



REVISTA INCLUSIONES

SEMINARIO BRASIL
AS REPRESENTAÇÕES SOCIAIS NO CONTEXTO DO BRASIL

Revista de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales

Número Especial Octubre / Diciembre

2019

ISSN 0719-4706

CUERPO DIRECTIVO

Directores

Dr. Juan Guillermo Mansilla Sepúlveda

Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile

Dr. Francisco Ganga Contreras

Universidad de Los Lagos, Chile

Subdirectores

Mg © Carolina Cabezas Cáceres

Universidad de Las Américas, Chile

Dr. Andrea Mutolo

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Editor

Drdo. Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Editor Científico

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo

Pontificia Universidade Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Editor Brasil

Drdo. Maicon Herverton Lino Ferreira da Silva

Universidade da Pernambuco, Brasil

Editor Ruropa del Este

Dr. Alekzandar Ivanov Katrandhiev

Universidad Suroeste "Neofit Rilski", Bulgaria

Cuerpo Asistente

Traductora: Inglés

Lic. Pauline Corthorn Escudero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Traductora: Portugués

Lic. Elaine Cristina Pereira Menegón

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

Portada

Sr. Felipe Maximiliano Estay Guerrero

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía, Chile

COMITÉ EDITORIAL

Dra. Carolina Aroca Toloza

Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Jaime Bassa Mercado

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

Dra. Heloísa Bellotto

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Nidia Burgos

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina

Mg. María Eugenia Campos

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Francisco José Francisco Carrera

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Mg. Keri González

Universidad Autónoma de la Ciudad de México, México

Dr. Pablo Guadarrama González

Universidad Central de Las Villas, Cuba

Mg. Amelia Herrera Lavanchy

Universidad de La Serena, Chile

Mg. Cecilia Jofré Muñoz

Universidad San Sebastián, Chile

Mg. Mario Lagomarsino Montoya

Universidad Adventista de Chile, Chile

Dr. Claudio Llanos Reyes

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Dr. Werner Mackenbach

Universidad de Potsdam, Alemania

Universidad de Costa Rica, Costa Rica

Mg. Rocío del Pilar Martínez Marín

Universidad de Santander, Colombia

Ph. D. Natalia Milanesio

Universidad de Houston, Estados Unidos

Dra. Patricia Virginia Moggia Münchmeyer

Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, Chile

Ph. D. Maritza Montero

Universidad Central de Venezuela, Venezuela

Dra. Eleonora Pencheva

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Rosa María Regueiro Ferreira

Universidad de La Coruña, España

Mg. David Ruete Zúñiga

Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, Chile

Dr. Andrés Saavedra Barahona

Universidad San Clemente de Ojrid de Sofía, Bulgaria

Dr. Efraín Sánchez Cabra
Academia Colombiana de Historia, Colombia

Dra. Mirka Seitz
Universidad del Salvador, Argentina

Ph. D. Stefan Todorov Kapralov
South West University, Bulgaria

COMITÉ CIENTÍFICO INTERNACIONAL

Comité Científico Internacional de Honor

Dr. Adolfo A. Abadía
Universidad ICESI, Colombia

Dr. Carlos Antonio Aguirre Rojas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Martino Contu
Universidad de Sassari, Italia

Dr. Luiz Alberto David Araujo
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dra. Patricia Brogna
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Horacio Capel Sáez
Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Javier Carreón Guillén
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Lancelot Cowie
Universidad West Indies, Trinidad y Tobago

Dra. Isabel Cruz Ovalle de Amenabar
Universidad de Los Andes, Chile

Dr. Rodolfo Cruz Vadillo
Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, México

Dr. Adolfo Omar Cueto
Universidad Nacional de Cuyo, Argentina

Dr. Miguel Ángel de Marco
Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Emma de Ramón Acevedo
Universidad de Chile, Chile

Dr. Gerardo Echeita Sarrionandia
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, España

Dr. Antonio Hermosa Andújar
Universidad de Sevilla, España

Dra. Patricia Galeana
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dra. Manuela Garau
Centro Studi Sea, Italia

Dr. Carlo Ginzburg Ginzburg
Scuola Normale Superiore de Pisa, Italia
Universidad de California Los Ángeles, Estados Unidos

Dr. Francisco Luis Girardo Gutiérrez
Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano, Colombia

José Manuel González Freire
Universidad de Colima, México

Dra. Antonia Heredia Herrera
Universidad Internacional de Andalucía, España

Dr. Eduardo Gomes Onofre
Universidade Estadual da Paraíba, Brasil

Dr. Miguel León-Portilla
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Miguel Ángel Mateo Saura
Instituto de Estudios Albacetenses "Don Juan Manuel", España

Dr. Carlos Tulio da Silva Medeiros
Diálogos em MERCOSUR, Brasil

+ Dr. Álvaro Márquez-Fernández
Universidad del Zulia, Venezuela

Dr. Oscar Ortega Arango
Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán, México

Dr. Antonio-Carlos Pereira Menaut
Universidad Santiago de Compostela, España

Dr. José Sergio Puig Espinosa
Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dra. Francesca Randazzo
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Honduras, Honduras

Dra. Yolando Ricardo

Universidad de La Habana, Cuba

Dr. Manuel Alves da Rocha

Universidade Católica de Angola Angola

Mg. Arnaldo Rodríguez Espinoza

Universidad Estatal a Distancia, Costa Rica

Dr. Miguel Rojas Mix

*Coordinador la Cumbre de Rectores Universidades
Estatales América Latina y el Caribe*

Dr. Luis Alberto Romero

CONICET / Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Maura de la Caridad Salabarría Roig

Dilemas Contemporáneos, México

Dr. Adalberto Santana Hernández

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Dr. Juan Antonio Seda

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dr. Saulo Cesar Paulino e Silva

Universidad de Sao Paulo, Brasil

Dr. Miguel Ángel Verdugo Alonso

Universidad de Salamanca, España

Dr. Josep Vives Rego

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Dr. Eugenio Raúl Zaffaroni

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Blanca Estela Zardel Jacobo

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México

Comité Científico Internacional

Mg. Paola Aceituno

Universidad Tecnológica Metropolitana, Chile

Ph. D. María José Aguilar Idañez

Universidad Castilla-La Mancha, España

Dra. Elian Araujo

Universidad de Mackenzie, Brasil

Mg. Romyana Atanasova Popova

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Dra. Ana Bénard da Costa

Instituto Universitario de Lisboa, Portugal

Centro de Estudos Africanos, Portugal

Dra. Alina Bestard Revilla

*Universidad de Ciencias de la Cultura Física y el
Deporte, Cuba*

Dra. Noemí Brenta

Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina

Dra. Rosario Castro López

Universidad de Córdoba, España

Ph. D. Juan R. Coca

Universidad de Valladolid, España

Dr. Antonio Colomer Vialdel

Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, España

Dr. Christian Daniel Cwik

Universidad de Colonia, Alemania

Dr. Eric de Léséulec

INS HEA, Francia

Dr. Andrés Di Masso Tarditti

Universidad de Barcelona, España

Ph. D. Mauricio Dimant

Universidad Hebrea de Jerusalén, Israel

Dr. Jorge Enrique Elías Caro

Universidad de Magdalena, Colombia

Dra. Claudia Lorena Fonseca

Universidad Federal de Pelotas, Brasil

Dra. Ada Gallegos Ruiz Conejo

Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos, Perú

Dra. Carmen González y González de Mesa

Universidad de Oviedo, España

Ph. D. Valentin Kitanov

Universidad Suroeste Neofit Rilski, Bulgaria

Mg. Luis Oporto Ordóñez

Universidad Mayor San Andrés, Bolivia

Dr. Patricio Quiroga

Universidad de Valparaíso, Chile

REVISTA INCLUSIONES

REVISTA DE HUMANIDADES
Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Dr. Gino Ríos Patio

Universidad de San Martín de Porres, Per

Dr. Carlos Manuel Rodríguez Arrechavaleta

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. Vivian Romeu

Universidad Iberoamericana Ciudad de México, México

Dra. María Laura Salinas

Universidad Nacional del Nordeste, Argentina

Dr. Stefano Santasilia

Universidad della Calabria, Italia

Mg. Silvia Laura Vargas López

Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos, México

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Dra. Jaqueline Vassallo

Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina

Dr. Evandro Viera Ouriques

Universidad Federal de Río de Janeiro, Brasil

Dra. María Luisa Zagalaz Sánchez

Universidad de Jaén, España

Dra. Maja Zawierzeniec

Universidad Wszechnica Polska, Polonia

Editorial Cuadernos de Sofía

Santiago – Chile

Representante Legal

Juan Guillermo Estay Sepúlveda Editorial

Indización, Repositorios y Bases de Datos Académicas

Revista Inclusiones, se encuentra indizada en:





REX



UNIVERSITY OF
SASKATCHEWAN



Universidad
de Concepción

BIBLIOTECA UNIVERSIDAD DE CONCEPCIÓN



RHETORICAL ARGUMENTATION IN MODERN PUBLIC SPEAKING

Ph. D. (c) Alla Vorobiova

Kherson State University, Ukraine
shkrekster@gmail.com

Ph. D. Iryna Shaposhnykova

Kherson State University, Ukraine
fapis@ukr.net

Ph. D. (c) Iryna Hlushchenko

Kherson State University, Ukraine
dianochkavelush@gmail.com

Ph. D. (c) Tatiana Shvets

Kherson State University, Ukraine
turchanova@ksu.ks.ua

Ph. D. (c) Viktoriia Koval

Kherson State University, Ukraine
kovalviktoriya26@gmail.com

Fecha de Recepción: 12 de junio de 2019 – **Fecha Revisión:** 28 de julio de 2019

Fecha de Aceptación: 16 de agosto 2019 – **Fecha de Publicación:** 25 de septiembre 2019

Abstract

This research addresses modern tendencies in rhetorical argumentation. The theoretical rationale of the study lies in the different approaches to studying the forms of arguments and their content. The study showed that the compositional perfection of argumentation can be successfully implemented where sequential deployment of the logical arguments and emotional reasoning achieve such goals as audience acquisition, acceptance and planned response. The argumentative system chosen allows for distinguishing the contemporary aspects of persuasive strategies in public appearance. To obtain an understanding of recent trends in argumentation, an analysis was performed of political speeches delivered by the presidents of Belarus, Kazakhstan, China, Ukraine and the United States during the 70th session of the United Nations General Assembly (September 15, 2015). As a result of this inquiry into the rhetorical discourse we tried to facilitate students' learning of argumentation, to develop their ability to critically analyse sample texts, to give them to understand what arguments and reasoning are more preferable. With the methodology of cliché (sample text) replenishment, we describe a way to engage students in studying rhetorical discourse, help them to develop the ability to analyse modern argumentation critically in the real-world contexts.

Keywords

Public Appearance – Rhetorical Argumentation – Logical Arguments – Emotional Reasoning
New Persuasive Strategies

Para Citar este Artículo:

Vorobiova, Alla; Shaposhnykova, Iryna; Hlushenko, Iryna; Shvets, Tatiana y Koval, Viktoriia. Rhetorical argumentation in modern public speaking. Revista Inclusiones Vol: 6 num Especial (2019): 257-275.

Introduction

Dynamic and constantly changing modern life requires the skills to construct both informative speeches and persuasive ones. The effective speaking is provided by Rhetoric, a science addresses “*the human capacity to create and articulate knowledge*”¹ grounded on the principles of argumentation. Today the argumentative strategies are strenuously involved in many processes: 1) to revive civic education²; 2) to facilitate academic discourse³; 3) to algorithmize the argumentation scripts with the help of artificial intelligence⁴; 4) to promote the interactive cognitive activities⁵; 5) to create an argument-based framework for decision making⁶, etc. Nevertheless, it ought to be remarked that *Aristotle and Cicero*, still belong to the core of argumentation theory⁷. In ancient Greece and Rome, the greatest orators (*Aristotle, Quintilian, Plato, Cicero and others*) developed the principles of common argument tactics, searching for the algorithm for constructing the most persuasive evidence and reasoning presentation. *Cicero*, in his treatise “*De Oratore*,” gave practical suggestions for inventing effective arguments. He recommended not simply following the rules of eloquence but noting down and collecting the habitual and instinctive methods of the masters of eloquence. *Cicero* claimed, “...eloquence is not produced by art, but the art has sprung from the practice of the eloquent”⁸.

¹ T. Strand, “Peirce’s New Rhetoric: Prospects for educational theory and research”, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol: 45 num 7 (2013): 707-711.

² M. J. Hogan and A. J. Kurr, “Civic education in competitive speech and debate. Argumentation and Advocacy”, Vol: 53 num 2 (2017): 83-89.

³ P. D. Gaonkar, “The Idea of Rhetoric in the Rhetoric of Science”, *Southern Communication Journal*, Vol: 58 num 4 (1993). Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10417949309372909>; O. Noroozi, Considering students’ epistemic beliefs to facilitate their argumentative discourse and attitudinal change with a digital dialogue game (*Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 2016). Retrieved from: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14703297.2016.1208112> y M. J. Wojdak, “An attention-grabbing approach to introducing students to argumentation in science”, *Bioscience Education*, Vol: 15 num 1 (2010): 1-3.

⁴ P. M. Dung, “On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games”, *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol: 77 (1995): 321–357; S. De Ascaniis, “Criteria for designing and evaluating argument diagramming tools from the point of view of argumentation theory”, in *Educational technologies for teaching Argumentation Skills*, eds. N. Pinkwart, and B. Mc.Laren (Bentham Science, eBook, 2012); O. Noroozi, Considering students’ epistemic...; A. Weinberger and F. Fischer, “A framework to analyse argumentative knowledge construction in computer-supported collaborative learning”, *Computer and Education*, Vol: 46 num 1 (2006): 71-95 y G. Carenini and J. D. Moore, “Generating and evaluating evaluative arguments”, *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol: 170 (2006): 925–952. Retrieved from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000437020600066X>

⁵ J.K. Staarman, K. Krol and H. Meijden, “Peer Interaction in Three Collaborative Learning Environments”, *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, Vol: 40.1 (2005): 29-39. Retrieved from: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ768690.pdf>

⁶ L. Amgoud and H. Prade, “Using arguments for making and explaining decisions”, *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol: 173 num 3-4 (2009): 413-436. Retrieved from: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000437020800194X> y F. Paglieri and C. Castelfranchi, “Why argue? Towards a cost-benefit analysis of argumentation”, *Argument & Computation*, Vol: 1 num 1 (2010): 71-91.

⁷ F.H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragmadiadical Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). Retrieved from: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3e38/d3ca665a2cdcb05d806e66aea277b1b0f78a.pdf>

⁸ Cicero, *De Oratore*, book 1, Translated into English with an introduction by E.N.P. Moor (London: Clifton COLLBGB, 1892). Retrieved from: https://archive.org/stream/deoratorebook1tr00ciceuoft/deoratorebook1tr00ciceuoft_djvu.txt

Considering this opinion, we believe that a detailed analysis of rhetorical argumentative strategies used by today's speakers will give an accurate idea for current speech persuasive patterns. Before delving more deeply into this, let us consider the fundamental steps.

- 1) Define the main components of rhetorical argumentation framework.
- 2) Research the argumentation types and techniques.
- 3) Study the quantitative and qualitative set of argumentative strategies in modern public speaking.
- 4) Apply an appropriate methodology to facilitate learning argumentation.

Rhetorical Argumentation Framework

Rhetoric is a vivid practical science that requires permanent refinement of its theory⁹ to understand effective mechanisms of current discourse confrontation for gaining agreement from the opponent. The debates about how to study argumentation bring the theorists of the Western tradition¹⁰ to three perspectives: the logical, the dialectical and the rhetorical. The *triumvirate*¹¹ performs argumentation as a product, as a process and as a procedure¹². After a well-known Peirce's work¹³, the New Rhetoric is included in general logic¹⁴ and becomes "*the highest and liveliest branch*" of it. Therefore, the rhetorical argumentation is regarded as the form of logical mainly due to rhetoric inability to build a strict model of reasoning¹⁵.

The "*continuing competition*"¹⁶ between dialectic and rhetoric primacy has defined the dialectical approach as a "*part of the study of verbal communication also known as 'discourse analysis'*" and the rhetorical one as the art of persuading an audience¹⁷.

⁹ F. J. D'Angelo, "The Rhetoric of Intertextuality", *Rhetoric Review*, Vol: 29 num 1 (2009). Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07350190903415172>

¹⁰ Ch. Perelman, *The Realm of Rhetoric* (Notre Dame/London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1982); J. Wenzel, "Three Perspectives on Argument", in *Perspectives on Argumentation: Essays in Honour of Wayne Brockreide*, eds. R. Trapp and J. Schutz (Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland, 1990), 9-16. Retrieved from: <https://ru.scribd.com/document/67636047/Wenzel-Three-Perspectives-on-Argument>; C. W. Tindale, *Acts of arguing: A Rhetorical Model of Argument* (Albany: State University of York Press, 1999); J. A. Blair, "The Relationships among Logic, Dialectic and Rhetoric", in *Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation*, eds. F. H. van Eemeren, J. A. Blair, Ch.A. Willard and F. Snoeck Henkemans (Amsterdam: Sic Sat, 2003); R. H. Johnson, *Revisiting the Logical/Dialectical/Rhetorical Triumvirate* (OSSA Conference Archive, 2009). Retrieved from: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA8/papersandcommentaries/84> y F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*

¹¹ R. H. Johnson, *Revisiting the...*

¹² J. Wenzel, *Three Perspectives...*

¹³ C. S. Peirce, "Ideas, stray and stolen, about scientific writing", in *The essential Peirce. Selected philosophical writings*, num 2 (1893–1913), eds. N. Houser N. and C.J.W. Kloesel (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1904), 325–330.

¹⁴ J. J. Liszka, "Peirce's Revolutionary Concept of Rhetoric", in *Ideas in Action: Proceedings of the Applying Peirce Conference. Nordic Studies in Pragmatism 1*. M. Bergman, S. Paavola, A.-V. Pietarinen and H. Rydenfelt (Helsinki: Nordic Pragmatism Network, 2010). Retrieved from: <http://www.nordprag.org/nsp/1/Liszka.pdf> y T. Strand, *Peirce's New Rhetoric...*

¹⁵ E. Ivunina, *Implicit Knowledge on the Argumentative Structure: synopsis of a thesis* (Moscow, 2008). Retrieved from: <http://cheloveknauka.com/neyavnoe-znanie-v-strukture-argumentatsii>

¹⁶ F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*

The rhetoric theorists in the Post-Soviet states generally address logic and dialectic to the cognitive basis of practical rhetoric¹⁸ drawing on Aristotle's and Lomonosov's fundamental works¹⁹. The logical argumentation is regarded as complete, strict and closed product when the rhetorical is seen as uncategorized and open to its form and content development²⁰. It can be distinguished that the rhetorical argumentation specificity is grounded on the process of persuasive communications²¹, where the effective influencing on opponent demands logical and dialectical perspectives as well. Nevertheless, while logical and dialectical discourse fallacies are permissible to use and create, "... *in rhetorical arguments, the premises need only be plausible for the audience*"²². Therefore, we can point the most rhetorical argumentation striking features: 1) intention to persuade; 2) striving for mutual understanding and acceptance; 3) using logical, ethnic and emotional premises (grounds) verbal and nonverbal; 4) appealing to goodwill and justice; 5) prohibition regarding manipulation and false information.

Argumentation in rhetoric is a form of reasoning that has the aim of generating a new one²³ and it is seen as "*the umbrella under which all reasoning lies*"²⁴. Quite recently, considerable attention has been paid to defining the denotation of the argumentative set. It is called variously *subconcept*²⁵, *microtheme*²⁶, *compositional element*²⁷, *structural-content block*²⁸, *act*²⁹, *model*³⁰, *set of statements*³¹ or *set of propositions*³², etc. The problem of modeling is connected with complexity and heterogeneity of rhetorical argumentation phenomenon.

¹⁷ F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*

¹⁸ Y. Rozhdestvensky, *Theory of Rhetoric* (Moscow: Dobrosvet, 1997). Retrieved from: <https://knigogid.ru/books/400606-teoriya-ritoriki/toread>; N. A. Bezmenova, *Essays on the Theory and History of Rhetoric* (Moscow: Nauka, 1991). Retrieved from: [https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=y T. Anisimova and G. Gimpelson, Modern Business Rhetoric \(Voronezh, 2002\). Retrieved from: https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0%2C5&q](https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=y T. Anisimova and G. Gimpelson, Modern Business Rhetoric (Voronezh, 2002). Retrieved from: https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0%2C5&q)

¹⁹ A. Makovelsky, *History of Logic* (Moscow: Kuchkove pole, 2004). Retrieved from: http://www.logic-books.info/sites/default/files/makovelskiy_a.o._istoriya_logiki.pdf

²⁰ N.A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...*

²¹ O.S. Issers, *Speech effects* (Moscow: Flinta, Nauka, 2009) y J. Wenzel, *Three Perspectives...*

²² F.H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*

²³ N.A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...* 1991.

²⁴ M. Goldstein, A. Crowell and D. Kuhn, "What Constitutes Skilled Argumentation and How Does it Develop?", *Informal Logic*, Vol: 29 num 4 (2009). Retrieved from: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.893.3372&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

²⁵ N.A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...*

²⁶ M.R. Lvov, *Rhetoric. Speech culture* (Moscow: Academia, 2004). Retrieved from: <http://journal.at.ua/publ/26-1-0-220>

²⁷ A. Volkov, *Foundations of Rhetoric* (Moscow: Akademicheskij Prospekt, 2003).

²⁸ M. Bloch and E. Freydina, *Public Speech and its Prosodic Organisation* (Moscow: Prometey, 2011). Retrieved from: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=TguHCwAAQBAJ&pg=PP1&lpg=PP1&dq>

²⁹ S. E. Toulmin, *The uses of argument* (U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

³⁰ C. W. Tindale, *Rhetorical argumentation: Principles of theory and practice* (California: Sage, 2004).

³¹ S. De Ascaniis and L. Cantoni, *Online visit opinions about attractions of the religious heritage: an argumentative approach*, *Church. Communication and Culture*, Vol: 2 No 2 (2017). Retrieved from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23753234.2017.1350585>

³² T. Honderich, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* (Oxford University Press, 1995). Retrieved from: <http://www.math.fu-berlin.de/users/diederich/downloads/Oxford.pdf>

The quantitative and qualitative composition of such a structural-content block is not clearly established. The simplest model consists of two main elements: thesis and grounds³³ where the thesis stirs up the question “why” and the grounds reply “because...”³⁴. The three-component argumentation set, the preferred one in the Post-Soviet states, includes the thesis, the argument and the demonstration³⁵. The thesis is the main idea, which must be justified, the argument (three or more points) convincingly proves the truth of the thesis, and the demonstration represents the process of developing the thesis statement to support the argument. Such an approach for constructing an argumentation framework has a wide variety of interpretations.

Another three-component block consists of the top, the scheme and the reduction. Based on this method³⁶ the top reflects the general idea of reasoning, the scheme determines the sequence of arguments, and the reduction reduces the terms’ meaning into the value of the top. Set of three main elements can also be distinguished as standpoint (claim or position), argument and counter-argument³⁷. A four-component structure³⁸ includes the situation, the problem, the solution, and the assessment and is usually used for rhetorical analysis³⁹. Invented by Toulmin⁴⁰, a basic structure of argumentation involves six components: the claim that is the more specific sub-opinion, the data, the warrant showing why the data supports the claim and the concluding statement, the qualifiers which are special conditions that present the arguer’s degree of certainty about the claim, backing “underlying assumptions that provide justification for the warrant, and rebuttals that acknowledge the limits of a claim”⁴¹. Such a wide range of approaches demonstrates the researchers’ wish to detect an integrated variant of the argumentation framework, and confirms the urgency of inventing a universally effective pattern of speech.

The active search has led the scientists to focus on the quality of the premises and the accuracy of the content within an argument. As a result, it brings to the framework based on consideration of the argumentative discourse goals⁴².

Rhetorical Argumentation Types and Techniques

Michael Gilbert points out that the successful argument building combines relevant and acceptable premises “*where collectively they provide adequate grounds for accepting*

³³ A. Alekseev, *Argumentation. Cognition. Communication* (Moscow: MSU Publishing House, 1991). Retrieved from: <http://www.philos.msu.ru/sites/default/files/lib/%D0%90%D0%BB%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%B5%D0%B2.pdf> y T. Honderich, *The Oxford Companion...*

³⁴ I. A. Sternin, *Practical Rhetoric in Explanations and Exercises for Those Who Want to Learn to Speak* (Voronezh: Istoki, 2011). Retrieved from: http://sterninia.ru/files/757/4_Izbrannye_nauchnye_publicacii/Rechevoe_vozdejstvie/Prakticheskaja%20 ritorika.pdf

³⁵ L. A. Vvedenskaya and L.G. Pavlova, *Culture and the art of speech. Modern rhetoric* (Rostov-on-Don: Publishing house "Phoenix", 1995).

³⁶ A. Volkov, *Foundations of...*

³⁷ S. De Ascaniis and L. Cantoni, *Online visit...*

³⁸ S. Tirkkonen-Condit, *Argumentative Text Structure and Translation* (U.S.: University of Jyväskylä, 1985).

³⁹ M. Bloch and E. Freydina, *Public Speech...*

⁴⁰ S.E. Toulmin, *The uses of...*

⁴¹ M. Goldstein, A. Crowell and D. Kuhn, *What Constitutes...*

⁴² M. Goldstein, A. Crowell and D. Kuhn, *What Constitutes...* y D. Walton, *Plausible Argument in Everyday Conversation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992).

*the conclusion*⁴³. Argument creating and conjunction depend on the choice of beneficial reasoning types and techniques.

Rhetorical argumentation framework can be arranged internally with different types of techniques: direct/indirect, descending/ascending, one-sided/two-sided, contradictory/supporting, etc. The types of direct and indirect argumentation⁴⁴ are widely known: in the direct case, the evidence substantiates the thesis; in the indirect one, the thesis is confirmed through the antithesis's denial. The researchers also determine descending and ascending types of argumentation⁴⁵. For the descending construction, the speaker offers the strongest arguments at the beginning of a speech, gradually moving to the weaker ones and concludes with an emotional request, prompting or conclusion. The ascending argumentation suggests that the intensity of feelings and arguments will increase by the end of the speech. It should be taken into consideration that the weak reasoning in the descending type of argumentation creates a better outcome.

When presenting your point of view, you can adduce one-sided or two-sided argumentation technique. The one-sided appeal pattern suggests either pros or cons. With the two-sided framework, the recipient gets an opportunity to evaluate the opposite arguments and chooses one of several points of view⁴⁶. Rhetorical discourse can contain contradictory/supporting types or argument/counter-argument⁴⁷. In contradictory argumentation, the speaker gradually destroys the real or possible counter-arguments of an opponent. With supportive arguments, the speaker puts forward only the positive reasoning.

Modern rhetorical studies offer a broad range of argument types grouped according to their *form* and *content*. The specified classification is used differently in the wide range of researchers⁴⁸. Speaking about argumentative content, some researchers divide argumentation into epideictic, judicial and deliberative⁴⁹ after the genres classification given by Aristotle, Sopatros, Hermogenos⁵⁰. The epideictic type is responsible for "*establishing principles and values on the basis of which problems are discussed*"⁵¹. The judicial one identifies and evaluates facts with respect to the past. Deliberative argumentation focuses on future decision-making. Due to the New Rhetoric the classification can be based upon argumentation by association; quasi-logical argumentation; argumentation based on the structure of reality; argumentation that grounds the structure of reality; argumentation by dissociation⁵².

⁴³ M. Gilbert, "Emotion, Argumentation and Informal Logic", *Informal Logic*, Vol: 24 num 3 (2004).

⁴⁴ A. Volkov, *Foundations of...*

⁴⁵ I. A. Sternin, *Practical Rhetoric...*

⁴⁶ I. A. Sternin, *Practical Rhetoric...*

⁴⁷ S. De Ascaniis and L. Cantoni, *Online visit...* y I. A. Sternin, *Practical Rhetoric...*

⁴⁸ G. Vreeswijk, "Abstract argumentation systems", *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol: 90 num 1-2 (1997): 225-279.

⁴⁹ T. Anisimova and G. Gimpelson, *Modern Business...*; A. Volkov, *Foundations of...* y Y. Rozhdestvensky, *Theory of...*

⁵⁰ C. Pepe, *The genres of rhetorical speeches in Greek and Roman antiquity* (Boston: Brill, 2013).

⁵¹ A. Volkov, *Foundations of...*

⁵² C. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969) y G. G. Hazagerov, *Rhetorical dictionary* (Moscow: Flinta, Nauka, 2009).

The clear parallels were drawn between the argumentation types: based on the structure of reality, rhetorical syllogisms (enthymemes) and the argument schemes that ground the structure of reality, rhetorical induction (examples)⁵³. After Aristotle's system, the researchers define this pair in different ways: technical /non-technical⁵⁴, theoretical/empirical⁵⁵, intrinsic/extrinsic⁵⁶. Extrinsic premises embody the laws, facts, testimonial evidence, examples, etc. and intrinsic ones depend upon the three components: plausible rational basis (appeals to logos), relevant moral rules and principles (appeals to ethos), benevolent feelings and emotions (appeals to pathos). Appeals to logos, in turn, can be presented as a rhetorical syllogism⁵⁷ (deductive or inductive) and its forms: an enthymeme (one of the clauses remains implicit), an epicheireme (expanded syllogism), a dilemma (complex syllogism with two opposite premises), a sorites (chain of related premises), etc.⁵⁸.

Appeals to ethos and pathos are sometimes posed as emotional reasoning not attributed to the grave arguments⁵⁹. Nevertheless, there is a vivid key point that “*the utilization of emotion in arguments in part or in whole is perfectly rational*”⁶⁰, the rhetorical validity⁶¹ of emotional arguments obviously need appropriate logic and vice versa. The emotional arguments occur not because of the strict logical necessity but because of motivated speaker's choice,⁶² appearing as pragmatically reasonable or justified.

Therefore, the argumentation array makes the public appearance truly rhetorical only if the intrinsic reasoning conveys all aspects of the methodological triad⁶³ of eloquence (appeals to logos, ethos, and pathos). The rhetoric paradigm should primarily include the conglomeration of speech qualities: 1) plausibility⁶⁴; 2) relevance⁶⁵; 3) benevolence⁶⁶ on the background of which an obligatory condition for a rhetorical feedback is novelty⁶⁷ and persuasiveness⁶⁸.

⁵³ F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*

⁵⁴ N. A. Kolotilova, *Rhetoric: textbook* (Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature, 2007). Retrieved from: <http://padaread.com/?book=84753&pg=1>

⁵⁵ A. K. Mihalskaja, *The Russian language. Rhetoric. 10–11 grades* (Moscow: Drofa, 2011). Retrieved from: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5_OUge9Bj1AMHJadEoza0FIMzg/view y W. Shi, *Paul's Message of the Cross as Body Language* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

⁵⁶ T. Van Dijk, *What is Political Discourse Analysis? Political Linguistics* (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1997). Retrieved from: <http://discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf> y F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*

⁵⁷ F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...* y N. A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...*

⁵⁸ N. A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...*

⁵⁹ T. Honderich, *The Oxford Companion...*

⁶⁰ M. Gilbert, *Emotion, Argumentation...*

⁶¹ R. E. McKerrow, “Rhetorical Validity: An Analysis of Three Perspectives on the Justification of Rhetorical Argument”, *Argumentation and Advocacy*, Vol: 13 num 3 (1977): 133-141.

⁶² N. A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...*

⁶³ N. A. Kolotilova, *Rhetoric: textbook...*

⁶⁴ Y. Rozhdestvensky, *Theory of...*; N. A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...*; F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory...*; D. Walton, *Plausible Argument...* y Y. Rozhdestvensky, *Theory of...*

⁶⁵ Y. Rozhdestvensky, *Theory of...*; N. A. Bezmenova, *Essays on...* y M. Gilbert, *Emotion, Argumentation...*

⁶⁶ T. Honderich, *The Oxford Companion...*

⁶⁷ Y. Rozhdestvensky, *Theory of...*

The required completeness of the methodological triad is relevant to rhetorical public speaking in modern society. Under the current conditions of ongoing struggle between discourses⁶⁹ “*only the ethos is the real proof that the discourse is rhetorical*”⁷⁰. The disregard for the ethos leads to fallacies and distortions making sophisticated arguments with concealed duality⁷¹ or “*a sophisticated tactic to bring pressure against an opponent in argument*”⁷² that essentially are not rhetorical and hybrid in character. Without the pathos, the argumentation material acquires the properties of the strict scientific discourse⁷³.

The ethical arguments are divided into empathy and repudiation⁷⁴ where an ethical norm is accepted, and the anti-norm is negated respectively. In the case of empathy, rhetorical statements are directed towards positive moral principles, and the addressee reveals intentions to share ethical values accepted by society. If it is repudiation, the speaker opposes immoral manifestations seeking audience support. The pathetic arguments include promises and threats when the speaker's influence is based on establishing analogies with addressee's specific positive or negative experience.

Among the emotional reasoning, the researchers traditionally single out the arguments “*to the person*”, to various aspects or hypostases, e.g., an appeal to authority, vanity, pity, motive, force, etc. Some scientists also single out the emotional contextual appeals to obviousness, faith, taste, fashion, tradition, etc⁷⁵. Therefore, it is obvious that the compositional perfection of argumentation can be successfully implemented through the sequential deployment of logical arguments and emotional reasoning to achieve audience acquisition, acceptance and planned response.

The Quantitative and Qualitative Set of Argumentative Strategies in Modern Public Speaking

Rhetoric is traditionally associated with a political discourse⁷⁶ and the permanent attempts to analyse it. Most critics now concur that there is no single method that can be used to analyze all types of a rhetorical discourse⁷⁷. Nevertheless, new studies reveal that the rhetorical analysis aim is to evaluate argumentation with regard to its effectiveness⁷⁸ or persuasion⁷⁹.

To consider the effective persuasive strategies of contemporary argumentation, we analyzed some samples of political discourse. The texts of public speeches delivered by

⁶⁸ N. A. Bezmenova, Essays on...

⁶⁹ P. Cohen, Reason seen more as weapon than path to truth (The New York Times, June 14, 2011).

⁷⁰ R. F. Verderber, K. S. Verderber and D. D. Sellnow, The challenge of effective speaking. (15th ed.) (U.S.: Cengage Learning, 2011).

⁷¹ D. Walton, Plausible Argument...

⁷² T. Honderich, The Oxford Companion...

⁷³ A. Volkov, Foundations of...

⁷⁴ G.G. Hazagerov, Rhetorical dictionary...

⁷⁵ I.A. Sternin, Practical Rhetoric... y A. Volkov, Foundations of...

⁷⁶ T. Van Dijk, What is... y D. L. Swanson and D. D. Nimmo, New directions in political communication: a resource book (Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1990).

⁷⁷ T. Van Dijk, What is...; F. J. D'Angelo, The Rhetoric of... y F. H. Van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, A Systematic Theory...

⁷⁸ Y. Rozhdestvensky, Theory of...

⁷⁹ T. Van Dijk, What is...

the presidents of Belarus, Kazakhstan, China, the United States and Ukraine during the 70th session of the UN General Assembly (September 15, 2015) were considered.

The selection of material addresses the unprecedented rhetorical event, when the competitive environment between the discourses of different political regimes requires the politicians “*continuously weigh, calculate and choose each word*”⁸⁰. In such a case, the speaker acts as the rhetorical ideal, “*cannot afford an unguarded moment*”⁸¹, creating the perfect models of reasoning, representing its best of language, ethics, morality and emotionally expressive culture.

The presidential speech is a political discourse⁸² appearing in a monologue. Within monological and dialogical types⁸³ of rhetorical discourse, the argumentation is mostly regarded as a means of improving a given dialogical situation⁸⁴. Researchers are arguing over the argumentation properties naming them constructive⁸⁵ or destructive⁸⁶. It is worth noting that the “*rhetorical perspective*”⁸⁷ of the political monologue definitely brings constructive “*argumentative optimism*”⁸⁸ for the listeners. The audience obtains the strategic advantage, in the case of either rational effectiveness or illogical weakness, the recipient accepts or denies the speaker’s ideas respectively.

Specificity of such a public appearance lies in the lack of reflection and inability to evaluate individual responses. The recipients are not the people or citizens but the masses, so the political discourse is in consonance with the media one⁸⁹. Expecting the masses reaction, the Presidents apply the elements of diplomatic eloquence⁹⁰ but avoid using lexical jargon (typically political words)⁹¹. The mastery of eloquence is actualized when the speakers pilot the interlocutors through the main discourse stages: audience involvement, acceptance of the opinions and developing a “*new manufacture*” of conveying ideas.

We have examined the various levels of discourse structure and have seen what typical argumentative strategies seem to have this status of preferred methods of doing a persuasive political speech. The analysis includes evaluation which extrinsic and intrinsic arguments are used when the politicians want to emphasize effectively the political attitudes and opinions.

⁸⁰ J. Kane, What’s at stake in Australian political rhetoric?, in *Studies in Australian Political Rhetoric*, eds. J. Uhr and R. Walter (Australia: ANU Press The Australian National University Canberra ACT 0200, 2013). Retrieved from: <http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/p291051/pdf/What%E2%80%99s-at-stake-in-Australian-political-rhetoric.pdf>

⁸¹ J. Kane, What’s at...

⁸² T. Van Dijk, What is...

⁸³ P. Besnard, A. Garcia, A. Hunter, S. Modgil, H. Prakken and G. Simari, G. “Introduction to Structured Argumentation”, *Argument and Computation*, Vol: 5 num 1 (2014): 1-4.

⁸⁴ F. Paglieri, *Ruinous Arguments: Escalation of Disagreement and the Dangers of Arguing* (Argument Cultures: Proceedings of OSSA, 2009).

⁸⁵ F. Paglieri and C. Castelfranchi, *Why argue? Towards...*

⁸⁶ F. Paglieri, *Ruinous Arguments...* y R. H. Johnson, *Revisiting the...*

⁸⁷ R. H. Johnson, *Revisiting the...*

⁸⁸ F. Paglieri and C. Castelfranchi, *Why argue? Towards...*

⁸⁹ T. Van Dijk, What is...

⁹⁰ S. M. Gustafson, *Eloquence is power: Oratory & performance in early America* (Williamsburg, Virginia: Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, 2000).

⁹¹ T. Van Dijk, What is...

It should be noted some similarities and differences are evident. Most speech outlines reflect the combination of deductive argumentative blocks, presenting an edifying, instructive, peremptory character. In contrast, the choice of inductive array is associated with the possibility of identifying the intentions of the speech addressee. Such sets of argumentation form a multistage process of substantiating theses. The most of microthemes obtain the deductive patterns, for example:

The value of the integration process lies in its democratic nature. To a certain extent it equalizes the opportunities for all stakeholders and enables small and middle-sized countries to develop their potential and become an important link in this process⁹².

Our attempts to establish a scheme germane to monological argumentation in a political discourse has led to consideration of the goals⁹³. After Walton's two goals of argumentation (a) to support the opponent's opinion, and b) to weaken the opponent's position), the studied argumentative array obviously stands out through two inherent "exact political" elements: 1) the evaluative arguments "supporting an argumentation strategy based on user preferences"⁹⁴; 2) call to action. For example:

We should create a security architecture featuring fairness, justice, joint contribution and shared benefits. In the age of economic globalization, the security of all countries is interlinked and has impact on one another. No country can maintain absolute security with its own effort, and no country can achieve stability out of other countries' instability⁹⁵.

We strongly condemn terrorism in all its forms and manifestations. The activity of ISIL, Al Qaeda, Boko Haram, Al Shabaab and others is the global challenge. The only possible way to address it is to unite in common and non-compromised fight against this evil.⁹⁶

From a logical point of view, the speakers aspire to systematize public discourse, algorithmizing its delivery. This is realized through the widespread use of logico-psychological arguments (e.g., enthymeme as a method of explaining logical evidence), anatomy (i.e., arranging in a strict order), enumeration (i.e. citation of facts), etc.⁹⁷.

Most of the attention-getting arguments are intrinsic arguments to pathos. Some of them are the threats: "... And if we cannot work together more effectively, we will all suffer the consequences"⁹⁸. However, the promises prevail: "We will continue to pursue common

⁹² A. Lukashenko, President of the Republic of Belarus (New York, September 28, 2015, United Nations General Assembly, Seventieth Session, General Debate, 2015). Retrieved from: <https://gadebate.un.org/en/70/belarus>

⁹³ D. Walton, Plausible Argument... y M. Goldstein, A. Crowell and D. Kuhn, What Constitutes...

⁹⁴ G. Carenini and J. D. Moore, Generating and evaluating...

⁹⁵ H. Xi, President of the People's Republic of China (New York, September 28, 2015, General Debate of the 70th Session of the UN General Assembly, 2015). Retrieved from: https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/70/70_ZH_en.pdf

⁹⁶ P. Poroshenko, Statement by the President at the General Debate of the 70th session of the United Nations General Assembly (New York, September 28, 2015). Retrieved from: <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-na-zagalnih-debatah-70-yi-sesiyi-36057>

⁹⁷ G. G. Hazagerov, Rhetorical dictionary...

⁹⁸ B. Obama, Remarks by President Obama to the United Nations General Assembly United Nations Headquarters (New York, September 28, 2015). Retrieved from:

*development and the win-win strategy of opening-up. We are ready to share our development experience and opportunities with other countries*⁹⁹. The influence of pathos activates the listeners' partaking and perception, appealing to the extreme level of emotional tension (from possible universal suffering to the common benefits).

A topology that studies "*what various types of discourses in what situations may be about*"¹⁰⁰ has its contractions in this situation. If the heart topics of classical pathos lie the notion of the two main strata – Love and Hatred¹⁰¹, the pathetic of political discourse is premised on the opposition between Good and Evil. The secondary common topics are global challenges (environmental issues, war, nuclear weapons, terrorism, challenges of refugees and migration policy, etc), domestic and foreign policy, historical background and future perspectives. For example, every speaker's contribution contains empathy appeals to shared environmental issues: "*Ukraine as a member of "Friends of Climate" Group is looking forward to reaching consensus on the universal agreement in the area of climate change as soon as possible. We hope that this result will be achieved by the UN Member States in December this year in Paris. We have to understand that the price of this issue is the safety of future generations and sustainable development of mankind.*"¹⁰². It is significant that the urgency of the discourse topics permits to perceive the loss of the other themes topicality (e.g.: crime, drugs, education, health problems, etc).

It is illustrative that politicians do not use humour in pathetic interventions as a rhetoric strategy trying to avoid misunderstandings and possibility to be shown up as populists¹⁰³. When "social actors"¹⁰⁴ endeavor "*to make use of humour for serious purposes*"¹⁰⁵ they choose irony, for example: "*You can try to control access to information, but you cannot turn a lie into truth. It is not a conspiracy of U.S.-backed NGOs that expose corruption and raise the expectations of people around the globe ...*"¹⁰⁶. The next largest group is composed of intrinsic arguments to ethos. The selection of topics is limited, avoiding political battles, religious quarrels. The speakers do not use *ad hominem arguments* directing against the man, not against his arguments¹⁰⁷, *argumentum ad baculum* as a rhetorical tactic used to put an end to further argument^{108 109}. Within four different kinds of emotional appeals that fall under the general heading of *argumentum ad misericordiam*¹¹⁰, the speakers shun the appeals to pity and sympathy, applying to compassion and mercy.

<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-united-nations-general-assembly>

⁹⁹ H. Xi, President of...

¹⁰⁰ T. Van Dijk, What is...

¹⁰¹ N. A. Bezmenova, Essays on...

¹⁰² P. Poroshenko, Statement by...

¹⁰³ R. Săftoiu and C. Popescu, "Humor as a branding strategy in political discourse. A case study from Romania", *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística*, Vol: 47 num 85 (2014). Retrieved from: <https://scielo.conicyt.cl/pdf/signos/v47n85/a07.pdf>

¹⁰⁴ R. Săftoiu and C. Popescu, Humor as...

¹⁰⁵ R. Săftoiu and C. Popescu, Humor as...

¹⁰⁶ B. Obama, Remarks by...

¹⁰⁷ T. Honderich, *The Oxford Companion...*

¹⁰⁸ D. S. Levi, "The Fallacy of Treating the Ad Baculum as a Fallacy", *Informal Logic*, Vol: 19 num 2&3 (1999). Retrieved from: https://windsor.scholarsportal.info/ojs/leddy/index.php/informal_logic/article/viewFile/2324/1767

¹⁰⁹ R. H. Kimball, "What's Wrong with Argumentum ad Baculum? Reasons, Threats, and Logical Norms", *Argumentation*, Vol: 20 num 1 (2006): 89-100.

¹¹⁰ H. V. Hansen, "Logic and Misery: Walton's Appeal to Pity", *Informal Logic*, Vol: 20 num 2 (2000).

It has been emphasized that the intrinsic repudiation arguments to ethos are considered the most individualized¹¹¹ and risky to use as a mass appeal. This reasoning often transmits personal moral norms, attitudes, and specific ethnic values that usually do not meet the common relevance criteria, for example: *“Let me be frank: we are deeply concerned by the ongoing destruction of the traditional family in a number of countries. We particularly do not like being invited to accept certain moral deviations and various social ‘innovations’ as natural.”*¹¹².

Traditionally, the most persuasive intrinsic argument is an emotional appeal to the obviousness¹¹³. The politician calls the listeners as the witnesses, so and in doing so identifies himself or herself with the audience, becoming part of it, for example: *“We live in an integrated world, one in which we all have a stake in each other’s success.”*¹¹⁴.

One of the most popular and strong¹¹⁵ reasoning approaches, an argument from authority, is rare or entirely absent¹¹⁶. Such a reasoning is chosen sometimes for developing repudiation, for example: *“The Gospel of John teaches us: ‘In the beginning was the word.’ But what kind of a gospel do you bring to the world, if all your words are double-tongued like that?”*¹¹⁷. It can also be used to form empathy, e.g.: *“Wars must not be an instrument for settling a score between states. ‘Peace cannot be kept by force, it can only be achieved by understanding’, as wise Einstein put it.”*¹¹⁸.

Attention is drawn to the tendency of abandoning intrinsic arguments to authority in favor of extrinsic arguments, usually life examples. The latter, for instance, represent the opinion of the townsfolk, and act as an effective adherence to the addressee, e.g.: *“One Syrian refugee who was greeted in Hamburg with warm greetings and shelter, said, ‘We feel there are still some people who love other people’*¹¹⁹. It is also indicative that the source of evidence is determined accurately, individually. The speakers use endoxa, *“that common opinions or beliefs shared by a community”*¹²⁰, but avoid indeterminate references intrinsic to endoxa, for example: *“analysts believe...,” “parliamentarians almost agree...,”* etc., which make the link untenable and unconvincing. The politician speaks the argument on behalf of the whole nation or on his or her own behalf, e.g.: *“I would urge that a world without nuclear weapons should be the main goal of humanity in the twenty-first century”*¹²¹. *“China will shoulder its share of responsibility and continue to play its part in this common endeavor.”*¹²².

¹¹¹ G. G. Hazagerov, Rhetorical dictionary...

¹¹² A. Lukashenko, President of...

¹¹³ G. G. Hazagerov, Rhetorical dictionary...; I. A. Sternin, Practical Rhetoric... y A. Volkov, Foundations of...

¹¹⁴ B. Obama, Remarks by...

¹¹⁵ M. J. Wojdak, An attention-grabbing...

¹¹⁶ N. Nazarbayev, President of the Republic of Kazakhstan (New York, September 28, 2015, at the opening debate of the 70th session of the UN General Assembly, 2015). Retrieved from: https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/70/70_Republic%20of%20Kazakhstan_en.pdf

¹¹⁷ P. Poroshenko, Statement by...

¹¹⁸ A. Lukashenko, President of...

¹¹⁹ B. Obama, Remarks by...

¹²⁰ S. De Ascaniis and L. Cantoni, Online visit...

¹²¹ N. Nazarbayev, President of...

¹²² H. Xi, President of...

Thus, the process of revealing the argumentative strategies in modern public appearance makes it possible to affirm the following: 1) the related studies dealing with components of rhetorical argumentation (the sets, the sequence of elements) remains relevant; 2) the rational framework of political argumentation is mostly deductive, expanded with the evaluative arguments and call to action; 3) emotional reasoning prevails; 4) the argumentation delivery becomes more systematized; 5) technical arguments with examples preference; and 5) accurate data is used without “common” endoxa.

Conclusión

Rhetoric is a science ranging over the whole of human affairs¹²³, the society’s demand for studying principles of argumentation strategies is increasing. All of the teaching techniques can be conventionally divided into: argument creating tasks¹²⁴, argument performing exercises¹²⁵ and computer-supported argumentation scripts¹²⁶.

We have focused on generating the rhetorical monologue as a promising pedagogical strategy included the steps: 1) to familiarize students with rhetoric current discourse samples; 2) to find and analyse the advanced persuasion patterns; 3) to develop the ability to replenish the prepared template with effective arguments. With the extended opportunity to practice, students start to use the famous speech as a model for investigation, developing the evaluation skills and create public discourse with more powerful argumentative strategies. Over the year, our students demonstrated gains in individual argumentative essays and speech. We registered the distinctive progress when developed skills in using effective arguments become the everyday speech habit.

References

Books

Alekseev, A. Argumentation. Cognition. Communication. Moscow: MSU Publishing House. 1991. Available at: <http://www.philos.msu.ru/sites/default/files/lib/%D0%90%D0%BB%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%B5%D0%B2.pdf>

Anisimova, T. and Gimpelson, G. Modern Business Rhetoric. Voronezh. 2002. Available at: https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0%2C5&q

Bezmenova, N. A. Essays on the Theory and History of Rhetoric. Moscow: Nauka. 1991. Available at: https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?hl=ru&as_sdt=0%2C5&q

Blair, J. A. “The Relationships among Logic, Dialectic and Rhetoric”. In Proceedings of the Fifth Conference of the International Society for the Study of Argumentation, edited by F.H. van Eemeren, J.A. Blair, Ch.A. Willard & F. Snoeck Henkemans. Amsterdam: Sic Sat. 2003.

¹²³ P. D. Gaonkar, The Idea of...

¹²⁴ M. J. Wojdak, An attention-grabbing...

¹²⁵ M. J. Hogan and A. J. Kurr, Civic education...

¹²⁶ O. Noroozi, Considering students’ epistemic...; A. Weinberger and F. Fischer, A framework to... y S. De Ascaniis, Criteria for...

Bloch, M. and Freydina, E. Public Speech and its Prosodic Organisation. Moscow: Prometey. 2011. Available at: <https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=TguHCwAAQBAJ&pg=PP1&lpg=PP1&dq>

Cicero. De Oratore, book 1. Translated into English with an introduction by E.N.P. Moor. London: Clifton COLLBGB. 1892. Available at: https://archive.org/stream/deoratorebook1tr00ciceuoft/deoratorebook1tr00ciceuoft_djvu.txt

De Ascaniis, S. "Criteria for designing and evaluating argument diagramming tools from the point of view of argumentation theory". In Educational technologies for teaching Argumentation Skills, edited by N. Pinkwart and B. Mc.Laren. Bentham Science, eBook. 2012.

Gustafson, S. M. Eloquence is power: Oratory & performance in early America. Williamsburg, Virginia: Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture. 2000.

Hazagerov, G. G. Rhetorical dictionary. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka. 2009.

Issers, O. S. Speech effects. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka. 2009.

Ivunina, E. Implicit Knowledge on the Argumentative Structure: synopsis of a thesis. Moscow. 2008. Available at: <http://cheloveknauka.com/neyavnnoe-znanie-v-strukture-argumentatsii>

Kolotilova, N. A. Rhetoric: textbook. Kyiv: Center for Educational Literature. 2007. Available at: <http://padaread.com/?book=84753&pg=1>

Liszka, J. J. "Peirce's Revolutionary Concept of Rhetoric". In Ideas in Action: Proceedings of the Applying Peirce Conference. Nordic Studies in Pragmatism 1, edited by M. Bergman, S. Paavola, A.-V. Pietarinen and H. Rydenfelt. Helsinki: Nordic Pragmatism Network. 2010. Available at: <http://www.nordprag.org/nsp/1/Liszka.pdf>

Lvov, M. R. Rhetoric. Speech culture. Moscow: Academia. 2004. Available at: <http://journalport.at.ua/publ/26-1-0-220>

Makovelsky, A. History of Logic. Moscow: Kuchkove pole. 2004. Available at: http://www.logic-books.info/sites/default/files/makovelskiy_a.o._istoriya_logiki.pdf

Mihalskaja, A. K. The Russian language. Rhetoric. 10–11 grades. Moscow: Drofa. 2011. Available at: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5_OUge9Bj1AMHJadEoza0FIMzg/view

Noroozi, O. Considering students' epistemic beliefs to facilitate their argumentative discourse and attitudinal change with a digital dialogue game. Innovations in Education and Teaching International. 2016. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14703297.2016.1208112>

Pagliari, F. Ruinous Arguments: Escalation of Disagreement and the Dangers of Arguing, Argument Cultures: Proceedings of OSSA. 2009.

Peirce, C. S. "Ideas, stray and stolen, about scientific writing". In *The essential Peirce. Selected philosophical writings*, 2 (1893–1913), edited by N. Houser & C.J.W. Kloesel. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press. 1904: 325-330.

Pepe, C. *The genres of rhetorical speeches in Greek and Roman antiquity*. Boston: Brill. 2013.

Perelman, Ch. *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame/London: University of Notre Dame Press. 1982.

Perelman, C. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press. 1969.

Rozhdestvensky, Y. *Theory of Rhetoric*. Moscow: Dobrosvet. 1997. Available at: <https://knigogid.ru/books/400606-teoriya-ritoriki/toread>

Shi, W. *Paul's Message of the Cross as Body Language*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck. 2008.

Sternin, I. A. *Practical Rhetoric in Explanations and Exercises for Those Who Want to Learn to Speak*. Voronezh: Istoki. 2011. Available at: http://sterninia.ru/files/757/4_Izbrannye_nauchnye_publicacii/Rechevoe_vozdejstvie/Prakticheskaia%20ritorika.pdf

Swanson, D. L. and Nimmo, D. D. *New directions in political communication: a resource book*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage Publications. 1990.

Tindale, C. W. *Rhetorical argumentation: Principles of theory and practice*. California: Sage. 2004.

Tindale, C. W. *Acts of arguing: A Rhetorical Model of Argument*. Albany: State University of York Press. 1999.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. *Argumentative Text Structure and Translation*. U.S.: University of Jyväskylä. 1985.

Toulmin, S. E. *The uses of argument*. U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2003.

Van Dijk, T. *What is Political Discourse Analysis? Political Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1997. Available at: <http://discourses.org/OldArticles/What%20is%20Political%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf>

Van Eemeren, F. H. and Grootendorst, R. *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-dialectical Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/3e38/d3ca665a2cdcb05d806e66aea277b1b0f78a.pdf>

Verderber, R. F., Verderber, K. S. and Sellnow, D. D. *The challenge of effective speaking*. (15th ed.). U.S.: Cengage Learning. 2011.

Volkov, A. *Foundations of Rhetoric*. Moscow: Akademicheskij Prospekt. 2003.

Vvedenskaya, L.A. and Pavlova, L.G. Culture and the art of speech. Modern rhetoric. Rostov-on-Don: Publishing house "Phoenix". 1995.

Walton, D. Plausible Argument in Everyday Conversation. Albany: State University of New York Press. 1992.

Journal articles

Amgoud, L. and Prade, H. "Using arguments for making and explaining decisions". Artificial Intelligence, Vol: 173 num 3-4 (2009): 413-436. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000437020800194X>

Besnard, P., Garcia, A., Hunter, A., Modgil, S., Prakken, H. and Simari, G. "Introduction to Structured Argumentation". Argument and Computation, Vol: 5 num 1 (2014): 1-4.

Carenini, G. and Moore, J. D. "Generating and evaluating evaluative arguments". Artificial Intelligence, Vol: 170 (2006): 925–952. Available at: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000437020600066X>

De Ascaniis, S. and Cantoni, L. Online visit opinions about attractions of the religious heritage: an argumentative approach. Church. Communication and Culture, Vol: 2 num 2 (2017). Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23753234.2017.1350585>

Dung, P. M. "On the acceptability of arguments and its fundamental role in nonmonotonic reasoning, logic programming and n-person games". Artificial Intelligence, Vol: 77 (1995): 321–357.

D'Angelo, F. J. "The Rhetoric of Intertextuality". Rhetoric Review, Vol: 29 num 1 (2009). Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07350190903415172>

Gaonkar, P. D. The Idea of Rhetoric in the Rhetoric of Science. Southern Communication Journal, Vol: 58 num 4 (1993). Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10417949309372909>

Gilbert, M. "Emotion, Argumentation and Informal Logic". Informal Logic, Vol: 24 num 3 (2004).

Goldstein, M., Crowell A. and Kuhn D. "What Constitutes Skilled Argumentation and How Does it Develop?", Informal Logic, Vol: 29 num 4 (2009). Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.893.3372&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

Hansen, H. V. "Logic and Misery: Walton's Appeal to Pity". Informal Logic, Vol: 20 num 2 (2000).

Hogan, M. J. and Kurr, A. J. "Civic education in competitive speech and debate. Argumentation and Advocacy", Vol: 53 num 2 (2017): 83-89.

Kimball, R. H. "What's Wrong with Argumentum ad Baculum? Reasons, Threats, and Logical Norms". Argumentation, Vol: 20 num 1 (2006): 89-100.

Levi, D. S. "The Fallacy of Treating the Ad Baculum as a Fallacy". *Informal Logic*, Vol: 19 num 2&3 (1999). Available at: https://windsor.scholarsportal.info/ojs/leddy/index.php/informal_logic/article/viewFile/2324/1767

McKerrow, R. E. "Rhetorical Validity: An Analysis of Three Perspectives on the Justification of Rhetorical Argument". *Argumentation and Advocacy*, Vol: 13 num 3 (1977): 133-141.

Pagliari, F. and Castelfranchi, C. "Why argue? Towards a cost-benefit analysis of argumentation". *Argument & Computation*, Vol: 1 num 1 (2010): 71-91.

Săftoiu, R. and Popescu, C. "Humor as a branding strategy in political discourse. A case study from Romania". *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística*, Vol: 47 num 85 (2014). Available at: <https://scielo.conicyt.cl/pdf/signos/v47n85/a07.pdf>

Staarman, J. K., Krol, K. and Meijden, H. "Peer Interaction in Three Collaborative Learning Environments". *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, Vol: 40.1 (2005): 29-39. Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ768690.pdf>

Strand, T. "Peirce's New Rhetoric: Prospects for educational theory and research". *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, Vol: 45 num 7 (2013): 707-711.

Vreeswijk, G. "Abstract argumentation systems". *Artificial Intelligence*, Vol: 90 No 1-2 (1997): 225-279.

Weinberger, A. and Fischer, F. "A framework to analyse argumentative knowledge construction in computer-supported collaborative learning". *Computer and Education*, Vol: 46 num 1 (2006): 71-95.

Wenzel, J. "Three Perspectives on Argument". In *Perspectives on Argumentation: Essays in Honour of Wayne Brockreide*, edited by R. Trapp and J. Schutz. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland. 1990: 9-16. Available at: <https://ru.scribd.com/document/67636047/Wenzel-Three-Perspectives-on-Argument>

Wojdak, M.J. "An attention-grabbing approach to introducing students to argumentation in science". *Bioscience Education*, Vol: 15 num 1 (2010): 1-3.

Internet reports

Cohen, P. Reason seen more as weapon than path to truth. *The New York Times*. June 14. 2011.

Honderich, T. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford University Press. 1995. Available at: <http://www.math.fu-berlin.de/users/diederich/downloads/Oxford.pdf>

Johnson, R. H. *Revisiting the Logical/Dialectical/Rhetorical Triumvirate*. OSSA Conference Archive. 2009. Available at: <http://scholar.uwindsor.ca/ossaarchive/OSSA8/papersandcommentaries/84>

Kane, J. What's at stake in Australian political rhetoric? In *Studies in Australian Political Rhetoric*, edited by J. Uhr and R. Walter. Australia: ANU Press The Australian National University Canberra ACT 0200. 2013. Available at: <http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/p291051/pdf/What%E2%80%99s-at-stake-in-Australian-political-rhetoric.pdf>

Lukashenko, A. President of the Republic of Belarus, New York, September 28, 2015, United Nations General Assembly, Seventieth Session, General Debate. 2015. Available at: <https://gadebate.un.org/en/70/belarus>

Nazarbayev, N. President of the Republic of Kazakhstan, New York, September 28, 2015, at the opening debate of the 70th session of the UN General Assembly. 2015. Available at: https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/70/70_Republic%20of%20Kazakhstan_en.pdf

Obama, B. Remarks by President Obama to the United Nations General Assembly United Nations Headquarters, New York, September 28, 2015. 2015. Available at: <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-united-nations-general-assembly>

Poroshenko, P. Statement by the President at the General Debate of the 70th session of the United Nations General Assembly, New York, September 28, 2015. 2015. Available at: <http://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-na-zagalnih-debatah-70-yi-sesiyi-3605>

Xi, H. President of the People's Republic of China, New York, September 28, 2015, General Debate of the 70th Session of the UN General Assembly. 2015. Available at: https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/70/70_ZH_en.pdf

CUADERNOS DE SOFÍA EDITORIAL

Las opiniones, análisis y conclusiones del autor son de su responsabilidad y no necesariamente reflejan el pensamiento de la **Revista Inclusiones**.

La reproducción parcial y/o total de este artículo debe hacerse con permiso de **Revista Inclusiones**.