ANALYSIS OF ARGUMENTATION SCHEMES IN HILLARY AND TRUMP'S THIRD PRESIDENTIAL DEBATE

Asst. Prof. Sarab Khalil Hameed (Ph.D)[1] and Rusul Adnan Ne'ma Al-Asadi[2]

[1]Dept. of English, College of Arts, University of Baghdad, Baghdad, Iraq
[2]Dept. of English, College of Arts, University of Al-Mustansiriyah, Baghdad, Iraq

ABSTRACT: *In their everyday life, people are usually involved in different types of conversations, they discuss about their different needs and in order to gain what they want and win the conversation, they tend to utilize different verbal ploys or strategies such as argumentation schemes. Argumentation schemes" Argumentation schemes are binding kinds of reasoning when seen as moves, or speech acts in the setting of dialogue". They are significant features in presidential debates since they can be exploited via the discussants in order to beat each other and win the presidential battle. However, the current paper aims at discovering the different kinds of argumentation schemes, their role in political debates and how they can be effective factors in the persuading process. The study hypothesized that "scheme of analogy is the most common type of schemes that is generally utilized in the presidential debates. The data includes the third American presidential debate that held between Clinton and Trump 2016. It has been analyzed based on Walton's(2002)concept of argumentation schemes. The hypothesis of the study is verified and the basic results that have been concluded from the study includes that Argumentation schemes are needed to be employed in any critical discussion because of its persuasive nature.They can be detected in humans every day discussions and people may employ them almost in all types of their conversations.Finally in presidential debates, the arguer exploits all his verbal attacked tools such as argumentation schemes to win the election race and get the audience's votes, so it can be considered as a cheese game in which the player do his best to win the game.*

KEYWORDS: Argumentation Schemes, Debates,Convince, Arguers, Persuade, Audience

INTRODUCTION

According to Van Eemeren (2001:19), the aim of any arguer in any argumentation is to make the listener accept the standpoint at issue. Hence, the interlocutor plans the argument in such a way that serves his aim. By doing so, he depends on what is called ready-made argument schemes which help in convincing the audience by leading them to make certain inferences of various types from the premises (expressed and unexpressed) count on the scheme utilized and this is the reason of calling scheme sometimes as "structures of inference"(Mirza and Al-Hindawi, 2016: 31).

Eemeren and Grootendorst (1984:19-22) presuppose that argumentation is part of critical discussion(such as political debates)that aims is to resolve the differences of opinion and to set whether a single argument contributes to that resolution, one needs to discover the argument scheme that is used. This is the real case in presidential debates when one can find a special organization for any argumentation to persuade and convince the audience by the correctness of the speaker's standpoint, i.e. there are specific instructions the arguer must follow such as finding the required proof and evidence for the argument of the debate. He needs to choose the

right premises for his defense then discovers whether those premises include adequate reasoning that supplies the evidence of the debate's arguments or not (Eemeren et. al ,2001: 86)

According to(Bahm et al.,2004:14) presidential debate is a public debate in which the arguer utilizes his arguments and power of speech to show that his plans are designed for the benefit of his audience while the opponent plan is not in order to persuade the listeners and get their votes

Moreover, Kaid and Bacha (2008:41)assert that debate is a *subset of argumentation limited to the used of the verbal linguistic communication*(such as ASs).It includes the process of decision making that has a distinct results reflected by the picture of the debaters in the eyes of their critics or audiences. Vion (1992: 92),describe this activity as a*"face to face battles includes two political candidates fight through a dialog"*.

Then, Presidential debate can be described as "*a boxing ring where the aim of the discussants is to knock out each other which is more important for them rather than focusing on logical argumentation*"(Arroyo ,2003: 397).

Therefore, presidential debates present a useful area in which one can study argumentation schemes to serve the sake of the current research,i.e.,to discover how they can be exploited via the debaters in order to achieve their persuading aims.

Argumentation Schemes

Argumentation schemes are conventionalized ways that show the relationship between what is mentioned in the explicit premise, i.e. argument, and what is stated in the standpoint. It links those premises and standpoints together in a special way in order to characterize the type of refutation or justification that is being introduced in argument for the standpoint (Eemeren 2001: 20).

Walton (2006: 84), states that argument schemes are forms of inference that represent the structure of common types of argumentation in every day discourse in particular cases. Their main role is to turn the burden of proof to one side or another, i.e. to persuade the audiences.

However, Walton (1996: 1) defines argumentation scheme as follows [1]:

> *Argumentation schemes are binding kinds of reasoning*
>
> *when seen as moves, or speech acts in the setting of dialogue.*
>
> *In this pragmatic framework, two participants are reasoning*
>
> *together in a goal-directed, interactive, conventionalized*
>
> *framework called a dialogue*[2] .

Anywise, argumentation scheme (henceforth ASs or As) is one of the topics that studied thoroughly by argumentation theorists. It is defined, characterized and approached differently, Eemeren et al (2002: 97) and Walton (2002: 35) classify ASs into different categories, but what is adopted in the current paper is that of Walton those which can be found in the critical discussions.

----

(1) For further definition see Walton (2005:44)

(2) the term 'form' is the past terminology of 'scheme' and Walton himself in 2002 uses the term 'form but in 2006 he replaces it by the term scheme.

According to Walton (2002: 35) argumentation can be described in many types of argument schemes. The schemes that corresponds with this study are:

Argument from Analogy

It is that type of argument which includes two situations those are similar in a particular perspective. Whereas one situation has a certain feature then, it is concluded that the other one also has the same feature because they are similar. Yet they are still different in the rest features because while one case may be analogous to another does not mean that the two cases will be the same in all aspects because they are not one case they are two cases share some characteristics and differ in the rest(Walton, 2002: 35-9; 2006: 96-100).

The argument scheme which describes this type is (ibid.):

>   *MAJOR PREMISE: Generally, case C1 is similar to case C2.*
>
>   *MINOR PREMISE: Proposition A is true (false) in case C1.*

 Walton (2002:36-7) mentions the following example:

>   *(2.6) As in prospecting for gold, a scientist may dig with skill,*
>
>   *courage, energy, and intelligence just a few feet away from a*
>
>   *rich vein – but always unsuccessfully. Consequently, in*
>
>   *scientific research the rewards for industry, perseverance,*
>
>   *imagination, and intelligence are highly uncertain.*

Walton comments that in this argument two activities are compared: scientific research and prospecting for gold where the exactness and methodology are the points of similarity, i.e. both are required to follow the same procedures besides the hard working (ibid.).

Then, the scheme of argument from analogy that can be applied to this example is:

>   *MAJOR PREMISE: Generally, gold prospecting is similar to conducting a scientific research.*
>
>   *MINOR PREMISE: Gold prospecting is liable to fail.*
>
>   *CONCLUSION: Scientific research is liable to fail as well.*

Argument from Sign

Walton (2002:41) states that this type is based on a sign that can be taking as evidence of the existence of some characteristics or events in a specific situation. For instance, somebody may see some tracks that recognized as being tracks of a bear. From such trails in a specific place one can concludes that a bear was present there.

The scheme of this argument as Walton (ibid: 42) portrays it as follows:

> **MAJOR PREMISE**:*If this type of indicator is found in a given case, it means that such-and-such a type of event has occurred, or that the presence of such and-such a property may be inferred.*
>
> **MINOR PREMISE***: This type of sign has been found in this case.*
>
> **CONCLUSION***: Such-and-such type of event has occurred, or the presence of such-and-such a type of property may be inferred, in this case.*

The example of this type, as Walton (2002 :42) states, includes the driver reasonableness and a police officer testimony about the former sobriety. The police man in this situation may write many signs as that the driver was drunk; he losing the control over his car, alcohol clearly smelled out of him, unsteady on his walking, his speech is slurred…etc. Then when the above scheme is applied to this situation, the result will be as:

> **MAJOR PREMISE***: Generally, if a driver is found losing control over his car, standing unsteadily on his feet, having alcoholic smell, with watery or bloodshot eyes, and speaking in a slurred manner, it means that the driver is drunk.*
>
> **MINOR PREMISE***: This type of sign has been found in this case.*
>
> **CONCLUSION***: The driver in drunk, in this case.*

However, this type of argument depends on context and needs to be evaluated based on other facts in a given situation, for instance if tracks that looking very much like bear tracks are found in the wall of classroom , then our conclusion will not be that a bear passed from here but it is only a kind of prank (ibid.)

Moreover, this kind cannot always be stand alone by itself since it sometimes integrated with another type of argument "***argument from expert opinion***"as in medical cases when the doctor suspects that his patient is suffering from specific disease from specific sign , but his suspicion can be confirmed or evaporated depending on the results of patient's blood analysis from the biologist i.e. the expert). This means that the conclusion can be changed by further investigation (Walton ,2002:42).

The Slippery Slope Argument

It is the argument from gradualism in which the arguer persuades the audience through sequences of steps. Within this type the bad outcome ,i.e. consequences is predicated to take place because of what is called (slope effect). This argument comes to light when someone takes the first step that makes the second step possible and so forth, i.e. where the series has been initiated, it cannot be stopped till they reach to the step of no return in which the consequences can be a horrible or disastrous. Yet the last step is a grey area since there is nothing specifies its beginning or end point(Walton, 2002: 63-64).

However, this form of argument can be worked for instance when someone thinks about taking new medication and his doctor asserts that *" You have a high blood pressure ,and this one will raise your blood pressure"*, then there will be a negative consequences or bad side effects as a result of taking this drug. (Walton, 2006: 104).

The general form of this type can be described in the following scheme(ibid.: 107).

> **FIRST STEP PREMISE**: A_0 is up for consideration as a proposal that seems initially like something that should be brought about.

> **RECURSIVE PREMISE**: Bringing up A_0 would plausibly lead, to A_1, which would in turn plausibly lead to A_2, and so forth, through the sequence $A_2,..,A_n$.

> **BAD OUTCOME PREMISE**:it is a horrible (disastrous, bad) outcome.

> **CONCLUSION**: A_0 should not be brought about.

According to Walton (2006:105), slippery slope argument is not restricted to argument of negative consequences since there is also positive consequences as they will be illustrated in the following example:

There are two persons Jack and John disagree on whether tipping is a good policy or not. Jack may use the following argument:

> **PREMISE:**If the practice of tipping were discontinued,unemployment would result.

> **PREMISE:** Unemployment is a bad thing.

> **CONCLUSION:** It would not be a good idea to discontinue the practice of tipping.

> On the other hand John may say:

> **PREMISE:** If the practice of tipping were discontinued, service

> providers would have greater self-esteem.

> **PREMISE:** Having greater self-esteem is a good thing.

> **CONCLUSION:** The practice of tipping should be discontinued.

So, Jack has used argument of negative consequences since he mentions the bad consequences of a particular policy or action. On the other hand John cited positive consequences of that policy as he supports it as a good thought (Walton, 2006:105).

The argument schemes of both above types are (ibid.:106)

- The positive consequences:

> **PREMISE:** If A is brought about, good consequences will plausibly occur.

> **CONCLUSION:** A should be brought about.

- The negative consequences:

> **PREMISE:** If A is brought about, bad consequences will plausibly occur.

> **CONCLUSION:** A should not be brought about.

Then, from what has been mentioned above it can be concluded that the argument of positive effects is often *"pitched pitted* "against the one of the negative effects and such conflict is

popular in **political debates** when each party still defending his standpoint till the end by mentioning the positive and negative sides of each other point of view (ibid.).

Argument from an Established Rule

It is the type which deals with the arguing about rules which are setting previously. This action is a popular feature of humans daily conversations and it can be operated like this:*"first of all, there must be some agreement reached at by putting some rules into place typically within an institutional framework"* (Walton, 2002:40)

Walton(ibid.) clarifies this type in an educational situation which is familiar to all teachers. The situation can be summarized in fixing a deadline for handing in essays and some students are late to react (ibid.).

> *(2.7)* **Student***: Would it be OK if I handed in my essay after the weekend?*
>
> **Professor***: Today is the deadline. That's the rule.*

However, the established rule in the above case puts presumption in place if the student needs to hand in his essay in some time later ,i.e. to get exception without penalty, he must give some reasons, here the argument may go to the next step (ibid.):

> *(2.8)* **Student***: I have another assignment due at the same time, I can't do a good job on both unless I have more time.*
>
> **Professor***: Your planning and how many courses you take are up to you. I can't grant you an exemption for that reason.*

Here, the decision that is made by the professor is based on the already established and agreed rule that there is a deadline for handing in assignment.

This type of scheme has no form and this may due to the fact as Walton (2002:41) asserts" each case needs to be judged on an individual basis".

Argument from Position to Know

Walton (2002:45) asserts that this type is used in a situation where the arguer needs to know some information about something, so he asks the other one who is in a position to know about that target subject. Mirza and Al-Hindawi (2016: 39) mention that this argument is a source – based inference in which the truthfulness of the source is at work due to its being the base which all the rest arguments depend on.

The example in which Walton illustrates this type is summarized in that if a tourist loses his way to the hotel ,he may ask the policeman about it. What the later says will be taking for granted because he already knows his city,he is in a position to know. So, the tourist assumes that the policeman is familiar with his town besides, he would be honest with him (Walton , 2002:46).

The general form of this type of scheme can be described as follows:

> **MAJOR PREMISE***: Source a is in a position to know about things in a certain subject domain S containing proposition A.*

MINOR PREMISE: a asserts that A is true (false).

CONCLUSION: A is true (false).

According to Walton (2002:49,2008:209),within argument from position to know, there is a subtype of argument which is called ***the argument from expert opinion or appeal to expert opinion*** or as Walton et al. (2008:209) introduces ***"argument from authority"*** It is the one that is based on the assumption that the source is supposed to be in a position to know about a subject because he has expert knowledge of that subject (Walton, 2006:86).

The argument scheme of this type can be characterized as (ibid.:87) :

MAJOR PREMISE:Source E is an expert in subject domain S containing proposition A.

MINOR PREMISE: E asserts that proposition A is true (false).

CONCLUSION: A is true (false)

The following statements presents Dr. Jack as an expert psychologist so the argument is based on an appeal to expert opinion:

 (2.9) Dr. Jack is an expert psychologist and he says that tipping lowers self-esteem.

The scheme of this argument can be displayed as:

MAJOR PREMISE: Dr. Phil says that tipping lowers self-esteem.

MINOR PREMISE: Dr. Phil is an expert in psychology, a field that has knowledge about self-esteem.

CONCLUSION: Tipping lowers self-esteem.

Argument from Verbal Classification

Walton (2002: 51, 2006:128) asserts that it is that type which may be used by people unconsciously since it has explicit nature that cancels the need to be prove. Besides, this type concludes that something has a specific feature based on a fact that this thing can be categorized under a general category of things which own this property.

According to Walton(2002:129),the scheme of this argument is:

MAJOR PREMISE: If some particular thing a can be classified as falling under verbal category C, then a has property F (in virtue of such a classification).

MINOR PREMISE:a can be classified as falling under verbal category C.

CONCLUSION: a has property F.

The above scheme can be applied into the following example

 (2.10) All dolphins are classified as mammals.

 Flipper is a dolphin.

 Therefore, Flipper is a mammal.

Walton (2006:128-9) suggests that the bases on which one can classify things is summarized by mentioning that the classification may due to scientific terminology , common usage in every day conversations or by legal definition of the terms as follows:

First, scientific terminology, as in the previous example in which one can say that by the science of biology that all dolphins are mammals. This result is based on scientific facts (ibid.).

Second, common usage, this type depends on word or topic usage in non- scientific speech of everyday life. For instance:

> *(2.11)Anyone who owns over two billion dollars is wealthy.*
>
> *Yara owns over two billion dollars .*
>
> *Therefore Sarah is wealthy.*

It is uncontroversial point that any one owns over two billion dollars is a wealthy person(ibid.).

Third, Legal definition, this refers to the legal definition of the term such as " *capital*" "*murder*"…etc. (ibid.).

Ad Hominem Argument (argument from personal attack)

According to Walton (2008: 160) ,it is the one in which the focus will be turned toward the arguer himself rather than his argument. It is a very popular and powerful scheme by which someone's argument is attacked via suggesting that he is ethically bad person .For instance, when an arguer says that his opponent is a lier, so his argument will not be accepted as a plausible one. This argument is based on the person's features especially his veracity ones. Parenthetically, it includes any type of claim that the arguer under attack is ethically imperfect (Walton, 2002: 59).

According to Walton (ibid.:60) , the use of ad Hominem Argument in negative campaign in political debates is popular. Within this type there must be three participants: a proponent, a respondent and the audiences. Firstly the proponent will put his argument then the respondent will attack that argument in order to persuade the audiences not to accept it as plausible or credible. This is the exact case in political debates when the arguers still fight each other to gain the acceptance of the audiences.

The scheme of this type can be portrayed as follows (ibid.):

> ***MAJOR PREMISE****: If the respondent is not credible, then his argument should not be judged to be (very) plausible.*
>
> ***MINOR PREMISE****: The respondent is a bad person (ethically speaking), and therefore he is not credible.*
>
> ***CONCLUSION****: The respondent's argument should not be judged to be (very) plausible.*

Walton (2002:60) proceeds that this argument has three subtypes based on the attack between the arguers:

1. **Abusive,** it focuses on vilifying other's characteristics, i.e., attacking ones personality such as this person has bad truthfulness, bad moral …etc. An example of this type is that when one says "He is a lier!" he directs the attack to destroy the other person's credibility in order to put him in doubt position (Walton, 2002: 62).

Walton (ibid.) designs the following scheme for this type:

CHARACTER ATTACK PREMISE: a is a person of bad character.

CONCLUSION: a's argument should not be accepted.

2. **Circumstantial**, it deals with the questioning or criticizing of person circumstances of the arguer. It is against the person depends on an alleged conflict of an adherence of the respondent.Sometimes the conflict sets between propositions which is asserted or advocated by the arguer in the past and some actions attributed to him in the present. By his turn, the proponent notices these actions and makes certain inferences to attack the respondent(Walton, 2002:61-2).

The scheme of this type as it is cited by Walton (ibid.) is:

MAJOR PREMISE: Anyone who asserts proposition A, but then reveals that she is not personally committed to A (or is even committed to the opposite of A), is ethically a bad person and not a credible arguer, and her argument should not be judged to be plausible.

MINOR PREMISE: This person asserted proposition A, but she then revealed that she was not personally committed to A (or that she was committed to the opposite of A).

CONCLUSION: This person is ethically a bad person and not a credible arguer, and her argument should not be judged to be plausible.

Walton (2006:124-5) illustrates the following example of this scheme in which the child's argument is circumstantial one since he attacks his father who preaches what he does not practice.

(2.13) Parent: Smoking is unhealthy habit. So you should not smoke.

Child: But you smoke yourself?

3. **Biased Ad Hominem** ,Walton (2008:170) asserts that this last type includes hidden agenda that belongs to the arguer who is under attack because of his loyalty to a specific side. His backing is due to some benefit that he will get from that side. So, the central point here is that the objectivity or sincerity of the arguer.This means that the respondent within this type is biased to one side rather than another so as a person can depend on his speech must not to be given much credibility since the sincerity of the respondent is at stake because of his prejudice(Walton, 2002: 62).

The following form is due to the scheme of this type (ibid.)

MAJOR PREMISE: If a person is biased, he cannot be trusted to tell us what he really thinks about an issue he is questioned about.

MINOR PREMISE: This person is biased.

> *CONCLUSION: This person cannot be trusted to tell us what he really thinks about this issue he has been questioned about.*

An example about the above type as it is mentioned by Walton(2008:185) is:

> *(2.14)Bill and Jack are talking about the problem of rain*
>
> *acid. Jack argues that the reports which tackle this problem*
>
> *are greatly exaggerated and that amount of action are*
>
> *prohibitive. Bill asserts that Jack said so because he is on the board of directors of a U.S. coal company, and that therefore her argument should not be taken at face value.*

What one might inference from this example is that Jack is not a trusted person because he works for U.S. coal company benefits.

METHODOLOGY

Data Collection

The data of the current paper is reflected by the third American presidential debates that set between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in 2016. *According to Creswell (2011:206) "purposeful sampling is the process of selecting people or sites who can best help us understand our phenomenon*". So, the presidential debate data is selected purposefully based on the fact that they are lengthy and tackled variants topics, so they are full of details. In addition to that, presidential debates are a real life situations that stir the most fateful matters for citizens.

The Debate in its transcribed PDF form are downloaded from the following website:

1. **http://fortune.com/2016/10/19/presidential-debate-third-transcript/**

Method of Analysis

The analysis of the data will go around the following steps:

A. Detect the types of ASs based on Walton's (2002) concept of ASs to discover how the arguers utilize the different types of schemes to persuade their audiences.

B. In order to avoid redundancy, only some examples of the debate will be analyzed.

C. Finally, The results will be arranged through numbers to reject or verify the hypothesis. After that conclusions have been set depends on the analysis.

THE ANALYSIS

Analyzing Fallacies

Argument from Analogy

-This type of scheme can be marked in quoting what Trump says*:"The biggest complaint they have — it's with all of the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and by Barack Obama".* Both Hillary and Obama cause many crisis.

> *MAJOR PREMISE: Hillary Clinton is similar to Barak Obama*

> *MINOR PREMISE: Hillary Clinton caused problems*

> *CONCLUSION: Barak Obama caused problems*

- Another use of this type is committed when Clinton make analogous relation between the undocumented workers and American worker as when she says*"...and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers, which hurts them, but also hurts American workers".* She connect the harmful of the undocumented worker with that of American workers. Both of them have the same situation because of Trump's policy.

> *MAJOR PREMISE:Undocumented workers is similar to American workers.*

> *MINOR PREMISE:Trump hurts the undocumented workers*

> *CONCLUSION: Trump hurts American workers.*

Argument from Sign

-The committing of this scheme can be represented by Trump's argument *"But we have horrible deals. Our jobs are being taken out by the deal that her husband signed, NAFTA, one of the worst deals ever. Our jobs are being sucked out of our economy".*Smuggling American's job out of their country is a sign of that unhelpful policies and deals of Clinton's and her husband.

> *MAJOR PREMISE: If American jobs is shipping out because of NAFTA, then Clinton and her husband polices are not helpful and NAFTA is a bad deal.*

> *MINOR PREMISE: There is a shipping of American jobs.*

> *CONCLUSION: Clinton and her husband polices are not helpful and NAFTA is a bad deal.*

-Another use of this type can be triggered in Clinton's argument*:"But, of course, there's no way we can know whether any of that is true, because he hasn't released his tax returns. He is the first candidate ever to run for president in the last 40-plus years who has not released his tax returns, so everything he says about charity or anything else, we can't prove it. You can look at our tax returns. We've got them all out there".* She exploits Trump's refusing to pay the tax as a sign that his speech is not true and must be in doubt position.

MAJOR PREMISE: If Trump does not release his tax,then his speech is doubtful and he is untrusted person.

MINOR PREMISE: Trump does not release his tax.

CONCLUSION:his speech is doubtful and he is untrusted person.

Argument from Slippery Slope:

- it is employed with mentioning the bad and negative effects of the opening border strategies that is managed by Clinton and Obama. *"...the single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern border. It's just pouring and destroying their youth. It's poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people. We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country..."*.As a result of the open borders heroin will pours across, destroying American youths, poising their blood…etc,

PREMISE: If our southern borders do not closed ,bad consequences will occur such as pouring the heroin,across them, destroying American youths and poising their blood…etc,

CONCLUSION: America southern borders should be closed

-Clinton applies this scheme when she mentions the effects of involving the immigrants in the formal economy of the country*"... bringing undocumented immigrants out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wage"*. As a result this action will have good consequences for both, the immigrants and the Americans and then, there will be no offense for any of them.

PREMISE: Having undocumented immigrants involved in the formal economy of the country has a benefit consequences and then the employers will not exploit them.

CONCLUSION: The undocumented immigrants must involved in the formal economy.

Argument from an Established Rule

-this scheme is mainly represented by Clinton's phrase *"I understand and respect the tradition of gun ownership. It goes back to the founding of our country"* .She presents a strong proof to improve her support to the second amendment since it is one of the country's foundation rule.

- Another use is embodied in Trump's sentence "*They have to pay up. We're protecting people, they have to pay up"*. It is uncontroversial standpoint that if they protect NATO , then NATO must pay for that defense.It is an agreed topic that there is no giving without taking.

Argument from Position to Know

- Trump performs this scheme when he puts the Border Patrol Agents in a position to know their work and the needs of the country and as a result they endorsed Trump because they know that his plan can be worked successfully,*"First time they've ever endorsed a*

candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what's going on. They know it better than anybody. They want strong borders. They feel we have to have strong borders".

> ***MAJOR PREMISE****: the Border Patrol Agents is in a position to know about Trump and what is going on.*
>
> ***MINOR PREMISE****: the Border Patrol Agents says that Trump is a good candidate since they endorsed them.*
>
> ***CONCLUSION****: Trump is a good candidate and must be endorsed.*

- Clinton performs this scheme when she oriented the audience to search in Google to find Trump's audio about the invasion in Ira q *:"Donald is implying that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq….he supported it…I just want everybody to go* Google*…And you can hear the audio of him saying that".* She does not do so unless she watched this audio before so she is in a position to know about Tramp's opinion toward the war in Iraq.

> ***MAJOR PREMISE****: Clinton is in a position to know about Trump and his opinion toward the invasion of Iraq.*
>
> ***MINOR PREMISE****: She says that Trump supports the invasion of Iraq*
>
> ***CONCLUSION****: Trump supports the invasion of Iraq*

Argument from Verbal Classification

-It is embodied by what Clinton literally says*" the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful corporations and the wealthy…… we need a Supreme Court that will stand up on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community…".* It is uncontroversial and agreed point that the supreme court needs to be on the behalf of rights and justice since it's her job and nobody can claim the opposite thing:

> **MAJOR PREMISE**: It is uncontroversial point that the Supreme Court must work to the behalf of rights and justice
>
> **CONCLUSION**: *"a Supreme Court will stand up on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community…".*

-Clinton also within this scheme introduces many uncontroversial point in order to convince the audience by her standpoint .This scheme represents by *" we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns. I think we need comprehensive background".* This implies that Trump's plans about the Second Amendment are dangerous for all people

> **MAJOR PREMISE**: It is uncontroversial point that if America have 33,00 people who die from gun in a year so, the second amendment rule must be changed since it is dangerous.
>
> *MINOR PREMISE*: America have 33,00 people who die from gun in a year
>
> **CONCLUSION**: the second amendment rule must be changed since it is dangerous.

Ad Hominem Argument

-This scheme is employed when Trump utilizes the abusive ad. Hominem as he focuses on Clinton and Obama themselves rather than their arguments *" These women — the woman on the plane, the — I think they want either fame or her campaign did it. And I think it's her campaign …….But they were all totally — it was all fiction. It was lies, and it was fiction"*. Instead of justifying what has been said about him he indirectly accused Clinton for being lair for attributing such things to him.

CHARACTER ATTACK PREMISE: Clinton has bad characters as they are lairs..

CONCLUSION: Her arguments should not be accepted.

- Another sub-type of this scheme which is operated in this extraction is the circumstantial based ad hominem in which Clinton puts Trump's veracity in doubt position as one who has two contradict situation as in the argument*"…Donald is implying that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq….he supported it…I just want everybody to go Google…And you can actually hear the audio of him saying that."* Then, Trump supports the invasion of Iraq in the past and now he denies it. He has conflict opinions.

MAJOR PREMISE:If Trump says that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq but in fact in the past he supported it then, he is not a credible arguer, and her argument should not be judged to be plausible.

MINOR PREMISE: Trump asserts that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq but in fact in the past he supported it

CONCLUSION: Trump is not" a credible arguer, and her argument should not be judged to be plausible."

RESULTS

This section of analysis includes the statistical results of ASs in the data under discussion which are reached at via applying the following mathematical equation:

"Percentage = occurrence of each strategy   × 100 "

total number of situations

Statistics of Argumentation Schemes in the Third Debate.

No.	Argumentation schemes	Frequency	Percentage%
1	Analogy	23	(32%)
2	Sign	9	(13%)
3	Slippery slop	5	(7%)
4	An established rule	6	(8%)
5	Position to know	14	(20%)
6	Verbal classification	5	(7%)
7	Ad Hominem Argument	9	(13%)
	Total	71	(100%)

Argument from analogy, as it is shown in the above table, is the most prominent scheme that is utilized by the debaters. It is used (23) times which represents (32%) of the whole data. This verifies the second hypothesis of the current study "*scheme of analogy is the most common type of schemes generally utilized in the presidential debates.*". From analyzing the debate, it has been noticed that this scheme is the most fluid one that can be applied easily since its usage is limited to find someone and link the opponent to this person to share the same positions, characteristics, decisions…etc. in order to convince the audience that there is an analogous relation between the two. This may give an impression that this scheme does not need big amount of efforts from any debater to find someone familiar to the audience and connect him with the opponent. Therefore, scheme of analogy is not difficult to be used in contrast with the other types of schemes that demand special strategies ,ways and efforts and for that reason , this type of scheme is the most prominent one.

The second level is occupied via the argument of position to know that is utilized (14) times with the percentage of (20%) of the debate. In the third level, comes both the scheme of sign and that of ad hominem, they occupy the same frequency rate which is (9). This represents the percentage of (13%).In the fourth level, the scheme of an established rule occurs with (6) instances which constitute the percentage (8%) Finally, the scheme of slippery slope and that of verbal classification also share the same number of frequency (9) with the percentage of (13%).

CONCLUSIONS

1. ASs are needed to be employed in any critical discussion in which the arguer's aim is to resolve the difference of opinion or win the conversation due to the fact that this type of ploy has an effective impact because of its persuasive nature. So, There is a strong relationship between argumentation schemes and the debaters in the presidential debates.

2. The scheme of analogy is that scheme which is employed more than any other schemes in political debates and this is due to its structure which is very fluid to be applied that provides a wide range of manipulation choices. This conclusion verifies the research hypothesis.

3. Argumentation schemes can be detected easily in humans' every day discussions. they may employ them consciously or unconsciously almost in all types of conversations.

4. In presidential debates, the arguer exploits all his verbal attacked tools(such as ASs) to win the election race and get the audience's votes, so it can be considered as a chess game in which the player do his best to win the game.

REFERENCES

[1] Arroyo, B. and Jose, L. (2003). "*Perdóneme que se lo diga pero vuelve usted a faltar a la verdad, señor González": Form and function of politic verbal behaviour in face-to-face Spanish political debates*. Discourse and Society.14(4). 395- 423.

[2] Bahm, K. et. al. (2004*). Argument and Audience: Presenting Debates in Public Settings*. New York: The International Debate Education Association

[3] Creswell, J. (2012). *"Educational Research: Planning, Conducting* and Evaluating *Quantitative and Qualitative Research"*. Pearson Education. Inc.

[4] Eemeren, F. (2001). *"The State of the Art in Argumentation Theory"*.In Eemeren, F.(ed.) *Crucial Concepts in Argumentation Theory.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 11-26.

[5] Eemeren,F. and Grootendorst, R.(1984).*Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications Holland.

[6] Eemeren, F. et al.(2002). " Argumentation, Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

[7] Kaid, L. and Bacha, C. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Political Communication.* California : Sage Publications,Inc.

[8] Mirza, R. and AL-Hindawi, F.(2016).*Strategic Maneuvering in   American Civil and Criminal Court Trails*. LAP LAMBERT Academic Publishing

[9] Vion, R. (1992*). La communication Verbale*: Analyse des interactions. Paris: Hachetter Supérieur.

[10] Walton, D.(1996). *Argumentation Schemes for Presumptive Reasoning*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

[11] Walton, D. (1995). *A Pragmatic Theory of Fallacy Studies in Rhetoric and Communication*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

[12] Walton, D. (2002). *Legal Argumentation and Evidence*. The Pennsylvania State University Press.

[13] Walton, D. (2006). *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[14] Walton, D. (2008). *Informal Logic: A Pragmatic Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[15] Walton, D. Reed, C. and Macagno, F. (2008). *Argumentation Schemes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.