PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology

JACK SYMONDS' SPEECH IN OXFORD UNION DEBATE: A PRAGMATIC STUDY OF ARGUMENTATION

Wala'a Hashim Mohammed[1], Qasim Abbas Dhayef Altufay[2]

[1,2]Candidate at Babylon University, College of Education for Humanities, English

Department

Email: [1]walaa.h.mohammed@student.uobabylon.edu.iq [2]qasimabbas@uobabylon.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

In argumentations or events such as Oxford Union Debates, speakers are expected to present the best data, in terms of content and linguistic realization, on the topic of discussion to effect on both the audience and the opposing party. As such, these events do not only leave impacts on the social levels (by contributing in lessening tension on controversial issues) but also on the linguistic levels. Speeches from these events present wealth of data on language use during argumentations and on rhetoric as well. Therefore, the current study seeks to analyze and discuss the different linguistic means (both techniques and principles) employed by Jack to make his series of arguments creatively reasonable and effective and help his party win the debate. That is, the linguistic means to achieve a reasonable and effective argumentation are investigated.

INTRODUCTION

Argumentations are held when there are disagreements on certain topics. Oxford union debate is held for the same reason, i.e., to resolve the difference in opinion on many controversial topics. Many topics these days are set on fire around the world. Social media in relation to human interaction is one of those topics. Therefore, Oxford society invites number of speakers to argue on the issue. Each speaker is expected to state number of arguments on one of the two opposing standpoints: social

media corrupts human interaction or social media does not corrupt human interaction. Arguments, in linguistic terms, are defined by Govier (2010:1) as "a set of claims in which one or more of them are put forward so as to offer reasons for another claim, the conclusion".

Accordingly, Jack- who defends the positive standpoint that social media corrupts human interaction- is expected to present set of arguments to defend the main argument-the standpoint- to help the audience to reach a conclusion the falls in his-Jack's- party's favor. Doing so, the study hypothesizes that Jack employs various techniques and respects several principles to come up with as much reasonable and effective speech as possible.

On the base of the above hypothesis, the study aims to: (i) analyze the various linguistic means (techniques and principles) employed by Jack , (ii) detect the most common techniques that he employs to defend his position, and (iii) define how reasonableness and effectiveness are achieved in his speech.

The study adopts the TDA. It is a newly developed approach on the base of notions derived from (i) researcher's perspective on argumentation kinds , (ii) several models from van Eemeren and Houtlosser's (2002) strategic manevuring approach and (iii) Walton's (2006) kinds of arguments.

Debate, Argumentation and Arguments

Both argumentation and debate refer to the activity by which people provide reasons for the purpose of supporting or refuting certain claim or point of view. Both of them are ways "of arriving at a reasoned judgment on a proposition" (Freeley and Steinberg, 2005:6; Van Eemeren and Grootendorst ,2004:1). However, a slight difference can still be figured when the two terms are considered more deeply.

In its formal sense, debating involves a more structured form of argumentation than mere discussion. It presents regulated challenges to arguers to present their statements, arguments and critiques in forms of interactive and innovative dialogue. It is a more "dialectical and collaborative process which provides far reaching and long-term benefits" for the public space as a whole. Even more, a panel of people or a person may do the judgment in the more formal debates and define the winner side, as it is the case in Oxford Union Debates (Gardiner,2017:7-8). From this perspective, debating can be said as standing for, though more structured, the same sense of argumentation. This slight difference does not represent a huge space between the two terms. Therefore, the two terms are used interchangeably in this study.

On the other hand, argument is the product of argumentation and debate. Although some scholars see argumentation and argument as synonyms, this study does not follow this vein. It rather, as Walton (2006:1) suggests, considers argument as "the giving of reasons to support or criticize a claim that is questionable or open to doubt". Thus, to say that there is a successful argumentation is held is to say that successful arguments are offered and/or presented, i.e. good enough reasons are given.

The Three-Dimensional Approach to Argumentations

The three-dimensional approach is a new approach that bases itself on three main points:

(i)   A newly established distinction of argumentation kinds: the approach suggests that argumentations are of two main kinds: a two-dimensional argumentation (refers to the kind of discussion held between two people or two parties-two dimensions- in some in-group or personal sense), and a three-dimensional argumentation- of which Oxford Union Debate is a sample (refers to the kind of discussion that involves three parties or sides interested in resolving a difference of opinion on a topic that falls in the whole public sphere's interest). The distinction focuses on the existence or the non-existence of an audience (the third party) in an argumentation.
(ii)   Some essential concepts from the strategic maneuvering approach by van Eemeren and Houtlosser (2002): the TDA adopts and remodels three main concepts from the strategic manevuring approach which are: stages of argumentation, aspects of argumentation, and reasonableness and effectiveness. This makes the TDA an extension of the strategic manevuring one.
(iii)   Certain kinds of arguments by Walton (2006): list of argument kinds are adopted as a sort of stylistic touch to make the argumentation more effective.

The below sub-sections show more on the main parts of the TDA that concern the current study:

Stages of Argumentation

In the other approaches, stages of argumentation are always three or four. For all of them, the main stages are three (opening or confronting- arguing and concluding). This is an undeniable fact. However, it can only be considered so in terms of the two-dimensional kind of argumentation. For the three-dimensional argumentations, TDA introduces five stages:

Pre-Argumentation Stage:

This is the first stage of a three-dimensional argumentation. It is when the speakers or the two opposing parties are notified about certain discussion viz., they know they are invited. They start preparing themselves and setting well their thoughts.

Opening Stage:

This is the second stage where the argumentation opens by announcing the disagreement in the event.

Argumentation Stage:

This is the core stage of argumentations. It is the part where parties start presenting their arguments and standing for their side publically

Concluding Stage:

This is the stage where the end result of the argumentation is announced

Post-Argumentation Stage:

this is one additional stage to any three-dimensional argumentation held. It deals with the effects that result from the held event (the argumentation or debating) on the public space, on many levels.

The current study does not include the stages in its analysis. The speech chosen for the analysis represents only one turn of a whole argumentation. That is, it represents a speech that is prepared in the pre-argumentation stage and presented in the argumentation stage. The stages are referred to just to emphasize that the speaker, Jack, has had the opportunity to be well prepared for the argumentation and, thus, level up the quality of the arguments presented.

Aspects of Three-dimensional Argumentation

Aspects of argumentation are driven from van Eemeren and Houtlosser's (2002) triangle, which is an essential part of the SM approach. However, TDA goes deeper and re-models this triangle. In TDA, the aspects are as follows:

Topic Potential:

This aspect, as explained before, is the one that concerns the selection of materials that serves arguer's goal the best. TDA extends this aspect to

refer to the selection of materials on the base of two main points. The first is arguer's conviction. Arguer's conviction covers the personal beliefs of the arguers on what they see the best for achieving their purpose. This first point mostly covers the choices made in terms of three pillars of persuasion. The arguer may decide on the base of his personal conviction whether to appeal with ethos (trustworthiness), pathos (emotions) or logos (logic and reasoning). The second point deals with the selection of materials in terms of the general knowledge of the world. This, in turn, covers the selection of materials from those which are recently controversial (up-to-date) and/or those which have always been controversial and interesting (historical). Arguer's can reflect this sub-aspect by the use of "reported speeches", viz. the use of quotes- direct or indirect- that always gets treated as more authentic.

Audience Demand:

This second aspect deals with the selection of materials on the base of what best fits others. "Others" here refers to two groups of people. The first is the opposing party. The second group of people covered under audience demand is the "audience". Audience refers to the third party in an argumentation. It can refer to both (i) those present in the event and participate in some effective or ineffective way (P audience) , yet not central to the actual dialectical activity, and (ii) those who are absent but still get effected by the whole argumentation- people watching the discussion via TV, internet , etc (A audience). Arguers in three-dimensional argumentation are expected to direct their arguments to the opposing party as well as those two sets of audience. They have to plan their moves in light of both the opposing party's and the public space's interest.

Presentational Devices:

No modifications have been done in light of this third aspect. It refers to the careful selection of the most effective linguistic means to represent the arguments. Some of those rhetorical linguistic means considered in this study include:

Metaphor:

Refers to the use of language in a way that a direct comparison is established between two ideas or things. The comparison states that one thing or idea well describes the other or does the action of the other. Further, the comparison is done implicitly, without any use of the explicit comparing expressions such as like or as (Grey, 2000:1).

Irony:

Is a kind of figure of speech where a contrast in meaning is done by saying something and implicating the opposite meaning? This is mostly done as a means of criticizing or attacking certain idea, thing or person (Roy, 1981:407).

Overstatement or Hyperbole:

Refers to the exaggerative representation of certain idea or thought. However, the speaker does not intend to mislead the listener or the audience. S/he expects them to infer the intended meaning. Overstatement is merely an emphasis in the service of truth. The speaker only wants to emphasize the importance of certain idea, (Perrine, 1969: 110).

Understatement:

is the opposite case of overstatement. In this case, speakers say less but mean more. The purpose behind using this figure is also opposite to that of overstatement. Understatement is used to indicate or imply an impression that an idea expressed is not important and does not deserve attention (Harris, 2008:9).

Rhetorical Questions

Are the kind of questions that typically have the structure of a question but the force of an assertion? Thus, they are questions that neither seek nor elicit information or answer. They imply the opposite polarity of the asserted idea (Han, 2002: 202).

Effectiveness And Reasonableness

Effectiveness and reasonableness are seen as two inseparable notions in TDA. This is because TDA claims that every reasonable argumentation is effective at least in some way, and vice versa. However, the degree of effectiveness and reasonableness might normally differ from an argumentation to another and this difference cannot be exactly measured or justified. This can be because these two notions (effectiveness and reasonableness) are context dependent. Accordingly, argumentations can be classified in terms of these two notions into: a good argumentation (which is effective and reasonable no matter how much) and a bad argumentation (which is not and which ends with a failure in resolving the difference of opinion or a failure in keeping the argumentation hold). Such a perspective of these notions takes us to the fact that they both need to be treated as one complementary whole and analysed inseparably. Therefore,

TDA remodels the notions of effectives and reasonableness in argumentations.

In TDA and following the above simple distinction (good argumentation VS bad argumentation), a good argumentation (an effective and reasonable one) is maintained through the proper adherence to: (i) aspects of three-dimensional argumentation, (ii) principles of politeness, (iii) Cooperative principles-namely Grice's maxims, and (iv) signs of acceptability.

Cooperative Principles:

This theory, Grice's (1975) theory of cooperative principles, puts forward the concept that interlocutors in a conversation are meant to achieve a meaningful interaction. To be meaningful in an interaction, Grice (1975:166) claims that the principle stating "make your contribution such as required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged" should be followed. He (ibid) further explains them in terms of four maxims: quantity, quality, manner and relevance.

Principles Of Politeness:

The theory to be adopted under TDA is Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory of politeness. The main concept of this theory is the concept of "face". Face is the public self-image individuals own and anticipate everybody to be familiar with. To them, face is of two types. The two types are: positive face and negative face. The former is the desire to show involvement with others. The latter is the desire not to offend others or not to be offended (Crystal, 2008: 184). In their interaction, people need to maintain balance between these two types of faces. That is, people have to avoid threatening acts and seek saving acts.

Signs Of Acceptability:

It is an alternative notion for the ten rules of reasonableness – the codes of conduct developed by van Eemeren and Grootendrost (2003). In TDA, "signs of acceptability" refers to the conditions that logically make up a proper argumentation. The more those conditions are respected; the strongest is the signs of acceptability of arguing effectively and reasonably. Those conditions – taken from the ten rules- are: (1) freedom condition (2) starting point condition (3) closure condition and (4) usage condition – to see details check van Eemeren and Grootendrost (2003).

Kinds Of Arguments

Walton (2006: 14-20;49-52) covers a list of the main kinds of arguments. Those are:

Argument of Generalization:

This kind refers to the use of some general arguments in support to a specific point (standpoint) at issue. Walton (ibid:15) states that generalization "ascribes some property to group of individual things". He adds that "sometimes a generalization is called a rule or general rule because it states how things generally go in a wide range of specific cases". Generalization is of three sub-types (ibid:49-52):

Deductively Valid Generalized Argument (Universal Generalization):

In this type, if the reasons given for a certain standpoint are true, that standpoint wins. The standard of strictness is in its highest degree. It is impossible for a deductively valid argument to be true and the conclusion false. The use of "all" in a statement represents an example. If all of something is true, then any of it is true too (ibid:.49-50),

Inductively Valid Generalized Argument:

In this type, the standard of strictness is less. It is not so strict. If the general reason or evidence given is true, the standpoint defended can probably be true but it can be false too. Here comes the turn of the other opposing part, if the argument withdraws their attack then it is true. The use of "most" is an example to this type of argument. Stating a "most" proposition makes it probably true, but not necessarily. This type takes the notion of enumeration as the base for its validity, i.e. some methods of calculation are applied (Walton, 2006:50-51), and

Presumptive Defeasible Generalized Argument- Or Abductive Generalized Argument:

This type is considered as the most useful type and the most necessary though being less strict in validity and thus less reliable. It is seen as a sort of assumption that leads to a conclusion which is highly plausible. Plausible means that the argument seems true on the currently given facts, but it can turn out to fail once opposing evidence is given. There is no certainty here; the assumption is made on the base of the best guess (*Walton, 2006:52;* Thagard et al, 2011).

Argument of Analogy:

It is the use of comparison in making a statement, that is, to compare one thing to another (Walton, 2006:14). The validity of this argument depends on the given analogy. Strictness cannot be defined**.**

Argument of Defining:

In this type, definitions for the essential terms are provided for the purpose of clarifying certain evidences and reasons (ibid).

Argument Of Counter-Example:

This is the opposite type of generalization argument. It is used when the use of generalization fails. It is to give a singular example, a particular instance, of something. It is a singular statement, saying something on one thing or one individual or group (Walton, 2006:16).

Argument of Existential:

This type is sometimes confused with the first type (generalization). However, it is neither a generalization nor a counter example. It reflects the idea that at least some of certain things are true. For example, some social media apps are threatening. Such an statement means neither all of them nor one specific app is harmful. It indicates that at least some of them are harmful, or at least one unidentified app is! So, this type asserts that some groups, individuals or things have certain property" (ibid).

Attacking Arguments:

The above-mentioned kinds of argument (from 2.3.1 to 2.3.8) are the kinds used for stating or asserting an argument. That is, they are statements that the arguer claims are true. However, Walton (ibid) mentions two more kinds of arguments that are used for attacking previously raised ones. Those are:

Counter-argument or a Rebuttal:

Using this, the arguer gives an instance or reason for clarifying why they think that certain claim is wrong. It is to attack a prior argument. Such a move can either prove that certain argument is wrong or that it is not strong enough to defend a point at issue (Walton,2006:26-27).

Raising a Question:

This is the second kind. The arguer may attack specific weak point in a prior argument. Arguers can raise a question and put the argument in a doubt (ibid:27).

Data Collection and Methodology

Oxford Union Debate is a famous debating event held in England by Oxford University, which is one of the most prestigious education communities in the world. The event takes place almost every week. In each debate, a very controversial and critical issue to the public space is chosen to argue on and an audience is asked to decide the winning party in terms of certain voting method.

The special nature of the event incentivizes the quest speaker to employ the best argumentative qualities of their own, both in terms of principles and techniques, to present the most reasonable and effective speech possible. What distinguishes the nature of this argumentative event from the others is that: (i) it is a three-dimensional argumentation which involves a pre-argumentation stage where arguers can be better prepared, and (ii) it has a far bigger post-argumentation impact as it is a famous debating society that tackles issues in direct relation to people's life.

Jack is one of quest speakers in a session about social media, whether it corrupts human interaction or not. He is the first speaker in the winning group and he defends the positive standpoint that social media corrupts human interaction. His speech is chosen as it is very rich and well-organized.

The methodology planned to analyze his speech is simple and it is as follows:

(i)   A detailed analysis of the techniques and principles he employs is going to be done in terms of TDA.
(ii)   A discussion on the possible reasons to make his speech one of the most effective and reasonable ones is going to be presented and results are defined too.

DATA ANALYSIS
In this session of Oxford Union Debate, Jack stands for the standpoint that social media corrupts human interactions and therefore defends this belief and attacks the opposite. As such kinds of three-dimensional argumentations involve a pre-argumentation stage, arguers are expected to come fully weaponised. Jack is a good sample of a fully weaponised arguer. He utilizes all the available means he finds proper to defend his

position. He smartly opens the debate with announcing a shared interest between him– so as his group- and both the opposition and the audience by drawing a cut line between the advantages and the disadvantages of social media. Then, he goes on stating reasons (arguments) for believing that social media corrupts human interaction. He quotes researches and examples that help him prove the relationship between social media and (i) depression and (ii) eating disorder. He also discusses mental illness as another negative impact. Then, he covers the more personal side of social media's negative effect on interactions referring to increasing negative feelings such as envy. He later jumps to refer to some serious political and professional issues as well. He covers the topic on several levels- medical, personal, social and political.

The short summary of his arguments above gives a hint on how Jack's arguments reflect his interest in the adherence to the three aspects of argumentation: topic potential, audience demand and presentational devices. Starting with **topic potential**, Jack seems to prefer exploiting all the three pillars of persuasion (ethos, pathos, and logos). To specify, Jack chooses to effect on the audience and the other party by the use of ethos in the following argument:

(a.1) "I would like to start by saying that I am most certainly not against social media …."

In a.(1) , Jack tries to communicate honesty and shared interest with audience and the other party by admitting ahead the benefits of social media before going on with the other arguments, which involves attacks to social media.
Pathos, on the other hand, is used twice. Pathos is where playing on the emotional rhythm comes to the ground:

(a.2) "And in order to feel included, we are forced to pos,t graham, snap, tweet, upload, pin, check In, swipe, like, share, reac,t or message. Our real human connections are being replaced by virtual relationships"

Jack seems to be trying to make everyone remember the feeling that causes and motivates people to get engaged on social media platforms. By this, he makes use of everyone's emotion as a sort of evidence to support his arguments

(a.3) "So, tonight I say to you all it's time to stop stalking and start talking and sometimes you can only learn more by looking someone in the eye than you can from looking at their social media profile"

(a.3) is the concluding line of Jack's turn. After presenting a long list of logical arguments (will be shown next) with some (less) other emotional

ones, he decides to conclude his turn with an emotional statement. As just stated, Jack adopts logic and reasoning many times in his arguments. Those include:

(a.4) But the fact of the matter is that the motion put before the House tonight is not about the benefit of social media. It is not about whether or not the internet is good or bad The motion put before us tonight is about the impact that social media can have on our interaction on our relationships and on each and every one of our lives on a deeply personal level"

In the appeal made above- (a.4), Jack clarifies the main point of the discussion using the "but" technique logically. He does this by drawing a clear line between the well-known benefits of social media and the one specific disadvantage of social media, which is corrupting human interaction, which the event is concerned with and thus everyone must focus on. Some other instances of appeals by logic and reasoning are stated below (from a.5 to a.10 - which they range between using a logical reasoning, quoting research statistics, highlighting certain medical issues resulted from the use of social media, and even some political issues) :

(a.5) " if we can agree that social media is affecting us as individuals and changing the way that we behave, it follows that social media is affecting the way we interact with each other"

(a.6) "Research from the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine studied over 1,700 people between the ages of 19 and 32. It was found that on average participants were spending 61 minutes per day on social media and visiting social media websites over 30 times per week.

(a.7) "Social media is causing depression for a lot of people and of course that depression is affecting the way that we interact with each other in the physical world"

(a.8) "even more troubling than the relationship between social media and depression is the relationship between social media and eating disorders in young people"

(a.9) "giving young people distorted images of how their bodies should look and oftentimes the result is a serious mental illness"

(a.10) "it is also changing the way that we act as a society and the ways that we interact with our political leaders"

Topic potential also involves the use of reported speeches as some kind of general knowledge that strengthens the position of the arguer. An example can be seen in (a.6) above. It is an argument that quotes a research

conducted earlier. Such arguments are considered as more authentic to others as they reflect documented facts.

The second aspect adored to is **audience demand.** As being the first speaker in the debate and taking into consideration that every speaker speaks only once, Jack cannot do so much in the argumentation stage about audience demand. This is because he still does not know anything about the other party's arguments. Audience adds no comment too.

The pre-argumentation stage also includes a consideration of audience demand. Jack, the arguer, himself admits this fact by stating,

"When I was researching him" (where him refers to another arguer in the opposition) and "in an attempt to sabotage my opposition and learn about their arguments for tonight's debate".

The two statements prove the fact that audience demand is considered in the pre-argumentation stage. In addition, all the choices made in respect to the three aspects of argumentation by Jack are done in the pre-argumentation stage. It is only the presentation of the arguments that is actually done in the argumentation stage. For the other speakers, the situation can differ. Speakers may add, delete or change things in their prepared arguments as they listen to other augers or to some P audience comments or questions.

However, in the pre-argumentation stage, Jack prepares a good move in respect to audience demand. It is figured when argument (a.1) and argument (a.4) are re-considered together. Jack makes a good use of "but" technique there. He first shows the audience and the opposing party that he already agrees with them on the point that social media has benefits (there is a shared interest and belief). Then, he goes on adding the "but" statement to draw their focus on the one real disadvantage that everyone needs to focus on. He implicitly asks everyone to admit the disadvantage just the way he admits the benefits of social media in general. This is a move that can win him a point in the discussion because he reads the mind of everyone and acts accordingly.

Further and in respect to **the presentational devices** employed in Jack's arguments, Jack mostly uses canonical styles. He makes a little use of rhetorical figures of speech. He mostly relies on content than form in his fight for the position he holds. Some instances of rhetorical figures of speech that found are as follows:
- Overstatement: as in: (a.11) "Our real human connections are being replaced by virtual relationships"- this expression literally refers to a total replacement, but it does not intend to imply so. It only tries to emphasize the amount of the effect.

- Understatement: as in: (a.12) "The simple truth is that for the most part we are spending huge proportions of our lives living in the digital universe and it is corrupting the way that we act with each other"- in which, though the arguer uses the expression "simple truth", he does not ever intend the literal meaning. To him, the idea is far from being just a simple truth. In addition, another form of understatement is seen in the concluding lines: (a.13)"my message is simple". Jack describes his position as being a fight for a simple issue, but he does not really take it so and does not even want anyone to take it so.

- Irony: as in: (a.14) *"Now the opposition would have you believe that this data is inaccurate. Perhaps it is people who are already depressed that are turning to social media as an outlet"*- the speaker speculates an opposition argument and states it in an ironic way indicating that such a speech should not be taken seriously. The opposition would have you believe that this data is inaccurate, so do not believe in that.

- Rhetorical questions: as in: (a.15) *"why is social media causing depression, why is social media causing eating disorders?"*- these are questions meant to direct the mind of the other party and the audience to certain way of thinking than merely asking for information. It is proved to be so by the upcoming line when Jack goes on saying *"The answer is one that I think we all inherently know"*.

- Metaphor: as in: (a.16) *"social media is not evil"*- the metaphoric use of "evil" here implies that the arguer does not intend to convince one that social media is completely a cause of harm. He rather shows that it only has a serious harm that needs confirmation and awareness. Another metaphoric use is found in: (a.17)*"it's time to stop stalking and start talking"*. It is a metaphoric argument in the form of an analogy. The two terms "Stalking" and "talking" metaphorically refer to social media interaction and the real life interaction.

In addition to respecting the three aspects of argumentation, Jack makes use of different **kinds of arguments**. This is a point that can contribute in: attracting the attention of audience, varying the degree of arguments strictness and adding some stylistic touch which itself contributes in the degree of the effectiveness of the arguments. He extensively employs four main kinds of arguments in addition to an attacking argument. Those are: generalized arguments, arguments of definition, counter-example arguments and arguments of analogy.
Instance of generalized arguments are seen in:

(a.18) *"Eating disorders today are affecting people of all genders of all races and from all socioeconomic backgrounds and in some cases of all ages as well"*- which is a form of deductively valid generalized argument. If this argument is true, then the protagonist wins a defense point for the favor of the standpoint they stand for.

(a.19) "if we can agree that social media is affecting us as individuals and changing the way that we behave it follows that social media is affecting the way we interact with each other"- which is a form of presumptive defeasible generalized argument or abductive generalized argument. It is a plausible argument. Its validity depends on the facts are going to be presented by each group and speaker.

Analogy is found in the following:

(a.20) "*social media is giving massive followings for people who are popular rather than people who are professional*"- an analogy is done between popularity and professionalism. Such an analogy tries to direct the minds to the shallowness of social media criteria in deciding and promoting for people as influencers and sources as influencing sites. A popular person or site on social media is not necessarily professional nowadays, yet they are treated as so.

(a.17) mentioned earlier- a comparison is done here between stalking and talking. The argument compares between the thing that people used to do before social media when they feel something towards someone- talk- and the thing that they do nowadays- stalking.

(a.21) "you can learn more by looking someone in the eye than you can from looking at their social media profile"- this is one last analogy Jack uses. It is similar to the pervious one in the general sense, that is both analogies deal with the comparison of social media and reality. Jack compares between looking in the eyes and looking at the profile.

On the other hand, argument of definition seems to be the main kind of argument that Jack depends in his picturing up what social media is. He also uses it to explain/define corruption in relation to social media: (a.22)

> **"This alteration of information, this filtering of our reality is once again at the very heart of what corruption really is"**

In addition, Jack presents an instance of counter-example arguments too: (a.23) "*As someone whose immediate family has been directly affected by the ravages of an eating disorder, I can tell you that social media does have a part to play*"- in this argument, Jack refers to a personal example as an additional evidence to a pervious argument being covered. However, the validity of such arguments is up to the audience and the opposing party.

Finally, Jack makes a special use of an attack argument- a rebuttal- though being the first speaker to present his arguments. He builds his attack on an

expectation which is mostly triggered in the pre-argumentation stage. The attack starts with argument (a.14) quoted earlier- "*Now the opposition would have you believe that this data is inaccurate….*".

In terms of the main principles, Jack respects and follows the main principles of politeness. He never does any face threatening moves. For instance, he opens his arguments with friendly words. Some of them, which makes them more effective and reasonable, show acceptability of some ideas of the other group and the audience by admitting some shared points (such as in a.1 and others). Further, he does not force his ideas on the others. He kindly and gently asks everyone to think about the points/arguments that have been raised. Moreover, for being enough clear and relevant, Jack is considered a cooperative arguer. He never violates any maxim, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Further, he respects the four main signs of acceptability- viz. the conditions of freedom, starting, closer and usage are all adhered to during argumentation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Following the measurements set by TDA for reasonableness and effectiveness, Jack's series of arguments reflect a good sample of reasonable and effective argumentation. The general characteristics of his speech can be introduced as the main reason. Those characteristics are as follows:

(i)   An appropriate variation in the techniques employed during the debate is made. First, a good amount of variation is done in the use of the linguistic techniques in light of the adherence to the aspects of argumentation. Second, other additional variations are also done in terms of kinds of arguments. He defends his position with a really rich series of arguments in terms of the linguistic techniques utilized.
(ii)   A perfect adherence to the main principles of argumentation is also seen. Jack is highly polite in the way he presents his arguments in addition to being clear, relevant and accurate in terms of quality and quantity. He further makes no violations at all in terms of the signs of acceptability.

The above two characteristics have qualified Jack's speech to be highly persuasive. Further, he professionally uses a new technique which is called by the study: "but technique". Jack starts his speech by making his position as clear as possible. He starts with drawing a clear-cut line between being "against social media" in general and believing that "social media corrupts human interaction". He uses "but" to set things right. He confidently lists some of the benefits of social media in general and separates them, using "but", from the fact that social media has one essential disadvantage which is corrupting interactions. This is one of the smartest and the most creative moves made by Jack. He achieves two functions by this move: (i) he establishes a shared ground with both the

opposing party and those audiences who disagree with the standpoint he defends; (ii) he also tries to gain everyone's trust in himself as a wise arguer who knows very well all the angles of the issue on the merit. He implicitly communicates with them declaring that he understands why some people may stand against his viewpoint, but those people need to avoid mixing the overall benefits of social media with the one specific disadvantage that they all are there to discuss about. The message works quite well as the debate ends with the audience voting for Jack party's favor.

 In terms of the three appeals, jack uses more instances of logic and reasoning (7 times) than the other appeals. He is convinced that this topic is better discussed in terms of logic. He logically relates social media to some medical issues and other political ones that all relate in a way or another to the corruption of human interactions. He further makes only one use of reported speeches.

With regards to the linguistic structure he uses, i.e. the presentation devices, Jack devotes only few seconds from the whole 11 minutes that he speaks to rhetoric. He uses few rhetorical devices. Those few instances include: overstatement (1 time), understatement (2 times), Irony (1 time), rhetorical question (1 time), and metaphor (2 times). All the other arguments are represented in a simple canonical language. However, he does other forms of variation, in terms of argument kinds. He employs: generalization (2 times), analogy (3 times) , counter-example (1), definition (1 times) and an attack (1 time).

The attacking argument that Jack uses has its special characteristics too. First it is established with a polite language. Second, it is made although Jack is the first speaker in the whole event, that is, although he still does not know what the other party is going to use/say. He builds the attack on speculation. He speculates an argument might be raised by the opposing party and attacks it preparing the audience with an against attitude.

Final feature to consider in Jack's series of arguments relates to the content of the arguments themselves. Jack discusses the issue of social media corrupting human interactions from various angles. That is, he refers to medical matters, social and political ones. He, doing so, convers all the main angles of human interests. He takes a holistic approach in covering the issue.

CONCLUSIONS
The current study has arrived at the following conclusions:

1.   The special employment of various linguistic techniques and the adherence to the main principles of argumentation are highly productive.

They have shown their fruit as the issue is perfectly covered and the audience has voted for the favor of the arguer's group.

2.   A renewal property can be seen in Jack's series of arguments. He keeps each argument distinct from the other by either varying the kind of appeal, the kind of argument or the kind of the presentational devices. The same property is noticed in terms of content too. The issue is covered from different angles: social, medical and political.

3.   A further creativity is seen in Jack's linguistic and argumentative abilities through the way he makes use of "but technique".He has used the technique professionally to serve two functions (clarifying his state and gaining trustworthiness).

4.   The holistic coverage of the ideas and the nature of the linguistic realizations have made the arguments/the speech more reasonable and effective

5.   Jack has made 23 sub-arguments in 11 minutes to defend his position.

6.   Some of the techniques which are used the most involve logos (7 times), analogy (3times) and generalization (2 times).

7.   Most of the times, Jack uses canonical language, i.e. only few instances of rhetorical devices are employed. This can indicate that a general variation in techniques, whether in terms of argument kinds or presentational devices or appeals, is more essential than a mere employment of rhetoric.

8.   Variation should be a focus on the level of thought, content and representation in any argumentative event.

REFERENCES

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987) Politeness: some universals in language usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, D. (2008) A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Freeley, A., and Steinberg, D., (2005) Argumentation And Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making (11th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Gardiner, J (2017) Debate, Argumentation and the Public Sphere: The Importance of Debate in Education and the Wider Society. UK: Anglia Ruskin University

Govier, T. (2010). A Practical Study of Argument. Belmont.USA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning

Grey, W. (2000). "Metaphor and meaning". In Minerva, Vol 4. http://www.minerva.mic.ul.ie//vol4/metaphor.html

Grice, P. (1975). "Logic and Conversation". In D. Davidson and G. Harman (eds.) The Logic of Grammar. Encino, pp. 64-75.

Han, C.(2002). Interpreting Interrogatives as Rhetorical Questions. In Lingua 112 (2002) 201-229

Harris, R.(2008). A Handbook of Rhetorical Devices. Glendale: Pyrczak

Perrine, L. (1969). Sound and Sense: an Introduction to Poetry (3rd Ed). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc.

Roy, A. (1981). "The function of irony in Discourse" In the journal Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse. Vol (4), pp. 407-423 https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1981.1.4.407

Thagard, W., Paul, D. and Cameron, S. (2011). "Attitudes and Cognitive Organization".
http://www.limsi.fr/Individu/jps/research/buzz/buzz.htm

Van Eemeren, F., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Van Eemeren, F.and Grootendorst, R (2003). " The Development of the Pragma-dialectical Approach to Argumentation". Argumentation, 13. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 387-403.

Van Eemeren, F.and Houtlosser.P (2002). "Strategic Maneuvring in Argumentative Discourse: Maintaining a Delicate Balance". In F. Eemeren and P. Houtlosser (eds.), Dialectic and Rhetoric. The Warp and Woof of Argumentation Analysis. Dordrecht: Kluwer,131–159.

Walton, D (2006). Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Appendix

The motion is: this house believes social media corrupts human interactions.

Thank You mr. President and thank you for having me as one of your guest speakers this evening. I would like to start by saying that I am most certainly not against social media. Any one of my friends or followers will tell you that I'm certainly not averse to the semi-regular Instagram post, Facebook upload or even snapchat story. Perhaps, even more importantly as an Australian student, social media allows me to effortlessly stay in contact with my friends and family around the world. More importantly still social media acts as a positive implication for many people living in developing countries and some of the world's largest social media companies are at the heart of these positive changes. Facebook's internet.org for example has given Internet access to over 25 million people around the world who have been able to reap the many benefits that the internet provide. These people live in countries ranging from Kenya to Colombia and the program is only in its first two years. Social media gives a voice to the people. It allows us to fight for what we believe in. It keeps people safe and it allows us to create a movement in the name of what we think is right. But the fact of the matter is that the motion put before the House tonight is not about the benefit of social media. It is not about whether or not the internet is good or bad. The motion put before us

tonight is about the impact that social media can have on our interaction on our relationships and on each and every one of our lives on a deeply personal level. As a society, we are constantly feeling the need to be seen by massive amounts of people. We are growing more and more dependent on instant gratification. And in order to feel included, we are forced to post, graham, snap, tweet, upload, pin, check in, swipe, like, share, react or message. Our real human connections are being replaced by virtual relationships. The simple truth is that for the most part we are spending huge proportions of our lives living in the digital universe and it is corrupting the way that we act with each other. But before I go into more detail about the ways in which social media is affecting our lives, it falls on me to introduce tonight's opposition.

Speaking first for the opposition tonight is my friend Lolly VAD Romani. Now in the spirit of tonight's debate Facebook memes often tell us to find you someone who can do both but as the treasurer elect of the Oxford Union as president of the Oxford Majlis Asian society as an incoming summer intern in JP Morgan's asset management division and as a regular attendee at all of the finest night clubs at Oxford has to offer Lolly VAD Romani can not only do both she can do it all.

Next up we have Liam Hackett founder and CEO of ditch the label Liam and I were chuckling earlier because when I was researching him in the lead-up to tonight's debate I came across the first comment on his Wikipedia page which simply read Liam Hackett should not have a Wikipedia page. Liam you'll be pleased to hear that I actually disagree. I have tremendous respect for you and the work they are doing for victims of cyberbullying and I look very much forward to hearing what you have to say tonight.

 Finally closing the case of the Opposition, we have dr. Jessica Calvinor Tinder sociologists. Now, in an attempt to sabotage my opposition and learn about their arguments for tonight's debate I set my tinder radius to the maximum 160 kilometers. However, it was obviously far enough not far enough because Jessica we are yet to match and I still have no idea what you're going to say against me tonight.

Mr. President these are our speakers and they are most welcome.
I'd now like to continue my argument by first discussing the impact that social media is having on us at an individual level because if we can agree that social media is affecting us as individuals and changing the way that we behave it follows that social media is affecting the way we interact with each other. Research from the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine studied over 1,700 people between the ages of 19 and 32. It was found that on average participants were spending 61 minutes per day on social media and visiting social media websites over 30 times per week.

This research was conducted in 2014 and the numbers have been growing steadily since that time. Over one quarter of the young people survey displayed indicators of high levels of depression and the people who most frequently check social media were found to be 2.7 times more likely to develop depression than the average. Now the opposition would have you believe that this data is inaccurate. Perhaps it is people who are already depressed that are turning to social media as an outlet. While this may be true to some degree, the extent of the data simply does not lie. Social media is causing depression for a lot of people and of course that depression is affecting the way that we interact with each other in the physical world. Perhaps, even more troubling than the relationship between social media and depression is the relationship between social media and eating disorders in young people and I'm not just talking about young girls. Eating disorders today are affecting people of all genders of all races and from all socioeconomic backgrounds and in some cases of all ages as well. The rise of pro anorexia and pro bulimia communities coupled with advancements in social media algorithms. Now means that these troubling communities have ways of reaching people who aren't even necessarily searching for them in the first instance. As someone whose immediate family has been directly affected by the ravages of an eating disorder, I can tell you that social media does have a part to play. Platforms like Facebook Instagram and Tumblr are giving young people distorted images of how their bodies should look and oftentimes the result is a serious mental illness that has far-reaching implications on loving families and loving friendships. The mere fact that Facebook and Instagram have simple methods for reporting self-harming and suicidal content is respectable but it is also a chilling indictment of the extent of this problem. So, if we take a step back and examine the questions that we have looked at so far: why is social media causing depression, why is social media causing eating disorders. The answer is one that I think we all inherently know: by being constantly presented with highly idealized views of our peers. Social media elicits feelings of envy and feelings of inadequacy by instilling us with the often-false belief that other people are living are living more successful or more fulfilling lives. Social media is not evil but it can very well be dishonest. It presents us with a standard that is unrealistic, a reality that is unreliable and a world which has been filtered and altered for the benefit of another person or group and that is the very essence of corruption. Not only is social media corrupting the way that we behaveas individuals in our own lives, it is also changing the way that we act as a society and the ways that we interact with our political leaders. In the recent US election Facebook's, I voted function generated three hundred and forty thousand extra votes. While it hasn't yet been determined whether these were in favor of Republican or in favor of Democrats, the implications on our freedom of thought are worryingly clear. To give you a perhaps more serious example, in Facebook's recent fake News scandal Facebook employees were accused by Gizmodo and

other journalists of falsely of choosing the Articles that appear as trending on our news feeds based on their own political beliefs. This alteration of information, this filtering of our reality is once again at the very heart of what corruption really is. But the issue goes deeper than any one, scandal social media is giving massive followings for people who are popular rather than people who are professional truth is quickly being replaced with speed and access and journalistic integrity is something that is quickly becoming harder and harder to find. We are not having organic interactions with each other with our friends without Idol with our family or with our political leaders and if you think we are I would urge you to be more skeptical.

In summary my message is simple we need not condemn social media but to be aware of the fact that it is corrupting our interactions. So, tonight I say to you all it's time to stop stalking and start talking and sometimes you can only you can learn more by looking someone in the eye then you can from looking at their social media profile proud to propose thanks you