

Argumentation Strategies of the Saudi Political Discourse: A Critical Analysis of Oral Messages

Dr. Ali M. AlShehri^{*,†}

Associate Professor of Linguistics, Baljurashi College of Science & Arts, Al-Baha University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

DOI: [10.15520/jassh52398](https://doi.org/10.15520/jassh52398)

Accepted 25 Jan 2019; Received 16 Dec 2018; Publish Online xx Feb 2019

ABSTRACT

The current study aimed at exploring the argumentation strategies of the Saudi political discourse (henceforth SPD) through critical analysis of oral messages delivered by the ex-Minister of Saudi Foreign Affairs, Adel Al-Jubeir. For fulfilling the goal of the study, the researcher: (1) surveyed what was written about Al-Jubeir in order to get acquainted with his academic, political and diplomatic background, (2) examined the most common argumentation strategies used by politicians and diplomats, and how to analyze them in oral discourse, and (3) selected an issue that is chronic or deeply-rooted, *Saudi- Iranian Tensions*. Al-Jubeir's oral interview on that issue was transcribed, and then four techniques of analysis were used. The study results were thoroughly discussed with exemplary analyses. It was concluded that different argumentation strategies are used in SPD – one cements the other – in order to accomplish an effective result. The main contribution of this study can be seen as the elaboration of the theoretical background on argumentation strategies and the empirical evidence in the SPD that necessitates further research.

Key words: argumentation strategies–Saudi political discourse–Saudi-Iranian tensions–CDA–exemplification–explicitness–entailment–RQs

1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1.1 First: Political Discourse

Language and politics have a close relationship. They cannot be divorced from each other. And it is impossible for politics to exist or to be described without language. Since language is the politics' only aide, political actions and activities and events are interpreted through words with which political facts are constituted (Bayley, 2005; Chilton & Schaffner, 2002a, Dunmire, 2012; Farr, 1989; Ker-validze&Samnidize, 2016).

Politics are seen to be intended communicative activities, like reporting what had happened, briefing what is in question, preparing what can (will or should) be done, formulating new perspectives or standpoints, summarizing the moves and roundabouts, negotiating for winning/gaining more benefit or losing/leaving little benefit to others, forming coalitions for or against and also convincing or persuading others to align with one. Such a view is quite illustrated in political argumentation where it is a trial al

debates, speech for convincing or persuading others of accepting one's standpoint voluntarily. In political debates, skilled politicians use different argumentation strategies in order to have the upper hand to establish a claim or support it recursively (Cano-Basave and He, 2016; Fischer & Gottweis, 2012; Rubenelli, 2009; Toulmin, 2003; Walton, 2006; Wodak, 2011; Wodak 2015).

It is widely known – sometimes accepted and some other times contested – by researchers (e.g., Chilton & Schaffer, 1997; Fairclough,1992a,1992b, 1995, Joseph et al., 2006; ; Ochs & Taylor, 1992; Wilson, 1990, Wilson, 1997; Wodak, 2015) that a critical role is really played by the language used in politics when preparing and delivering a political discourse for influencing specific addresses, and any mode of discourse can be political if it implies issues like control, conflict, power or domination in different ways/within different levels and different contexts. But its interpretation may take different paths in the minds of different ideologies. This notion assumes that two political views can be represented in the same linguistic form but entail/refer to (im)possible interpretations. And the consequences, may, generate negative or positive word associations. Therefore, specific words or specific phrases seem significant when dis-

cussing a political issue. Clichés, set expressions, and collocations can also confirm or disconfirm what is there in the discourse. The issue here is that some humans are biased when they are invited, asked, or even obliged to interpret an event or a discourse that tackles an event. Some linguistic areas are highlighted and some others are neglected. But adopting certain criteria for evaluating political discourse, one could perceive the whole spectrum.

For it represents one's beliefs and views, one can assume that political discourse is ideological. It is a medium of transferring information in a try to influence others' actions or control their minds. Besides, when a candidate/a politician receives, perceives and experiences knowledge in a political context, he depicts his ideology that needs to be communicated with others, whether he is acclaiming, attacking or defending. Thus, political discourse analysis is concerned with discourses that take place within political contexts and which are pronounced by political actors such as politicians to achieve political discourse". For such goals, pragmatic tools, stylistic devices (metaphor, irony, hyperbole, parallelism and repetition), pragmatic presupposition, conversational implicature, argumentative strategies are used.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) explores opaque/intricate relationships between events, practices and texts and social processes, ideologies and power. It has a bidirectional relationship shaped by cultural and social context and influenced by language. Also, it implies hidden causes and connections. So, the production as well as the interpretation of discourse are implied in the discourse that is used to form the social identity, knowledge systems and social relations. In some researchers' view (e.g., Batstone, 1995; Fairclough, 1989,1992,2015), CDA is a research tactics focusing on reorganizing directions and tensions of two sides shaped in language in different stages (social conditions process and text) and levels (description, interpretation, and explanation). To Fairclough (1989), *description* focuses on the formal text properties, *interpretation* tackles how far the interaction has a relationship with the text, while *explanation* deals with how far there are social effects due to the social processes of the interaction.

1.2 Second: Argumentation strategies

Argumentation is a human trait and behavior that occurs at different levels of interaction within different situations in our daily life, regardless levels of learning, skills, state of arousal and political, social and cultural positions the willingness to argue arises from a personal choice (Infante&Rancer, 1982; Thomlinson & Phillips, 1991). Functionally, and according to researchers (e.g., Al-Khatib et al., 2017; Hample&Dallinger, 1991; O'Keefe, 1988) argumentation is an effective strategy to persuade others, but only when giving reasons in a competent way of delivering the message. The ability to motivate others to take action depends upon justifying why they should/should not go a specific way. But this depends mainly on the words and phrases

forming the context. Billig (as cited in Wodak, 2015: p.1) states that "to understand the meaning of a sentence or whole discourse in an argumentative context, one should not examine merely the words within that discourse or the images in the speaker's mind at the moment of utterance. One should also consider the positions which are being criticized, or against which a justification is being mounted. Without knowing these counter-positions, the argumentative meaning will be lost".

Argumentation strategies have been explored from different perspectives in different contexts for different purposes. They are basically used for conflict management, dispute resolution, negotiations, and disagreement fixing. They are what both arguers and argues think, analyze and choose – whether the area and mode of discourse. Also, they are believed to trigger thinking of one's affective power and one's significant objectives considering the opponent's effective power and their significant objectives. Such tactics may make changing a situation possible. Some researchers (Infante, 1988; Rolof et al., 1989; Toska, 2010; Turlacu, 2014; Walker,1991) hold the belief that the argumentation strategies can be manifested in the discussion of issues, using specific forms of argument and implementing differentiated patterns of interaction with the appropriate type of reasoning and defensiveness techniques that suit the issue under question. This view stems from the different definitions given by argumentation theorists. To the researcher, those definitions can be categorized into three:

1.2.1 According to form, argumentation

- is a process of reasoned interaction about controversial issues (Makau, 1990).
- is "disagreement over ideas" or "disagreement over behaviors" (Newell & Stutman, 1988).
- is a "people-centered conflict" and "issue-centered conflict" (Reinard, 1991).
- exists whenever incompatible activities occur (Duetsch, 1973).
- is a verbal and social activity of reason (van Eemeren, et al., cited in Schwarz and Asterhan, 2008).

1.2.2 According to function, argumentation

- is discourse in which people attempt to solve problems rationally by supporting their claims with reasons and evidences. (Rowland, 1987)..
- establishes assertions (Baker cited in Schwarz and Asterhan, 2008).
- is mainly for persuading others of one's claims or standpoints.
- might be used in individual deliberation for considering some social issues.

- mediates multiple points of view where the issues are joined (Sillers&Ganer, 1982).
- promotes rational, constructive conflict resolution via verbal reasoning (Grootendorst, 1988; Walton cited in Schwarz and Asterhan,2008).

1.2.3 According to components, argumentation

- involves people interacting for the purpose of making sound choices (Rieke & Sillars, 1992).
- is a process including advancing, supporting, criticizing, and modifying claims, so that appropriate decision-makers – including yourself – may grant or deny adherence (Rieke & Sillars, 1992).
- includes not only orderly discussions of controversial issues but disruptive quarrels and disputes as well (Reinard, 1991).
- is a set of assumptions followed by a conclusion obtained by one or more reasoning steps (Besnard and Hunter cited in Petasis and Karkaletsis, 2016)

Argumentation, then, becomes in the house of conflict, choices, and incompatibilities, governed by rationality, communicative competence and willingness to fix relationships. But three factors are still there affecting that willingness: *interdependence* in which each arguing pole banks on fixed resources, *differences in goals* in which each pole tries to attain their objectives regardless others, and *differences in perceptions* in which each pole has different levels of perceiving personal, impersonal, interpersonal and intra personal experiences (Mansouri et al., 2017; Walker, 1991). Besides, when the argument becomes the ability to recognize controversial issues in communicative situations, to present and defend positions on the issues, to shape definitions, and recast perspectives as well as to attack positions which other people take – as Infante cited in Schultz, 1991 – asserts, argumentation seems not only necessary, but practical as well with three different types of proof: ethos, logos and pathos (Nelson, 1991).

Dace (cited in Leatham, 1991:246) provided some argumentation strategies that can be used in controversial-marked situations including the political ones. Some of them are summarized below:

- Integrative strategies
- Distributive strategies
- Passive/Indirect strategies

Other researchers suggest multiple and varied argumentation strategies that can be used in different situations where disagreements, disputes, controversies, challenges, conflicts, oppositions or confrontations exist in any social situation particularly the field of politics. Some those strategies in political discourse can be reasoning (inductive, deductive or causal) exemplification, discovering fallacies and refuting them, appealing to different authorities,

entailments, rhetorical questions, explicitness, comparison-contrast, cause and effect, classification, arguing from reality, using analogies, and using enthymemes. Since the current research is focusing on the argumentation strategies in Saudi political discourse, the researcher finds it suitable to thoroughly review the literature and previous studies closely related to only four strategies namely: Exemplification, Explicitness, Entailment and Rhetorical questions. Those strategies are thought that they need more elaboration in recent political discourse analysis.

Exemplification

Examples are assumed as one familiar form of evidence, and a way for defining things. To Buys et al. (1991), an example is a description of an event or experience that is like the idea you wish to communicate. In reviewing the literature on example in argumentation, Hartney (1995) finds out a common focus on two specific conceptions, one involves argument by example, a form of rhetorical induction; and the other involves the use of examples as illustrations to clarify or support premises. This means that the first definition – argument by example – is a method of reasoning which involves examining particulars in order to arrive at a conclusion about another particular. This is what Book 1 of Aristotle (in Hartney, 1995, p. 408) refers to; example (or paradigm) is described as “reasoning neither from part to whole nor from whole to part but from part to part”. In order for such reasoning to do function, it is to demonstrate points of similarity and contrast. The other way of defining the example refers to specific instances used to support, clarify, or illustrate a proposition. Away from those distinctions, Adler and Rodman (1997) give a general definition. They think that, “an example is a specific case that is used to demonstrate a general idea” (p. 398). Anyhow, an example can be seen as a way providing support for the truth of a generalization since “an example is a sample, ...a selection from the group”, Barnett and Bedau (1987, p. 27). Examples can also be statements that are proved valid for being based on empirical evidence (Antonini et al., 2010).

In arguments, two sorts of examples are believed to be common : real (or factual) examples and hypothetical (artificial or invented) examples. Barnett and Bedau (1987) believe that a third one is also common which is ‘analogies’ – a kind of comparison offered as evidence – while Adler and Rodman (1997) see that in addition to examples’ being factual or hypothetical, they can be either personal of one’s life and experience or borrowed from others. UWC Staff for Dallas Baptist University (2015) see that examples can be brief for covering wide possible outcomes, or extended for providing further, distinct details.

Real examples are taken from actual events or real happenings. The advantage of an example drawn from real life is that “its reality lends weight to it” (Barnett and Bedau, 1987, p.28). Some examples might be made up; they aren’t real. They are said to be hypothetical, artificial or invented. In such a sort of examples, imaginary situations are created for the audience in order to encourage them to visualize which might happen under certain circumstances. Buys et al. (1991, p. 92) suggest that, “it is important to let your

audience know that you are using hypothetical examples by saying : Let's imagine ...or I would like to have you imagine ...". Though it is commonly thought that the real, the better and real examples cannot simply be brushed off, Adler and Rodman (1997, p. 399) stress that "hypothetical examples can often be more powerful than factual examples, because hypothetical examples ask the audience to imagine something – thus causing them to become active participants in the thought ... One way to generate a hypothetical example is to consider the possible consequences of some current trend or occurrence". Whether examples are real or hypothetical, personal (relating to the arguer) or borrowed (relating to others rather than the arguer), they can be combined with other types of support.

To state functions and uses of examples, Buys et al. (1991, p. 92) hold the view that examples are used as an important available technique not only for introductions, but when greater clarity is needed. Besides, examples can be effective in clarifying information and making it interesting and memorable. The use of example in argumentation is justified by Consigny (in Hartney, 1995, p. 409) as "an independent mode of rational persuasion or proof". Benoit (in Hartney, op. cit.) notes that example can be used to refer to a reasoning process, or "it can refer to the use of specific instances as illustrations to clarify propositions". When arguing an issue in journalism, examples have a power in rhetorical discourse when they are used as persuasive illustrations. Examples, or exemplars – according to Brosius and Bathett (in Hartney op. cit.) – are said to describe causes, and consequences of the problem from the unique perspective of an individual and function as a case illustration or exemplar of the underlying problem. Though those exemplars give a more episodic insight, and are collected in nonsystematic way, stressing some aspects while neglecting others, Brosius and Bathett stress that the use of exemplars increase vividness, perceive authenticity and evoke a higher level of interest from the recipient. In short, if the examples are successfully used, they will command a certain affective response (Brinton in Hartney, op. cit., p. 10). Besides examples are commonly used in proving specific points, UWC Staff for Dallas Baptist University (2015), or for generating conjectures (Antonini et al., 2010).

For evaluating the examples provided in an argumentative discourse, Jensen (1981, p. 128) poses two questions can be posed : "Are the instances representative?" and "Are there enough instances?". At the same time, Rotteberg (1985, p. 92) asks the same first question, "Are the examples representative?". Then, he raises another different question : "Are the examples consistent with the experience of the audience?". The case here is that the examples provided must be representative and quite enough to simplify or to clarify the situation. But the matter of consistency with the experience of the audience depends on the sort of examples being offered and the claim the arguer is insisting. From another lens, UWC Staff for Dallas Baptist University (2015), state that the examples should be preceded by a well- researched generalization. That generalization is to be stretched with examples that are enough, detailed, logically

organized, applicable and at the same time assert the claim raised.

In argumentation, Harteny (1995) revealed the significance of examples. Via examples, some issues and propositions are clarified, claims are defended, concepts are illustrated, problem/issue causes and consequences are described, and premises are supported. Furthermore, she considers examples a method of proof backing enthymemes constituting rhetorical induction. In such a way, the perceptions and judgments of recipients/ audience are significantly affected. This means that examples can elicit or create some sort of feelings/emotions or sentiments such as sympathy, concern or outrage on behalf of others. Besides, they can function as a moral side with who or what deserves to be supported. Once happened, they respond affectively, or react in a certain way even though they do not help.

Explicitness

Explicitness has received much interest in the researches and studies related to argumentation and argumentative discourse. To Hahn – cited in Baumgarten et al. (2008) – explicitness is defined as a property of texts and discourses. This means that the speaker or the addressee has complete power over the words of texts and discourses and the tactic to communicate them in an ambiguous way. Explicitness refers to – according to Baumgarten et al. (2008) – the information that is linguistically encoded in a complete, detailed, and surface way on the contrary of implicitness that indicates a message referred to from the text. Murtisari (2016) believes that the message is *explicit* when it is visible, comprehensive, or accessible , but *implicit* when it is implied, indirectly accessible, or inferred to by something else. In the light of the definitions aforementioned, the researcher believes that explicitness can be defined as a communication strategy for bridging the gap between the addresser's well-specified intentions and well-formed goals and the addressee's conceptions and mental representations via certain cues.

Explicitness is thought to have some indicators. Three of them are: the thesis is clearly stated, the anticipated disagreement is well-expressed, and "the performance efficiency is improved" Shang et al. (2014). Besides, and if it shapes an intentional query, it must have a relation with a specific goal to be achieved in a plain way (Strohmaier et al., 2017).

In an argumentative setting, explicitness is a tactic or even a strategy for solving problems or resolving conflicts, or a strategy for clarifying some processes concerning the issue raised to be more cognitively clear and easily communicated (DeMetsenaere and Vandepitte, 2017). O'Keefe (2018) holds the belief that " argumentation that is more explicit is better (normatively speaking) than argumentation that is less implicit, precisely because greater explicitness opens the advocated view from critical scrutiny" (p.1). To him, explicitness can be of the message's conclusion or of argument premises whether its type is, and though it might widen the disagreement space and negatively affect persuasive effectiveness, it really reveals and specifies different aspects related to the views presented and the reasonings given to support one's claim. In discourse analysis,

explicitness can be identified through the referents intended and represented by the speaker and understood by the listener. With this, explicitness still becomes relative since the frameworks within which explicitness is explained are different.

On the other hand, some researchers (e.g., O'Keefe, 2018) argue that explicitness can negatively affect the persuasion of others. It might widen the disagreement and deepen the dispute over claims under discussion. The explicit message might be so directive, insistent or aggressive – the state with which the addressee(s)/audience gets angry or threatened. Instead, the addresser may resort to the enthymeme – in which the major premise or conclusion is omitted, but understood implicitly – inviting for active participation from the part of the addressee(s)/audience towards problem/conflict resolution.

Whether explicitness influences the persuasion of others positively or negatively, it has different degrees. von Fintel (2006) and Declerck (2009) – cited in Kranich and Gast (2013) identified two lexical dimension levels representing two major degrees: (i) the indication of a source of evidence, and (ii) the degree of precision in the indication of 'epistemic force'. Strohmaier et al. (2017) classified the degrees of intentional explicitness as for the users of web search engines into two degrees: a theoretical level (intended for increasing the abstraction level of knowledge and refining goals when searching), and a practical level (intended for improving the utility of searching). While in the field of translation – where two (or more) languages are tackled, Murtisari (2016) sees that the degrees of explicitness depend on factors such as encodedness, informativity, specificity, topicality, focus and emphasis. Though the degree of explicitness for each factor is intended by the addresser, it is perceived by the addressee(s)/audience. They are who recover the message received and interpret it according to their attributions, frames of reference and habits of mind.

Entailment

Entailment has received much interest by different scholars and researchers in different fields including philosophy, logic and linguistics. But in linguistics, it is usually tackled and analyzed logically. When a sentence is validated and accepted true under certain conditions, the one entailed from that sentence must be true, and when A is denied or unaccepted, B must therefore be denied and refused. Or when A leads to B, B must be because A. Clearly saying that one sentence follows another. Thus, the information available in a sentence entails other pieces of information derived from the main one. This depends on deducing meaning and logical inference. It is said – by Khalil (2002) that A entails B only when B is derived from A. van Dijk – cited in Khalil – argues that when A expresses a proposition, the proposition that is expressed by B is entailed by A. This is called textual entailment because it is between two texts fragments, a text *t* and a textual statement (hypothesis) *h*. We say that *t* entails *h*, denoted $t \models h$, if humans reading *t* will infer that *h* is most likely true (Dagan et al., 2005)

In order for identifying textual entailment, discourse commitments are used according to some researchers (e.g.,

Hickl, 2008; JijkounanddeTijke, 2005), in a series of steps: (1) decomposing the discourse in order to pinpoint its syntactic, lexical and semantic features, (2) generating commitments from the content proposed, (3) producing interrelations and co-references, and (4) producing paraphrases of commitments in individual ones and in strings.

Entailment has different types in the perspective of different researchers. To Zhang and Chai (2010), two types are there: (1) *textual entailment* which is mainly inferred to from written texts whereas (2) *automated entailment* that is automatically inferred to from segments constituting some information extracted or a question answered. Yule – cited in Khalil (2002) classified entailment into two types: (1) *foreground entailment* where the asserted meaning precedes the presupposed meaning via inferring the intended one, and (2) *background entailment* where the proposed meaning is entailed in the sentence. Moreover, there is one more entailment that is *conversation entailment* which is inferred to from complete sentences or even segments from conversational scripts of online chatting, meetings and court proceedings. According to Nordquist (2018), there are two other types of entailment: *truth conditional entailment* where declarative sentences are used, and *illocutionary entailment* where imperative sentences are used.

However, whatever the types of entailment are, all of them have pragmatic roles. Those who use them in certain contexts can use them in other ones if they are appropriate, and serve the goals they are pursuing to accomplish. But, it must be clear that the semantic rules as well as the logical ones play a vital role when applying to entailment, since there is no sharp division between entailment, semantics and logic.

Rhetorical questions

Rhetoric is referred to as the art of persuading others to change or maintain their opinion, or their set of beliefs through argumentation whose aim is to set up a specific standpoint as true or false in the given circumstances. In order for rhetorical arguments to be sound, rhetorical questions (RQs) can be used in addition to other strategies. RQs are defined as utterances that have the structure of a question intended mostly to elicit an answer (Blankenship and Craig, 2006; Frank, 1990; Oraby et al, 2017; Rohde, 2006, Schaffer, 2005). They are often used in arguments and expressions of opinion, clarification of points of views, discourse management, emphasis related to argumentation, advertisements and other persuasive domains or even constructing counterargument/counter-persuasion, and creating/changing attitudes among people who have no/low interest towards a certain issue.

From another perspective, RQs are a type of figurative language whose aim is to achieve a pragmatic goal, such as structuring an argument, persuading, emphasizing a point, or being ironic (Oraby et al., 2017), or they may take the form of commands. As for the form of the rhetorical question, it can end in either a question mark, or an exclamation mark or a period. Ilie cited in Spago (2017:103) thinks that RQs achieves six goals: (1) softening criticism, (2) strengthening assertions, (3) defending ones opinion, (4) manipulating and changing the opinions of others, (5) making one's

message more memorable, and (6) being ironic. Besides, and to the researcher, they are used in formal language in formal contexts such as meetings, forums, conferences and debates, and in informal language in informal contexts such as social media, chats and humor. They provide different argumentative functions in political debates as “a powerful weapon”, Gergen cited in Spago (2017:104). When they are interrogatives, they are oriented to remind the audience or the addressee(s) of the answer or to assert that the answer to that question is a well-known truth. Through affirmative or negative RQs, the speaker may oblige his adversary to give an answer affirmatively or negatively. Besides, he might go further and oblige him to choose a modal answer (Turlacu, 2014). According to Spago (2017), RQs do not need answers. They are just asked for eliciting mental response. They aim to persuade the addressee(s) to elicit or accept the implicit answer intended by the addresser.

RQs have syntactic and semantic features. If they have polar items, questions can be incompatible with the answer needed, and if the questions are followed by ironic answers, questions replace explicit and implicit statements. When they are indicative, they include an answer, but when they are implicative, the answer can be understood and known to the interlocutors. To put it clear, questions are *syntactically* featured as rhetorical when they fall in one category or more of the following :

- the use of polarity items in questions,
 - introducing questions with a lexical item incompatible with asking for information,
 - questions accompanied by ridiculous answers,
 - questions realized in why + lexical verb form,
 - questions incorporated into declarative or imperative sentences, and
1. auto-responsive questions.
 - yes-no questions
 - rhetorical question with an answer
 - rhetorical questions in the series

But the most common *semantic* indicator featuring the RQs is the semantic incompatibility which refers to joining two conflicting concepts/opinions together in a question.

1.3 Third: The connection between argumentation strategies and political discourse

“Differences of opinion” is proposed to be a norm of human life specifically in politics where the interactional and logical discourse revolves around different issues of concern to be agreed upon, opposing view to be settled, and a dispute to be resolved, or goals to be negotiated. These processes take argumentation as a means to an end. When contradiction is heated, conflict arises; and each contradictory part

tries to use argumentation strategies that they think can help win the round or at least maintain their face. At the level of debate, the speaker has several strategies to use. Among them, he may appeal to different authorities, statistics, testimonies, reasonings, analysis, exemplification, anecdotes, and any other argumentation strategy for convincing the audience or the addressee(s) of the point of view. Many studies (e.g., Al-Khatib et al., 2017; Turlacu, 2014) tackled political argumentation strategies: types and classification, techniques, purposes and functions.

1.4 Fourth: Argument evaluation

Judging an argument is a clumsy task. The reason may be related to its components, the functions it does, the considerations around an argumentative situation/context and the evaluative criteria. Determining the soundness of an argument has been widely researched by different scholars (e.g., Bynton & Nelson, 1998; Gouran, 1998; Krieg, 1997; Schippa, 1995). To Gouran (1998), there are four criteria for evaluating that soundness of argument: (1) whether the evidence given by the arguer is appropriate for supporting his claim(s), (2) whether that evidence is sufficient (amount and relevance) for backing his claim(s), (3) whether there are reasons behind believing that the evidence is both appropriate and sufficient, and (4) whether there are reasons for justifying advancing the claim(s) (or what is labeled by Gouran as tentativeness).

From another perspective, rhetorical effectivity seems to be a path for influencing others, and accordingly accomplishing one's goal. Assessing that effectivity is based on the epistemological-ethical implications offered by the arguer for supporting his argument. Wenzel (1990) as well as Greene (1998) shed light on the constituents of effectivity (perspectivism, purposes, scope and focus, situations, resources, standards and roles) related to rhetoric, dialectic and logic that make it possible to translate any social practice into argument.

2 STUDY PROBLEM

It seems to the researcher that there is a research gap in the field of English Applied Linguistics focusing on the Saudi political discourse that might unveil the real policy of Saudi Arabia towards her neighbors, allies and other countries in the globe. And this analytical study might be a step to accomplish this aim.

2.1 Questions of the study

1. What are the argumentative strategies currently used in the Saudi political discourse (henceforth SPD)?
2. Can those strategies help unveil the real policy of Saudi Arabia towards others through analyzing the political discourse of its ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs, Adel Al-Jubeir?

2.2 Instrumentation

For fulfilling the study aim, the researcher developed and used the following instruments:

1. Dialog Analysis
2. Dimensions of Discourse Complexity Analysis
3. Critical Discourse Analysis
4. Exemplification Analysis
5. Explicitness Analysis
6. Entailment Analysis
7. Rhetorical Questions Analysis

2.3 Delimitations of the study

1. Adel Al-Jubeir's speech on Saudi-Iranian Tension on 21 June, 2016 Appendix A.
2. Two types of dialog: Persuasion and Inquiry
3. Dimensions of Discourse Complexity with its three levels (
4. Critical Discourse Analysis with its three components: speech, processing and political aspects
5. Argumentation strategies (3E's & RQs) Analysis with the focus on Exemplification, Explicitness (

2.4 Method

The researcher developed a cognitive map that has four subsequent phases grouped as OSTA in order to collect data and practically carry out the analysis of SPD.

First: Operationalization. It is the key factor in conducting such a study. The researcher surveyed many speeches delivered by the Saudi ex-minister of foreign affairs, Adel Al-Jubeir, in order to select what is believed the most prominent political issue/problem he tackled, or faced one day during his political/diplomatic career.

Second: Sampling. Sample size is not usually a main issue in discourse analysis as the interest is in the variety of ways the language is used. Besides, large variations in linguistic patterning can emerge from a small sample of people or of themes. So, a larger sample size may just make the analytic task unmanageable, rather than adding to the analytic outcomes. For those reasons, the researcher selected only one political issue: the *Saudi-Iranian Tensions* representing the most conventional international issue.

Third: Transcription. Al-Jubeir's interview as for the issue selected was transcribed. The records represented only words, self-repetitions and self-corrections.

Fourth: Analysis. After the interview had been transcribed, it was read three times to get the overall impression and bridge any cultural barriers that might exist. The text units of transcripts were codified and given labels. Besides, additional insightful notes along the margins were set in a qualitative way. Varied techniques for analysis were used in order to reach some sort of the reliability of the process.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In order to make sure of the reliability and validity of the analyses done to the SPD, the researcher utilized more than one technique beginning with the dialog passing by critical discourse analysis and ending with the argumentation strategies. The results and discussion of the analyses are sometimes displayed in the body of the research and some other times in the appendices.

3.1 Dialog Analysis

Having surveyed Al-Jubeir's interview, it can be noticed that he used two types of dialog referred to by Walton (2006), namely: *persuasion* and *inquiry*. Throughout each type, he managed to use its three stages: An *opening stage* in which he paved the way to his argument asserting that he didn't say anything that was not based on fact, and assuring that he had to have the burden of proof that Iran is a terrorist state. In a chain of explicit, detailed, rational arguments, Al-Jubeir structured the *argumentation stage*. In the *closing stage*, he proved that Iran is violating the internal laws by behaving in a way that expose her to criticism. The burden of persuasion that Al-Jubeir used had revealed the conflict of opinions between Iran and Saudi Arabia. It could clarify the roots of the tension issue between the two countries. Besides, he proceeded the evidence, verify it and then prove his claim that Iran is a terrorist state Table 1

Analysis of the Dimensions of Discourse Complexity

Al-Jubeir presented multiple levels of meaning. He mainly expressed his views explicitly; but sometimes, implicit meanings were there. Anyhow, he provided those meanings in a conventional way. The language used by Al-Jubeir is contemporary, familiar and domain specific. Besides, no ambiguous/misleading words/phrases or expressions existed. Common situations related to the topic under question were experienced. Multiple perspectives could match the Saudi one. Al-Jubeir could also successfully function/use the intertextuality when he cited the statement from the Iranian Constitution.

3.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

3.2.1 Speech analysis

3.2.1.1 Lexicalization

1. Lexical analysis (vocabulary)

From a lexical view, Al-Jubeir used the nouns, verbs and adjectives in their positive meanings when he tried to persuade or even inquire, but he resorted to the negative meanings when he determined to face the other side of the real state, or when he wanted to create an argument sounder and stronger than the one created by the other party side. The nouns used by Al-Jubeir mostly expressed the substance of living beings (e.g., leaders, terrorists, Huthis), lifeless beings (e.g., Riyadh, Bekaa valley, weapons), processes and states (e.g., operations, propaganda, attacks), abstract notions (e.g., neighborliness, suicide), qualities (e.g., destitute, violation, explosives). Besides, the verbs describing persuasion

Table 1. Exemplary Analysis of Dialog* in SPD

| Type of dialog | Initial situation | Participant's goal | Goal of dialog |
|----------------|---|---|--|
| Persuasion | Conflict of opinions | Persuade other party | Resolve or clarify issue |
| | Iran harbored them (those involved in terrorist attacks in Riyadh), and protected them. Iran created Hezbollah, and abetted terrorists. | We asked them (the Iranians) to extide them (terrorists). Return to the international laws and behaviors. Our hand is extended to you. | but it was refused. We have our diplomats killed, and our embassies blown up. |
| Inquiry | Need to have proof/falsify evidence | Find and verify evidence | Prove hypothesis |
| | Didn't Iran create Hezbollah? Iran interferes in the Saudi Affairs. | The explosives came from Bekaa valley. Iran sent four shipments of weapons to Huthis in Yemen. | Hezbollah is one of Iran's agents of terrorism. Iran is not a good neighbor. |

Note: Adapted from Walton (2009:14)

were soft and expressive (e.g., want, hope, extend), while the ones describing counterarguments were explicit, strict, precise and to the point (e.g., get round, harbor, abet, tangle, smuggle, sanction). Moreover, the adjectives used provided details about the nouns they modified (e.g., international laws, South America, Saudi official, stubborn things), and/or conveyed different senses (e.g., the big brigadier, the bomb maker, Al-Qaeda operations, terrorist attacks, the great nation) Table 2.

Lexical Analysis (Grammar)

3.2.1.1.1 Choices of modality Although very few modalities (n=5) were used, *can* for *expressing ability, possibility and request, cannot* for *expressing impossibility, could* for *expressing possibility and suggestion, and may* for *probability* – as shown in Table 4, only two strong commands were used: *Return to the international laws and behaviors. Behave in a way that doesn't expose you to criticism.* Moreover, Al-Jubeir overused statements and rhetorical questions in order to transmit a message to the addressees when explaining the issue of terrorism to them and how Iran is with blood-stained hands in many areas of the world.

3.2.1.1.2 Voice passivity It was unnatural for Al-Jubeir to use the active voice (n=31) more than the passive one (n=10) because formal speeches are often characterized by the passive voice. But he wanted his message to be explicit, precise, concise, efficient and to the point – identifying the agent of the action experienced, because - as he might think - the smooth flow of ideas would help the audience identify who did what, when and how in a faster moving. Even when Al-Jubeir used the passive voice or causative, he could have been free not to identify the agent. Instead, he got the actions done in focus in an impersonal way, at the time he identified the agent of the action at the end.

3.2.1.1.3 Verbing Checking the verbs used by Al-Jubeir, one can notice that he used dynamic verbs (n=51) more than stative verbs (n=32). He might have wanted to show that the progressive actions, movements and processes willed, and plotted by Iran are still done (*Iran began terrorist acts and is still doing so over time ...she harbored terrorists and is still doing that ...she interferes in the domestic affairs of Saudi Arabia and is still committing such an act, etc.*). He could successfully variate his dynamic/action verbs be-

tween accomplishment verbs, achievement verbs and activity verbs. With that, Al-Jubeir could – via the stative verbs - describe his thoughts, emotions, opinions and attitudes towards the Iranian acts and behaviors in an efficient way. Besides, he could reveal the general characteristic, situation and the attributions and conditions that made Iran described as a terrorist state. To do this, he used the most common linking verb (*verb to be*) Table 3

3.2.1.1.4 The information focus Al-Jubeir seems to have right perceptions concerning the rooted tensions with Iran due to correct information from reliable different sources he got and digested during his academic, political and diplomatic life. Even when he appealed to a legal authority, he referred to the Iranian Constitution. Those sources tended to show off the terrorist acts and plots of Iran world-wide. Moreover, all testimonies and inferences given could not be falsified or refuted or even justified from the Iranian side: *The 1996 and 2003 attacks, the phone conversations, the Iranian agents captured in Saudi Arabia, the shipments of weapons to Huthis in Yemen, the international laws violated by Iran...* . So, any objective addressee finds it easy to form an opinion about Iran being a sheltering home for terrorism.

Owing to the fact that the Iranian successive governments since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, Iran has been the cause of many problems in the world, especially for the Arab Gulf countries. By this norm, Al-Jubeir does not expect the Iranian consul to acknowledge that Iran is a terrorist country even with the continuing sanctions for a long time owing and to the repeated international accusations of Iran of terrorist acts. Therefore, It was so easy for Al-Jubeir to form an opinion and accuse Iran of terrorism with reference to what he has understood and been aware of from different perspectives from different sources. So the logic of Al-Jubeir's response works like this:

MAJOR PREMISE: Diplomats don't commit suicide by shooting themselves three times.

MINOR PREMISE: Somebody must have shot diplomats.

MINOR PREMISE: Iranian agents have been linked to terrorist attacks in Europe, to terrorist attacks in South America.

CONCLUSION: Iran must be involved in shooting diplomats, and killing them.

Table 2. Qualitative SPD Analysis of the Dimensions of Discourse Complexity

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Dimensions of Discourse Complexity | Explanatory Analysis |
| Levels of meaning | <i>Didn't Iran manage, plan and execute the 1996 attack in Khubar ...? Yes, they did! The control officer was the big brigadier, Al-Shereify... The bomb maker was Hezbollah! The explosives came from the Bekaa Valley. The top three leaders of the plot escaped and have been living in Iran ever since.</i> |
| Levels of clarity | <i>Diplomats don't commit suicide by shooting themselves three times! Somebody is responsible. We have Iranian agents captured in Saudi Arabia for plotting terrorist attacks. We stopped four shipments of weapons that Iran tried to smuggle to the Huthis in Yemen</i> |
| Levels of demands | <i>Doesn't Iran in the Constitution say: Export revolution?! Ronald Regan used to say that, "Facts are stubborn things." They are really stubborn, because we cannot get round the fact. Hezbollah is a terrorist organization attacking embassies is a very clear</i> |

Table 3. Table 3. Lexical analysis (Vocabulary)

| | Nouns (n=41) | Adjectives (n=21) | Verbs (n=83) |
|------------------|--|---|--|
| Positive meaning | facts, laws, policies, diplomats, willingness, neighbor, principles, noninterference | international clear, responsible, right, peaceful | wish, want, hope, give up, extend, stop, exist, behave, return |
| Negative meaning | revolution, violation, attacks, explosives, plot, killing, operations, shooting | wrong, expansionist, terrorist, unaccepted, aggressive, | attack, harbor, refuse, blow up, get round, commit, tangle, smuggle, violate, sanction |

3.2.2 Processing Analysis

Banking on the close relationship between language and power, language constitutes the core of discourse that is used to challenge power. If politics exists, and power does, language must be there providing support, care, control and engagement where the power of people in power is found.

Investigating Al-Jubeir’s words, one can notice that revealing facts via language was overused , since facts give power to the addresser in supporting his claim: *I didn't say anything that was not based on fact. We didn't invent this. This is fact. Facts are stubborn things. We cannot get round the fact. We didn't make it up.*

3.2.3 Political Analysis

Mental representation was known to form ideologies. The repeated terrorist acts from the part of Iran shaped Al-Jubeir’s knowledge and opinions. He – in turn – tried to naturalize in the minds of the addressees/audience that Iran is a(n) terrorist , plotting, revolutionary, stubborn, nosy, law-breaking, aggressive, bad neighbor, and a death seeker state. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia is a peaceful, tolerant, responsible, cooperative, with the international community and obedient to the international laws. Hence, Al-Jubeir could succeed in detailing the work of the two different ideologies with two different identities, positions and norms mostly in a visible way (See Table 4).

3.2.3.1 Analysis of exemplification In order for Al-Jubeir to reason/verify his claims, he provided real examples taken from real events – not invented ones (e.g., *The order to blow up three housing compounds in Riyadh in 2003 was made by Seif Al-Adl, the chief of Al-Qaeda operations. While he was in Iran, we have the phone conversations on tape. We didn't make this up.*). Individual examples related to a specific issue constituted premises to an argument by

which a conclusion must be driven from them (See Table 5). Those examples are clear, enough, representative and memorable because they are based on facts and real experience. Therefore, Al-Jubeir could reach the conclusions logically and easily Table 4

3.2.3.2 Analysis of explicitness As for explicitness in Al-Jubeir’s interview, it can be deduced that he used different degrees of it: (1) he developed and expressed his argument clearly, definitely, in realistic details and unreserved in expression, (2) he provided new information that the Iranian side could not expect or predict, (3) he referred to specifics and details, specific names associated with and belonging to specific events, (4) he stuck to certain words mostly related to the issue under discussion or what is called “on-case argument” in an attempt to affirm and emphasize his claim, and (5) he laid special importance to particular acts, and intensified the prominence of those acts when he used the *verb to do* either in negative questions or affirmative answers. He might have done this in order to give the impression that he previously thought that Iran did so and so. Table 5

Thinking that “explicitness can threaten persuasive effectiveness and enlarges the disagreement space” as O’Keefe (2018) asserts, Al-Jubeir – with raising many claims for discussion – could soften his words and minimize his directness seeking for persuasion when he said : *Iran the great nation can be a great neighbor to us ...Return to the international laws and behaviors if you want people to do with you; and our hand is extended to you, and it has been for 34 years. But in a very wisestyle, he varied his articulation in-between conclusion omission and conclusion specific and detailed recommendation. This clarifies an epistemic force held by Al-Jubeir keeping pace with the lexical markers and modals he used Table 6*

Analysis of Entailment

Since entailment is one of the essential aspects daily used in different areas of life, the diplomatic contexts must have

Table 4. Lexical analysis (Grammar)

| | Modality | Voice | Verbs |
|----------|---|--|--|
| No | 5 | 41 | 83 |
| Function | Can (n=1), Cannot (n=1), Could (n=2), May (n=1) | Active (A)(n=31)* Passive (P) (n= 10)** | Stative (S) (n=32) ° Dynamic (D)(n=51) °° |
| Examples | The great nation can be a great neighbor to us.(Expressing ability, possibility and request) We cannot get round the fact.(Expressing impossibility) Could it be the whole world is wrong and Iran is right? (Expressing possibility and suggestion) | Didn't Irancreate Hezbollah? Didn't Iran ...execute the 1996 attack in Khubar? Iran harbored them and protected them. We stopped four shipments of weapons.(*) One of them was captured. Our hand is extended to you. We have got ...our diplomats killed, embassies blown up. Iran is designated as a state of ones of terrorism. Iran is sanctioned for its support for terrorism.(**) | We have the phone conversations on tape. This is world. This is evidence. The explosions happened in Riyadh in 2003. Facts are stubborn. The top three leaders of the plot escaped.(°) We asked them to extide them but it was refused. Iran harbored them. We stopped four shipments of weapons that Iran tried to smuggle to the Huthis in Yemen. Behave in a way that doesn't expose you to criticism.(°°) |

Note: * = active voice sentences, ** = passive voice sentences
° = Stative verbs, °° = dynamic verbs

Table 5. Exemplary Analysis of exemplification in SPD Claim

| | |
|---|--|
| Iran is a terrorist state. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Iranian Constitution says: Export revolution. • Iran attacked embassies, and killed diplomats. • Iran supports and shelters terrorists. • <i>Iran has ties with Al-Qaeda.</i> |
| Iran is not a good neighbor. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iran tempts some Saudi citizens to work against their country. • Iran has had the upper hand in terrorist attacks in Saudi Arabia. • Iran tried to smuggle four shipments of weapons to Huthis in Yemen. • <i>Iran interferes in the home/domestic affairs of Saudi Arabia.</i> |
| Iran is violating the international laws. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iran behaves against the international laws . • Iran has aggressive behaviours against others. • Iran is designated as a state of ones of terrorism • <i>Iran is sanctioned for its support of terrorism.</i> |

Table 6. Exemplary Analysis of explicitness in SPD

| Textual Explicitness | Examples |
|----------------------|---|
| Encodedness | Didn't Iran attack more than dozens of embassies inside Iran in violation of all the international laws?! We didn't attack them. Iran did ! <i>Didn't Iran manage, plan and execute the 1996 attack in Khubar towns against the American militaries?! Yes, they did!</i> |
| Informativity | <i>The order to blow up three housing compounds in Riyadh in 2003 was made by Seif Al-Adl, the chief of Al-Qaeda operations. While he was in Iran, we have the phone conversations on tape.</i> |
| Specificity | <i>When the explosions in Riyadh happened in 2003, Seif Al-Adl was in Iran along with Saad Bin Laden, the chief propaganda person for Al-Qaeda and four or five other people senior leaders.</i> |
| Topicality | <i>We have Iranian agents captured in Saudi Arabia for plotting terrorist attacks. We stopped four shipments of weapons that Iran tried to smuggle to the Huthis in Yemen.</i> |
| Emphasis | <i>Didn't Iran attack more than dozens of embassies inside Iran in violation of all the international laws? We didn't attack them. Iran did !</i> |

the prime priority for many reasons. Diplomats are believed to have common traits such as inoffensiveness, negative politeness, tactfulness, flexibility, gentle style of self-defense, and preserving the dignity of others. Such traits make them use entailment in their speech.

Having a strong knowledge base, and being a well-educated diplomat, Al-Jubeir used different types of entailment that made him second his proposition successfully. When he appealed to the logical consequence, he meant to say no one can deny what is there in the Iranian Constitution, or disbelieve that facts are stubborn. Also, it is taken for granted that diplomats are wise and practical. They have control over their emotions the case that they do not shoot themselves under any circumstances. This entails they can be shot by others.

Logical inference was also used by Al-Jubeir when he referred to classification and formal textual inference stressing that no one single event was recorded the suicide of a diplomat. On the other hand, and because Hezbollah did commit terrorist acts and is still plotting some others, Al-Jubeir could indicate a foreground entailment that Hezbollah is a terrorist organization Table 7.

7

Analysis of Rhetorical Questions

As shown in the literature reviewed, rhetorical questions (RQs) have different functions. They may be emphasizing, sarcastic, persuasive or any other ones. Although they are questions, they do not delimit themselves to interrogatives, but they also include commands ending with periods or statements ending with exclamation marks. Analyzing Al-Jubeir's speech, it can be noticed that the RQs used are emphasizing (n=14), whereas the sarcastic (n=5) and persuasive (3) ones are less. This means that Al-Jubeir had an epistemic base, a deep insight and successful argumentative techniques to present his claim and emphasize its soundness and validity. At the same time, when his adversary tried to fool him, he resorted to sarcasm as a defense mechanism. Wishing to have the door open, Al-Jubeir did not neglect using RQs for persuasion Table 8.

3.2.4 Overall Analysis

Al-Jubeir resorted to different argumentation strategies in order to set up a firm Saudi stance. He intensified his words to construct an influencing presentation. His long experience in political affairs seems to have helped him how to convince/persuade others to accept specific ideas or at least get them involved in the topic being discussed. Since he shouldered the responsibility to enlighten the world, especially the west, with the fact that Iran is a terrorist state, the burden of proof was imposed on him. On the other hand, he had to persuade Iran to get engaged in the international community and comply with its laws and behaviors.

Al-Jubeir could wittingly possess the floor in the situation analyzed. His university study, different careers, and various situations that he was engaged in seem to have affected him to acquire Dace's strategies (1990): (1) *question, clarification, correction and example* representing *integrative strategies*, (2) *persuading and imposing* representing

distributive strategies, and (3) *hinting*, and *sarcastic* representing *passive/indirect strategies*

Representing the Saudi diplomacy, Al-Jubeir had a direct message needed to be delivered in both direct and indirect ways since he was involved in a public political situation with an unequal relations with Iran. He could select his words in order to groom his ideology. And in order to reveal the other party's ideology against peace and stability in the Middle East, he could also survey some historical events, interpret and explain them forming a good argumentation strategy to convince others that Iran is a terrorist country. When Al-Jubeir supported that claim, he might have resorted to his schemata in his mind, that is bounded by his country's benefits. He had considered it a *container* of three structures: an *interior* representing hopes, ambitions and aspirations for the future, an *exterior* representing others' relations and ties or even threats, and a *boundary* between the two representing the political stance for or against a specific issue. Containment and embodiment, as explained Hart (2005) and according to cognitive linguists, can provide a cognitive perspective to the political discourse revealing how to attest the claims under question in a better way. It is clear that Al-Jubeir had successfully and repeatedly taken his justificatory role in convincing the world that Iran is a terrorist country. And he had his burden of proof, that – when giving one or two sentences he says: *Iran did!*. Besides, he could pay the audience's attention to the Iranian characters/terrorists loyal to Iran destructive scenes caused by Iran, and the Iranian plots.

Although Al-Jubeir accused Iran of terrorism, he intelligently presented himself as a competent communicator, and showed good word choice explicitly when he said that: *Yes, we wish and hope that Iran – the good nation...*, he might not only have determined to have his argument accepted by others to relieve hostility and reduce tension, but he went further and actively sought remedy for Iran's hostility, hardness, world conflict and terrorist acts. Al-Jubeir showed what can be called "concern for other" when he said "*Iran - the great nation – can be a great neighbor too*" aiming for convincing or persuading Iran as well as the audience that both Saudi Arabia and Iran can share goals and common grounds to cooperate and lead a peaceful life departing from good neighborhood. At the same time, Al-Jubeir's message was multifunctional. He said, "*The time Iran takes the willingness to give up her expansionist, aggressive policies and return to the international laws and behaviors, is the time it becomes a great neighbor to Saudi Arabia and above all the international community will be with her and will do with it*". Besides, Al-Jubeir used a sound, rational argument directed to convergence in a refined way though he sustained describing Iran as a terrorist country.

As a witty diplomat, Al-Jubeir had constructed what is called *arguments about responsibility* as for the permanent tension between Saudi-Iranian diplomatic relationship that the expansionist, aggressive policies that Iran was responsible for. Therefore, Iran was to be blamed for death, destruction, terrorism, and should stop planning terrorist acts and stop harboring terrorists. Even when the Iranian consul tried

Table 7. Exemplary Analysis of Entailment in SPD

| Types of entailment | | Examples |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|--|
| Logical consequence | Truth conditional | Doesn't Iran in the Constitution say: Export revolution? The explosives came from Bekaa valley. Facts are stubborn things. |
| | Illocutionary | Diplomats don't commit suicide. The great nation can be a great neighbor. This is not a child's play. |
| Logical inference | Textual Classification | Take care of the Shia, the destitute, you call them. The top three leaders of the plot escaped. Iranian agents have been linked to terrorist attacks in Europe to terrorist attacks in South America. |
| | Formal textual inference | One of them was captured last year in Lebanon with an Iranian passport, not a Saudi passport, even though he is a Saudi citizen. When the explosions happened in Riyadh in 2003, Seif Al-Adl was in Iran along with Saad Bin Laden ...and four or five other people senior leaders. Iran harbored them and protected them. We asked them to extide them, but it was refused. Diplomats don't commit suicide. Return to the international laws and behaviors. |
| Background entailment | | Iran harbored them (terrorists). |
| Foreground entailment | | Hezbollah is a terrorist organization. |

Table 8. Exemplary Analysis of Rhetorical Questions in SPD

| Classes | Emphasizing (N=14) | Sarcastic N=(5) | Persuasive (N=3) |
|----------------------|---|--|--|
| Rhetorical Questions | Doesn't Iran in the Constitution say: Export revolution? Didn't Iran create Hezbollah? Didn't Iran attack more than dozens of embassies inside Iran ...? Isn't that sheltering terrorists? | Doesn't Iran say: Take care of the Shia, the destitute, that you call them? Diplomats don't commit suicide by shooting themselves three times! They {embassies} don't just blow themselves up! Could it be the whole world is wrong and Iran is right?! | We wish and hope that Iran the great nation, can be a great neighbor to us. Return to the International laws and behaviors if you want people to do with you, and our hand is extended to you. Could it that it may be the international law that says peaceful relations and non-interference in the affairs of others ...? |

to deny responsibility, his argument was so fable and weak. He could not support his claim or even search for rationale for such acts that Iran has been doing. Even when he appealed to the 11th September accident, he resorted to a fable argument that some Saudis were involved in executing the accident neglecting that they portray individual cases, and no one single proof was discovered against Saudi Arabia describing her as a country sheltering terrorism. Furthermore, the Iranian consul referred to deceptive communication when he created a feigned message that Saudi Arabia is a terrorist country. But he could not name even one single terrorist act Saudi Arabia was involved in , nor even one single supporter for his claim. That feigned strategy would lead recipients or the audience suspicious of his discourse. To the worst, his face could not be maintained in the confrontation.

4 CONCLUSION

This study introduced different argumentation strategies and different techniques on analyzing oral discourse to demonstrate how far argumentation strategies are functioned in SPD. The issue that is lasting for 34 years – Saudi-Iranian tensions – constituted a fruitful chance for the researcher to identify how Saudi diplomats have been tackling

such an issue regionally and internationally. The oral interview by Al-Jubeir analyzed could unveil the real face of Iran with evidences and inferences, and thus responded to the international calls – in a depersonalized way – labeling Iran as a terrorist state and Hezbollah as a terrorist organization. In the choice of wisely-selected words, phrases and examples in supporting his claims, Al-Jubeir proved that Saudi diplomacy is successful in showing peaceful – but strong and stable – policy towards others.

5 REFERENCES:

1. Adler, R. and Rodman, G. (1997). Understanding human communication (6th ed.). Fort Woth: Hartcourt Brace Collage Publishers.
2. Al-Khatib, K.; Wachsmuth, H.; Hagen, M. & Stein, B.(2017). Patterns of argumentation strategies across topics. Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, pp.1351-1357. Copenhagen. Denmark, September 7-11,2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
3. Antonini, S.; Premeg, N.; Mariotti, M. and Zaslavsky, O. (2010). On examples in mathematical thinking and learning. ZDM Mathematics Education, 43: 191.

4. Baley, P. (2005). Analyzing language and politics. In *Mediazioni: Online Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies of Language and Cultures*. DOI 10.1437/media15.
5. Barnett, S. and Bedau, H. (eds.) (1987). *Current issues and enduring questions: Methods and models of argumentation from Plato to the present*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
6. Batstone, R. (1995) Grammar in discourse: Attitude and deniability. In G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds.). *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 197-213.
7. Baumgarten, N.; Meyer, B. and Özçetin, C. (2008). Explicitness in translation and interpreting: A critical review and some empirical evidence of an elusive concept. *Across Languages and Cultures* 9 (2), 177-203 (2008) DOI: 10.1556/Acr.9.2008.2.2
8. Blankenship, K. & Craig, T. (2006). Rhetorical question use and resistance to persuasion: An attitude strength analysis. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 25 (2), 111-128.
9. Bos, J., and Markert, K. (2005). Recognising textual entailment with logical inference. In *Proceedings of the conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 628-635). Association for Computational Linguistics.
10. Boynton, G. & Nelson, J. (1998). Making sound arguments: Would a claim by any other sound mean the same or argue so sweet? . In James F. Klumpp (Ed.). *Argument in a Time of Change: Definitions, frameworks and Critiques* (Annandale, VA: National Communication Association, 1997). 12-17.
11. Buys, W.; Still, T. and Beck, R. (1991). *Speaking by doing: A speaking-listening text* (6th ed.). Chicago: National Textbook Company.
12. Cano-Basave, A. & He, Y. (2016). A study of the impact of persuasive argumentation in political debates. *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT 2016*, pp. 1405-1413. San Diego, California, June 12-17, 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
13. Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*, Vol. 2. London: Sage, 206-231.
14. Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (2002a). Introduction: Themes and principles in the analysis of political Discourse. In Paul Chilton and Christina Schaffner (eds.) *Politics as text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia . pp. i-ix.
15. Dace, K. (1990). *The conflict group decision making link: An exploratory study*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA.
16. Dagan, I.; Glickman, O. and Magnini, B. (2005). *The PASCAL Recognizing Textual Entailment Challenge*, Volume 3944 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer
17. De Metsenaere, H. and Vandepitte, S. (2017). Towards a theoretical foundation for explicitation and implicitation. *trans-kom* 10 (3), 385-419.
18. Deutsch, M. (1973). *The resolution of conflict*. New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press.
19. Dunmire, P. (2012). Political discourse analysis: Exploring the language of politics and the politics of language. *Language and Linguistics*, 6(11), 735-751.
20. Fairclough, N. (1992a). *Discourse and Social Change* . London: Polity Press.
21. Fairclough, N. (1992b). *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
22. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Linguistics*. London: Longman.
23. Fairclough, N. (2015). *Critical discourse analysis*. Available at: [http:// balticpractice.nse.ru/...Critical%20discourse%20analysis](http://balticpractice.nse.ru/...Critical%20discourse%20analysis)
24. Farr, J. ((1989). Understanding conceptual change politically. In Terence Ball, James Farr & Russel L. Hanson (eds.) *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp.24-49.
25. Fischer, F., & Gottweis, H. (eds.). (2012). *The argumentative turn revisited: Public policy as communicative practice*. Durham, NC; Duke University Press.
26. Folger, J. & Poole, M. (1984) *Working through conflict*. Glenview, IL : Scott Foresman.
27. Frank, J. (1990). You call that a rhetorical question?: Forms and functions of rhetorical questions in conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14 (5), 723-738.
28. Gouran, D. (1998). The constituents of sound scholarly argument: An editor's perspective. . In James F. Klumpp (Ed.). *Argument in a Time of Change: Definitions, frameworks and Critiques* (Annandale, VA: National Communication Association, 1997). 116-121.
29. Greene, R. (1998). The rhetorical perspective on argumentation and the question of effectivity. . In James F. Klumpp (Ed.). *Argument in a Time of Change: Definitions, frameworks and Critiques* (Annandale, VA: National Communication Association, 1997). 185-190.
30. Grootendorst, R. (1988, August). *Rules for argumentation in dialogues*. Paper presented at Wake Forest University Argumentation Conference, Venice, Italy.

31. Hample, D. & Dallinger, J. (1991). Message design logic, goal structure, interpersonal construct differentiation, and situation. In A. Rahim (Ed.). *Managing Conflict: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (pp.188-192). NY: Praeger.
32. Hart, C. (2005). Analyzing political discourse: Toward cognitive approach. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2 (2), 189-194.
33. Hartney, A. (1995). Argument through examples: An exploration and case study. In Sally Jackson (ed.) *Argumentation and Values*. Proceedings of the Ninth SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation Speech Communication Association, Annandale: VA, pp. 408-412.
34. Hickl, A. (2008). Using discourse commitments to recognize textual entailment. Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on computational Linguistics (Coling 2008), pp. 337-344.
35. Infante, D. & Rancer, A. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46, 72-80.
36. Infante, D. (1988). *Arguing constructively*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
37. Jensen, J. (1981). *Argumentation in communication*. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.
38. Jijkoun, V. and de Rijke, M. (2005). Recognizing textual entailment using lexical similarity. In Proceedings of the First PASCAL Challenges Workshop.
39. Joseph, J. ; Davies, A.; and Mitchell, K. (2006). *Language and politics*. Edinburgh Textbooks in Applied Linguistics. Edinburgh University Press.
40. Khalil, H. (2002). Entailment in Meaning. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311383982_Entailment_in_Meaning/download
41. Kirlvalidze, N. & Samnidze, N. (2016). Political discourse as a subject of interdisciplinary studies. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 5 (1), 161-170.
42. Kranich, S. and Gast, V. (2013). Explicitness of epistemic modal marking: Recent changes in British and American English. Available at:
43. Kreig, E. (1997, July/August). Examining the amazing energy-free claims of Dennis Lee. *Skeptical Inquirer*, 21(4), 34-36.
44. Leatham, G. (1991). Explicit disagreement in groups with high and low judgment model overlap. In Donn W. Parson (ed.). *Argument Controversy*, Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation Speech Communication Association, Annandale: VA, pp. 243-248.
45. Makau, J. (1990). *Reasoning and communication: Thinking critically about arguments*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
46. Mansouri, S., Biria, R., Najafabadi, M. and Boroujeni, S. (2017). Nomination and argumentation strategies in oratory discourse: The case of an English sermon. *SAGE Open*, April-June 2017: 1-8. DOI:10.1177/2158244017702425.
47. Murtisari, E. (2016). Explicitation in Translation Studies: The journey of an elusive concept. *Translation & Interpreting*, 8 (2), 64-82. DOI: 10.12807/ti.108202.2016.a05
48. Nelson, J. (1991). Tropes of political argument in America: Toward mythic modes of rhetorical analysis. In Donn W. Parson (ed.). *Argument Controversy*, Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation Speech Communication Association, Annandale: VA, pp. 73-79.
49. Newell, S. & Stutman, R. (1988). The social confrontation episode. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 266-285.
50. Nordquist, R. (2018). Entailment in Semantics. Retrieved from: <https://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-entailment-in-semantics-1690653>
51. O'Keefe, B. (1988). The logic of message design: Individual differences in reasoning about communication. *Communicative Monographs*, 55, 80-103.
52. O'Keefe, D. (2018). Standpoint explicitness and persuasive effect\; A meta-analytic review of the effects of varying conclusion articulation in persuasive messages. *Argumentation and Advocacy* 1051-1431. (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rafa20>
53. Ochs, E. and Taylor, C. (1992). Family narratives as political activity. *Discourse and Society*, 3 (3), 301-340.
54. Oraby, S., Harrison, V., Misra, A., Riloff, E. and Walker, M. (2017). Are you serious?: Rhetorical questions and sarcasm in social media dialog. Proceedings of the SIGDIAL 2017 Conference (pp.310-319). Association for Computational Linguistics. Saarbrücken, Germany, 15-17 August 2017.
55. Petasis, G. and Karkaletsis, V. (2016). Identifying Argument Components through TextRank. Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Argument Mining, pp. 94-102, Berlin, Germany, August 7-12, 2016. Association for Computational Linguistics.
56. Reike, R. & Sillers, M. (1992). *Argumentation and the decision making process* (3rd ed.). New York: Harper Collins.

57. Reinrtd, J. (1991). *Foundations of argument: Effective communication for critical thinkers*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.
58. Rohde, H. (2006). Rhetorical questions as redundant interrogatives. Department of Linguistics, UCSD.
59. Rotteberg, A. (1985). *Elements of argument: A text and reader* (2nd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
60. Rowlanf, R. (1987). On defending argument. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 20, 140-159.
61. Rubinelli, S. (2009). *Ars topica: The classical technique of constructing arguments from Aristotle to Cicero*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
62. Schaffer, D. (2005). Can rhetorical questions function as retorts? Is the Pope Catholic?, *Journal of Pragmatics*, 37.433-460.
63. Schiappa, E. (1995). *Warranting assent: Case studies in argument evaluation*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
64. Schultz, B. (1991). Argumentative strategies for managing conflict. In In Donn W. Parson (ed.). *Argument Controversy, Proceedings of the Seventh SCA/AFA Conference on Argumentation*. VA: Speech Communication Association, Annandale, pp. 204-207.
65. Schwarz, B. and Asterhan, C. (2008). Argumentation and reasoning. In K. Littleton, C. Wood, & J. KleineStaarman (Eds). *Elsevier Handbook of Educational Psychology: New Perspectives on Learning and Teaching*. Elsevier Press.
66. Shang, Z.; Brooks, C. and McCloy, R. (2014) Does more detailed information mean better performance? An experiment in information explicitness. *Review of Behavioural Finance*, 6 (2), 86103.
67. Sillars, M. & Ganer, P. (1982). Values and beliefs: A systematic basis for argumentation. In J. R. Cox & C. A. Willard (Eds.), *Advances in Argumentation Theory and Research* (pp. 184-201). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
68. Špago, D. (2016). Rhetorical questions or rhetorical uses of questions? *ExELL (Explorations in English Language and Linguistics)*, 4(2), 102-115.
69. Strohmaier, M.; Prettenhofer, P. and Lux, M. (2017). Different degrees of explicitness in intentional artifacts: Studying user goals in a large search query log. Personal contact (email:
70. Thomlinson, R. & Phillips, K. (1991). Self-monitoring and argumentativeness; Using argument as impression management. In In A. Rahim (Ed.). *Managing Conflict: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (pp. 193-196) . NY: Praeger.
71. Toska, B. (
72. Toulmin, S. (2003). *The use of argument*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
73. Turlacu, M. (2014). Argumentative strategies in political discourse. Available online at:
74. UWC Staff for Dallas Baptist University (2015). *Exemplification Essay*. Dallas Baptist University. Available at: <http://www.dbu.edu/uwc>.
75. Walker, G. (1991). Argument and conflict: Conceptual and empirical perspectives. In A. Rahim (Ed.). *Managing Conflict: An Interdisciplinary Approach* (pp. 182-187) . NY: Praeger.
76. Walton, D. (2006). Dialogical models of explanation. In *ExaCt2007: Papers from the 2007AAAI workshop, Vancouver, July 21-22* (pp. 1-9). Menlo Park. CA: AAAI Press.
77. Walton, D. (2009) *Argumentation Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. In: Simari G., Rahwan I. (eds.) *Argumentation in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, Boston, MA.
78. Weinstein, M. (1998). Foundational thoughts on informal logic as a theory of argument. . In James F. Klumpp (Ed.). *Argument in a Time of Change: Definitions, frameworks and Critiques* (Annandale, VA: National Communication Association, 1997). 18-23.
79. Wenzel, A. (1990). Three perspectives on argumentation: Rhetoric, Dialectic, Logic. I R. Trapp & J. Schueltz (Eds.). *Perspectives on Argumentation: Essays in honor of Wayne Brockriede* (pp. 9-26). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
80. Wilson, J. (1990) *Politically Speaking*. Oxford: Blackwell.
81. Wilson, J. (1997). Metalinguistic negation and textual aspects of political discourse. In J. Blmmaert and C. Bulcaen (eds.), *Political Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 69-89.
82. Wilson, J. (2006). Political discourse. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (2nd ed.) 398-415.
83. Wodak, R. (2011). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual*. London, UK: Palgrave.
84. Wodak, R. (2015). Political argumentation. In GianpietroMazzoleni (ed.) *The International Encyclopedia of Political Communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp.1-9.

A APPENDIX

Appendix A

Video Script Excerpt for Analysis

Video source: Al-Arabiya broadcasting on 21st June, 2016 Available from: <http://youtube.com/watch?v=1xp-HDSARXs>

Synopsis: The Saudi Foreign Minister, Adel Al-Jubeir speaks at an event hosted by the Egmont Research Center and organized by the Belgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs on July 19, 2016. Minister Al-Jubeir addressed Iran's continued aggressive policies and record in supporting terrorism.

Iranian Consul: Accusing that Iran for everything, I think that it is not unnecessary and it is also unbeneficial for the both countries. I think it has been to say that Al-Qaeda has a relation with Iran is completely a joke. We do not forget and everybody do not forget that that al-Ben Laden is a Saudi citizens and has a strong political and economic relation within of the Saudia. I think that everybody does not forgets that the from 19 people of the people that committed the 11th of September, 15 people of that 19 was the Saudi citizens. So it seems that and also now in the in this room ...I think that many people also know that which country which countries has supported the Daesh for many years. Just I would like to mention that the thing that the minister mention here is completely against and opposite to the policy of the European Union leader and even the United States that that does not have relations with Iran regarding and specially that recent charges of the nuclear negotiation and also there is some kind of that relation that also Iran has with other region countries that Iran has some kind of the logical policy , inviting Iran to present in the coalitions that for the the thing that the for solving the problem in Syria shows that Iran is is the main partner for the solving the problem in the Syria. That's all!

Adel Al-Jubeir: Now in the third issue , the honorable consul came from Iran. I didn't say anything was not based on fact. Doesn't Iran in the Constitution say: Export revolution?! Doesn't Iran say: Take care of the Shia, the destitute, that you call them?! Didn't Iran create Hezbollah?! Didn't Iran attack more than dozens of embassies inside Iran in violation of all the international laws?! We didn't attack them. Iran did ! Didn't Iran manage, plan and execute the 1996 attack in Khubar towns against the American militaries?! Yes, they did! The control officer was the big brigadier, Al-Shereify, your military attaché in Bahrain. The bomb maker was Hezbollah! The explosives came from the Bekaa Valley. The top three leaders of the plot escaped and have been living in Iran ever since. Isn't that sheltering terrorists?! One of them was captured last year in Lebanon with an Iranian passport, not a Saudi passport, even though he is a Saudi citizen ! Isn't that aiding and abetting terrorist?! We didn't make this up. When the explosions in Riyadh happened in 2003, Seif Al-Adl was in Iran along with Saad Bin Laden, the chief propaganda person for Al-Qaeda and four or five other people senior leaders. Iran harbored them and protected them. We asked them to extided, but it was refused! Some of them are still there in Iran. We didn't invent this. This is the fact. The order to blow up three

housing compounds in Riyadh in 2003 was made by Seif Al-Adl, the chief of Al-Qaeda operations. While he was in Iran, we have the phone conversations on tape. We didn't make this up. Ronald Regan used to say that, "Facts are stubborn things." They are really stubborn, because we cannot get round the fact. Hezbollah is a terrorist organization attacking embassies is a very clear, and they don't just blow themselves up! Somebody does. Killing diplomats! Diplomats don't commit suicide by shooting themselves three times! Somebody is responsible. Iranian agents have been linked to terrorist attacks in Europe, to terrorist attacks in South America. We didn't make this up. This is the world! This is evidence! So I say: Yes, we wish and hope that Iran, the great nation can be a great neighbor to us, but takes to to tangle. It takes willingness to give up this expansionist, aggressive policies and return to the international laws and behaviors, if you want people to do with you, and our hand is extended to you, and it has been for 34 years. But we have got - in return - our diplomats killed, embassies blown up. Terrorists!!! We have Iranian agents captured in Saudi Arabia for plotting terrorist attacks. We stopped four shipments of weapons that Iran tried to smuggle to the Huthis in Yemen. We have the explosives that Iran to smuggle in Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Kuwait. This is not fiction!!! And this is not a child's play! This is aggressive behavior. This is unaccented behavior. This is behavior that violates all laws, the international behavior and the international law. That's why Iran is designated as a state of ones of terrorism, and that's why Iran is sanctioned for its support for terrorism - not by us but by the international community. So could it be the whole world is wrong and Iran is right?! Could it be that it may be the international law that says peaceful relations and non-interference in the affairs of others is wrong, and Iran's approach of the aggressively pursuing your objective irrespective of how to do is correct?! I don't think so. So, if you want a Saudi official to not to be critical of Iran, behave in a way that doesn't expose you to criticism. And so far, your history has been one of death and destruction, disregard for the international law and disregard for principles that have existed since advent of nations which is good neighborliness and non-interference in the affairs of others. (660 words)

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Dr. Ali M. AlShehri Associate Professor of Linguistics, Baljurashi College of Science & Arts, Al-Baha University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia