (1999) .*The Myth of Conventional Implicature* .Linguistics and Philosophy .Vol. 22, pp. 327- 66.

Baker, M. (2003). Computer-Mediated Argumentative Interaction for   the Co-Elaboration of Scientific Notions ."In *Andriessen et al. (eds). Arguing to Learn: Confronting Cognitions in Computer Supported Collaborative* .Dordrecht: Spinger.

Barbaros, C. (2013). " Exploring Televised Political Debates: Strategies and Issues" .*Argumentation* vol. 10, pp. 140-9.

Bartles, L. M. and Lynn Wavreck (2000).*Campaign Reform: Insights and Evidence*. Michigan :University of Michigan Press.

Beniot, W. (2014). *Political Election Debates: Informing Voters about Policy and Character* .New York: Lexington Books Lanham.

Beniot, W. (2016) American Political Campaign Debates ."In *William L. Beniot (ed). Praeger Handbook of Political Campaigning in the United States* ,pp. 139-51.

Bermejo-Luque, L. (2017). Argumentative and Non-argumentative   Rhetorical Context: Two examples in same sex-marriage discourse ."In *Cornelia and Giuliana (eds) Argumentation across Communities of Practice: Multi-disciplinary Perspectives* .Ceuta and Melilla: John Benjamins.

Besnard, B. and N. Hunter (2008). *Elements of Argumentation.* Cambridge: The MIT Press.

 Betti, Mohammed Jasim, Igaab, Z. K. & Al-Ghizzi, M. T. H. (2018). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of Permission, Obligation and Prohibition. *International Journal of English Linguistics, 8, 3, 251-269.*

Betti, Mohammed Jasim and Yaseen, K. S. (2020a). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Use of Conversational Maxims at the University Level. *Education, Language and Sociology Research, vol. 1, no. 1, 43-60.*

 Betti, Mohammed Jasim and Hasan, Ahmed Abd (2020). The Iraqi EFL Learners' Ability to Use Speech Acts in MA and Ph.D. Theses Defense. *Education, Language and Sociology Research, 2, 2, 1-23.*

Bickenbach, J .E. and M.D. Jacqueline (1997) .*Good Reasons for Better Arguments: An Introduction to the skills and values of critical thinking* .Ottawa: J. E. Bickenbach and Jacqueline M. Davis.

Black, C. J. (2005 (Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor :London and New York: Jonathan Charteris Blac.

Blair, J. and R. Johnson (1987). " Argumentation as Dialectical" .*Argumentation*, vol.1, pp. 41- 56. Bonevac, D. (2003). "Pragma-dialectics and Beyond" . *Argumentation*, vol. 17, pp. 1-10.

Brydon, S. and M. Scott .(2008) *Between One and Many* .New York :Frank Mortimer.

Capone, A. , Franco P. and Marco C. (2013). *Perspectives in Pragmatics and Philosophy* .Bern: Springer   .

Cedroni, L. (2013). "Politolinguistics: Towards a New Analysis of Political Discourse" .In *Poggi et al. (eds) Multimodal Communication in Political Speech :Shaping Minds and Social Actions* .Berlin and Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 220-3.

Chilton, P. and Schaffner C. (2002) .*Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse* .Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Christina, S. (2003). *Politics and Maneuvering* .Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fairclough, N. and Isabellah Fairclough (2016). "Textual Analysis" .In *Mark and Rhodes (eds). Routledge Handbook of Interpreting Political Science* .London and New York: Routledge.

Fisher, A. (2004). *The Logic of Real Arguments*2 .nd edn. Cambridge: CUP.

Fraster, B. (1995). "Hedged Performatives" .In *Cole and Morgan (eds.). Syntax and Semantics: Speech Acts* .New York: Academic Press, pp. 187-210.

Furnan, T. M. (2011). *Critical Thinking and Logic: A Philosophical Workbook* .New York and North Syracuse: Gegensatz Press.

Gascon, J. A. (2017). *Brothers in Arms: Virtue and Pragma-Dialectics*. Madrid: Springer.

Gerber, M. (2011). Pragmatism, Pragma-Dialectics, and Methodology :Towards a More Ethical Notion of Argument Criticism .*Speaker and Gavel* ,vol. 28, (1), pp. 20-22 .

Grice, H. P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation" .In *Cole and Morgan (eds). Syntax and Semantics* .New York: Academic press, pp.41-58.

Hietanen, M. (2007). *Pual's argumentation in Galatians: A Pragma -Dialectical Analysis* ."Oxford: T&   T Clark International.

Hlail, H. H., Betti, Mohammed Jasim and Tari Kadhim Ajeel (2014). A Contrastive Forensic Analytical Study of the Language of Contracts in English and Atrabic. *Unpublished MA Thesis, College of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-Qar.*

Hohmann, H. (2002). "Rhetoric and Dialectic: Some Historical and Legal Perspectives ."*In van Eemeren and Houtlosser (eds) (.Dialectic and Rhetoric: The Warp and Woof of Argumentation Analysis* .Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 40-51.

Houtlosser, P. (2002). Indicators of a Point of View ."In *F. van Eemeren）   ed (Advances in Pragma-dialectics* .Amsterdam: Vale Press ,pp.169-84.

＿＿＿＿＿＿ and F. van Eemeren (2009). *Argumentation* .Oxford :T&T Clark International Infantido, E. (2001). *Evidential and Relevance* .Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Isotalus, P. (2011) "Analyzing Presidential Debates: Functional Theory and Finnish Political Communication Culture" . *Nordicon* Review 32, pp. 31-43.

Jacobs, S. (2000) .Rhetoric and Dialectic from the Standpoint of Normative Pragmatics. *Argumentation* ,vol. 14, pp. 261-86.

.Jakaza, E. and Mariana Visser (2014). "Dialogue Voices: A Pragma -Dialectical Approach to R. 6. Mugable's Ceremonial Speeches" .In *van Belle et al. (eds). .Let's Talk Politics: New Essays on Deliberate Rhetoric* .Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jehad, N. N., Mohammed Jasim Betti and Ammar Turky Attia (2015). The Language of Constitutions: A Forensic Contrastive Study of the American and Iraqi Constitutions. *Unpublished MA Thesis, College of Education for Humanities, University of Thi-Qar.*

Jorgensen, C. (2007). "Don't say that" .*Argumentation* .No. 20, pp -465 - 510.

Kauffeld, F. (2006). Pragma-dialectics Appropriation of Speech Act Theory ."In *Houtlosser and van Rees (eds (.Considering Pragma -dialectics* .Mohwah and London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kock, C. (2007). The Domain of Rhetorical Argumentation ."In van Eemeren et al. (eds.) Proceedings of the Sixth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation .*Argumentation* ,pp. 785- 8.

Leech, G. (1983) . *Principles of Pragmatics* .London and New York: Longman.

Lepore, E. and Sam C. (2009). *Meaning and Arguments: Introduction to Logic Through Language*. 2 nd edn. London: Wiley Blackwell.

Luque, B. L. (2011). Giving Reasons: *A Linguistic-Pragmatic Approach to Argumentation Theory*. New York: Springer.

Memon, N. , Faraz A. and IllahiBux G. (2014). Critical Analysis of Political Discourse: A Study of Benazir Bhutto's Last Speech ."*Balochistan Journal of Linguistics* .No. 2, pp. 80- 92.

Molek-Kozakowska, K. (2012). Historical References as Arguments in Jerzy Buzek's Selected Speeches ."In *Guttfeld et al. (eds) (.Re (Visions of History in Language and Fiction*. Cambridge :Cambridge scholars.

O'Halloran, K. (2017). *Posthnmanism and Deconstructuring Arguments: Corpora and Digitally-driven Critical Analysis* . London and New York: Routledge .

Palmieri, R. (2014). *Corporative Argumentation in Takeover Bibs* .Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Perkins, R. Jr. (1999). *Logic and Mr. Limbaugh: A Dittohead's Guide to Fallacious Reasoning*. Chicago: Open Court.

Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum (1973). *A University Grammar of English* .Hongkong: Longman. Renkema, J. (ed.) (2009 .(*Discourse, of Course: An Overview of Research in Discourse Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rescher, N. (1977). *Dialectics: A Controversy-Oriented Approach to the Theory of Knowledge* .New York: Spinger. Richards, K. (2006). *Language and Professional Identity: Aspects of Collaborative Interaction*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Rocci, A. (2017). *Modality in Argumentation* .Amsterdam: Springer.

Schaffner, C. and U. Wiesemann (2001). *Annotated Texts for Translation :English German* .Clevedon, Buffoldo, and Sydney :Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* .Cambridge: CUP.

Simons, H. W. (ed.) (1990) *The Rhetorical Turn: Invention and Persuasion in the Conduct of Inquiry.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Snoeck-Henkenmans, A. F. (1996). Indicators of Independent and Interdependent Argument: 'anyway' and 'even ." 'In *van Benthen et al) eds (.Logic and Arguments .Amsterdam: the Academic van Wetenschappen*, pp. 77-.87-2001).

Snoeck-Henkenmans, A. F. (1996a). "Argumentation, Explanation and Causality: An Exploration of Current Linguistic Approaches to Textual Relations" . In *Ted Sanders et al. (eds) Text Representation :Linguistic and Psycholinguistic Aspects*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 231-42 2001).

Snoeck-Henkenmans, A. F. (1996b). "Argumentation Structure ".In *F .van Eemeren (ed). Concepts in Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, pp. 101- 6.

Thomas, J. (1995) . *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics* .London and New York: Longman. Tindale, C. W. (2004) . *Rhetorical Argumentation: Principles of Theory and Practice* .London and New Delhi: Sage. .

Tosi, A. (2001). Language and Society in a Changing Italy . In *John Edwards (ed.). Clevedon, Buffola*, Toronto, and Sydney: Multilingual Matters.

Trent, J. S. and Robert Friedenberg (2008). *Political Campaign Communication: Principles and Practices*.6th edn. Lanham. New York, and Toronto: Rowman and Littlefield.

Van Eemeren, F. H. (2002). Argumentation Theory: An Overview of Approaches and Research Themes. In *Eriksson et al. (eds) Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts* .Penusylvania: Trinity Press.

Van Eemeren, F. H. (2007). Pragma-Dialectical Theory of Argumentation ."In *Whaley and Stamter (eds) . Explaining Communication: Contemporary Theories and Exemplars* .Amsterdam: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Van Eemeren, F. H. (2009). The Study of Argumentation .*In Lunsford et al. , (eds) .The Sage Handbook of Rhetorical Studies* .Los Angelis and London: Sage Inc.

van Eemeren, F. H. (2009) . "Strategic Maneuvering between Effectiveness and Dialectical Reasonableness" .In *Henrique Jales Ribeiro (ed (.Rhetoric and Argumentation of the XXI st Century* .Colombia: Colombia University Press.

van Eemeren, F. H .(2010) . *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse: Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation* .Philadelphia: John Benjamnins.

van Eemeren, F. H .(2012). " Strategic Manoeuvering in Discourse". In *Mannti Mannti and Franco Angeli) eds.) Positive Effects and Ethical Perspectives .Vol. 1*. Milano: Franco nglie.

van Eemeren, F. H. (2015). In Reasonableness" .In *van Eemeren (ed) .Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse* .Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 223-40.

 van Eemeren, F. H , Erik C.W. krabbe, Bart Garssen, A.Franscisca Henkenmans, Bart Verheij, and Jean H.M. Wagemans (2014) . *Handbook of Argumentation Theory* .Dordrecht: Springer.   .

van Eemeren, F. H and R. Grootendorst (1984). *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions* Dordrecht: Foris publications.

van Eemeren, F. H .(1988). "Rules for Argumentation in Dialogues" .*Argumentation* .Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic, vol. 2, 499-510.

van Eemeren ,F.H   .and   Rob   Grootendorst ." .(1989). *Speech Act Conditions as Tools for Reconstructing Argumentative Discourse Argumentation* .Amsterdam: Kluwer Academic.

van Eemeren, F. H. (1992) . *Argumentation, Communication and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective* .Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum.

van Eemeren, F. H (2004) . *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-dialectical approach* .   Cambridge :CUP.

van Eemeren, F. H. (2015). "Rationale for a Pragma-Dialectical Perspective" .In *van Eemeren (ed). Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse .Vol.17.* Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 203-20.

van Eemeren, F. H (2015). " Making the Best of Argumentative Discourse" .In *van Eemeren (ed). Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse* .Dordrecht: Springer, pp. 543-55.

van Eemeren, F. H , Snoeck-Henkenmans   A. F., Anthony Blair, Ralph Johnson, Erick C. W. , Christian, Doglas N. Walton, Charles A. Willard, John Woods, and David Zarefsky.(1996)

    Fundamentals of Argumentation Theory: A Handbook of Historical Background and Contemporary Developments . Mohwah and New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

van Eemeren, F. H .(2002) .*Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation* .New Jersey: Lawrence Associates.

van Eemeren and P. Houtlosser (1999). Delivering the Goods in Critical Discussion ."In *van Eemeren et al. (eds). Proceedings of the Fourth International Society for the Study of Argumentation* .Amsterdam :Amsterdam University.

van Eemeren, F. H " .(2006). The Case of Pragma -dialectics ."In *Parsons et al. (eds) (.Argumentation in Multi-Agent Systems .Amsterdam: Springer.*

van Eemeren, F. H (2015) " .A Procedural View of Critical Reasonableness ."In *van Eemeren (ed.), Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse .Vol. 17* .Amsterdam Springer, pp. 245-15.

van Eemeren, F. H.   (2015The Case of Pragma Dialectics ."In *van Eemeren (ed). Reasonableness and Effectiveness in Argumentative Discourse .Vol. 17* .Amsterdam: Springer, pp - 149 . 77.

van Eemeren, F. H and F. Snoeck-Henkenmans .(2007) *Argumentative Indicators in Discourse: A Pragma -dialectical study .Vol. 12*. Dordrecht: Springer.

van Eemeren, F. H and A. F. Snoeck-Henkenmans(2007*). Argumentation, Analysis and Evaluation   2 .nd* edn. New York and London :Routledge Taylor Francis.

van Eemeren, F. H and B. Garssen (2008). Conversing and Confrontation in Argumentative Discourse ."In *van Eemeren and Garssen (eds) .Conversing and Confrontation: Relating Conversing Analysis with Argumentation Theory* .Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 1-27 .

van Eemeren, F.H., B. Garssen, and B. Menffelds (2009) .*Fallacies and Judgements of Reasonableness: Empirical Research Concerning Pragma-Dialectical Discussion Rules .Vol. 16*. Dordrecht, London and New York: Springer.

van Eemeren, F. H and Wu Peng (eds.) (2017) .*Contextualizing Pragma-Dialectics* .12ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

van Laar, J. A. (2007) . Don't say that ."!Argumentation .Amsterdam. *Springer*, vol. 20. Pp.465- 51.

van Rees, M. A. (2000). Comments on Rhetoric and Dialectic in the 21st Century .*Argumentation* . Amsterdam: Springer, vol. 14, 3, pp255-9.

Walton, D. N. (2006) . *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: CUP.

Walton, D. N. .(2007). *Media Argumentation: Dialectic, Persuasion and Rhetoric* .Cambridge: CUP.

Walton, D. N. and E. Krabbe (1995) .*Commitment in Dialogue: Basic Concepts of Interpersonal Reasoning* .New York: New York University Press.

Wenzel, J. W. (1979). Jurgen Habermas and the Dialectical Perspective on Argumentation. *Journal of the American Forensic Associations* ,vol. 16, pp. 83-94..

Woodward, B. (2018) . *Fear: Trump in the White House .New York*. Simon and Schuster.Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. 4th edn. Cambridge and New York:

Cuarefsky, D. (2014). *Rhetorical Perspectives on Argumentation*. 24thedn .Northwestern Evanston: Springer.   .

WEBSITES

1.The Republican Presidential Debate in Detroit. The date of the debate is March 2, 2016 published by New York Times/ Richard Perry .Accessed at November 10, 2017. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/us/poliyics/transcript-of-the-republican-presidential-debate.

Debate.   .2. The Second Republican Debate .The date of the debate is September 2015 ,18 published by Ryan Teague Beckwith. Accessed at December 2, 2017. Available at: https://www.time.com/4037239/second-republican-debate-cnn.

3. The 5th Republican Debate transcript, annotated: Who said what and what it meant .The date of the debate is December 15, 2015. Published by Team Fix. Accessed at January 2, 2018. Available at: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp. fix/wp

4. The Democratic Presidential Debate in Flint, Mich. The date of the debate is March 6, 2016 published by Richard Perry, New York Times. Accessed at January 6, 2018. Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2016/03/us/politics/transcript-democratic-residential-elections.

5.MSNBC 2016 Democratic Candidates Debate. Published by Chuck Tood and Richel Maddow. Accessed at November 5, 2017. Available at: https://www.nbcnews.cm/politics/2016-election.

6. CNN Democratic Debate. The date of the debate is April 15, 2016 published by CNN. Accessed at January 15, 2018. Available   at: https://www.cnn.com/2016/04/14/politics.