PRAGMA-DIALECTICAL STRATEGIES OF MANOEUVRING IN POLITICAL ARGUMENTATION: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

[1]*Hawraa Talib Salman, [2]Zailin Shah Binti Yusoff

ABSTRACT--A review paper commonly creates an understanding of a given topic for the reader through discussing the findings introduced in the latest research paper. Hence, it can be regarded as a text that contains a summary of the scholarly research on certain topics. Reviews are important in that they enable the reader to have an idea about the published works in a given field of study without reading the entire documents or public books. According to Jesson and Lacey (2017), reviews are classified into three categories; narrative or traditional, scoping, and systematic quantitative review. To Khan (2017), the main purpose of a narrative review is to give the reader a comprehensive overview of the topic to highlight important areas of research and define research questions. Whereas the principle purpose of scoping review is to find all the materials on the topic, "When undertaking a scoping review, it is important to systematize your search strategies to ensure you can replicate your searches and to attend to any gaps that appear in results" (Sandle, 2016:73). A systematic review, on the other hand, attempts to collect secondary data and synthesize findings qualitatively or quantitatively (Boland & Dickson 2017). The current review is intended to be a narrative one. It aims to summarize and describe the literature published on the topic of 'strategic manoeuvring and its strategies' in relation to political argument. In response to achieve the mentioned aims, this review posits that politicians be inclined to use certain manoeuvring strategies more than others in in political speeches and interviews.The papers discussed here are chosen from peer-reviewed journals documented under Google Scholar, published in the last 13 years; 2006-2018 using many search keywords like 'pragma-dialectics', 'pragmatics', 'speech acts', 'strategic manoeuvring', and 'political argumentation'. The speech act literature is grouped according to the type of argumentation on the basis of topic relatedness first and the type of perspective involved. So, the papers with similar topics sharing the same argumentative discourse are reviewed together. In addition, the studies discussed are only those on political manoeuvring since the scope of this paper is limited to political argumentative studies. the study highlights that the use of strategic manoeuvring in political argumentation is widespread. It also clarifies certain difficulties in evaluating the nature of manoeuvring whether it is a social, pragmatic or psychological phenomenon. Each discourse has its ideology. Each argumentative political study has its frame.This paper reviews the literature related to strategic manoeuvring as used in political argumentation. It aims to present the findings and discussions of the previous studies which call for further research. To look at more recent content, the literature search comprised in this review covered current research papers published between 2004 to 2018. A substantial number of scholarly articles were identified and

[1]*Centre for Language Studies ,Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM)First (corresponding) author's hawraatalib910@gmail.com

[2] Centre for Language Studies, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia (UTHM)First (corresponding) author's zailin@uthm.edu.my

examined based on keywords search in Google Scholar. The discussions and findings are classified according to topic relatedness and the type of argumentation.

*Keywords--*Pragma-dialectical theory; strategic manoeuvring; political argumentation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of strategic manoeuvring is developed in the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation that was proposed by Eemeren and other scholars. Eemeren (2013) explains that the notion of 'manoeuvring' refers to a planned movement to do or win something. Eemeren (2015:54) further defines the process of manoeuvring as "an attempt to make use of the opportunities available in the dialectical situation for steering the discourse rhetorically in the direction that serves their speakers' own interest best". Garssen (2013) adds that it is related to the arguers' continual efforts to correspond in their argumentative persuasion aimed to influence through being reasonable. The effectiveness of the manoeuvring is one of the most significant communicative strategies to present a communicative intention (Kennedy 2017).

Hence, it is clear from the mentioned definitions that the term strategic manoeuvring is a purposeful action to reach a certain goal or to change someone's opinion. It also seems that the term 'strategic' is added to 'manoeuvring' because the goal has to be reached by skilful and tactful planning.

In pragma-dialectics, Eemeren and Houtlosser (2002) and Eemeren (2010) provide a categorization of essential elements incorporated within the process of manoeuvring. These strategic elements are utilized to achieve a balance between the two ideals of reasonableness and effectiveness including topical potential, audience demand, and presentational device.

In politics, strategic manoeuvring is of great importance to winning a standpoint by means of an argument. As to Riker (2016) to reduce the potential tension between effectiveness and reasonableness, politicians use certain strategies of manoeuvring specifically and effectively. The strategic manoeuvres not only present their faces to their audience. As a manifestation of strategic manoeuvring, politicians tend to make use of presentational devices by utilizing certain pragmatic strategies such as: metaphors, rhetorical questions, etc. So, by means of conversation politicians cooperate to achieve a shared goal. As stated by Eemeren and Houtlosser (2015:58) strategic manoeuvring analysis divides rhetoric into three distinguishable elements: topical potential, audience demand, and presentational device. In political discourse, for instance, politicians make a topical selection according to what they think is the most favourable to their interest. They also adapt their language to the commitments and beliefs of the audience demand, and regarding the presentational device is related to matters of style, structure, clearness, figurativeness, and so on. Often, the topical choice is the first condition that every strategic manoeuvre takes into consideration.

Studies on strategic manoeuvring indicate that strategic manoeuvring is essential in political argumentation. As a matter of course, the three aspects of strategic manoeuvring always go together and fundamentally connected, yet in argumentative practice often one particular aspect is more prominent than other aspects. By emphatic use of an argument from authority, for instance, the strategic manoeuvring may come mainly to the fore in the topical choice that is made. Or by emphatic adopting of audience demand, or by emphatically use of striking presentational strategies.

The purpose of this paper is to review the literature on the findings and discussions of strategic manoeuvring studies in political discourse. For this purpose, two questions are posed:

1. What are the common types of strategies of manoeuvring used by politicians?
2. How does the use of strategic manoeuvring affect in politicians' speeches?

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW

Related Studies on Strategic Manoeuvring in Political Argumentation

Characteristically, in pragma-dialectical theory, argumentation is studied from both a communicative perspective and a critical one. The first perspective is inspired by pragmatic insights from the speech act concept and discourse analysis. The second perspective, on the other hand, is stimulated by using dialectical insights from critical rationalism and dialog logic (Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004). Due to the fact that there are a lot of studies about strategic manoeuvring in political argumentation and analysing all of them will take a large space in this work, only selected representative studies will be reviewed.

It is worth noting that the more recent studies have tackled strategic manoeuvring in political discourse, starting with Eemeren's (2004) study of strategic manoeuvring in argumentative discourse in political deliberation in which the author explains how to tackle the problems involved in analysing and evaluating argumentative discourse deliberation from a pragma-dialectal perspective. Zarefsky (2008) then argues that examining persuasive definitions gives the chance to notice the differences and similarities strategic manoeuvring in rhetorical and dialectical argument, as well as differences of the role of the strategic manoeuvring between normative ideal argument and actual existing one. He views also that "although political argumentation is not institutionalized in a formal sense, it does have recurrent patterns and characteristic". He views that there are certain constraints in political argumentation such as "the absence of time limit, assorted audiences, and lack of a clear terminus". Based on this view, because of these constraints, strategic manoeuvring could be potential and indispensable. In this study, political argumentation shares some of the characteristics of a critical discussion however; it is shaped largely by the constraints of a sphere of argument that is open to all without preconditions regarding training, expertise, or prior commitments. The study concludes that in examining political argumentation, there are some difficulties in evaluating strategic manoeuvring because of the extensive use of figures and tropes.

Keeping with political discourse, Kienpointer (2013) did a critical discourse study on strategies of manoeuvring used by the U.S. president Barack Obama. The study explores the possibilities of Obama's contemporary political rhetoric discourse. He points out that Obama not only knows excessively well how to utilize the classical inventory of political rhetoric he also attempts to overcome the standards of strategic manoeuvring of political rhetoric that is oftentimes polarizing and injurious. Kienpointer (2013) assumes that Obama tries to modify the traditional style of political rhetoric by his tendency towards consensus and universal values. In addition to that, the study has shown that Obama is occasionally forced to abandon his high ethical and rhetorical standards in order not to lose an essential number of the U.S. voters. Obama has shown that politicians use a new type of strategic manoeuvring by overcoming traditional political rhetoric by his orientation towards individual values and consensus, in addition to his willingness to practice self-criticism, both at the governmental and national and individual level.

Politicians also tend to turn to techniques of ambiguity that make their positions broadly applicable. As such, Pietrucci (2014) conducts a rhetorical analysis for strategic manoeuvring employed by Silvio Berlusconi in his first liberation day speech. The study shows how Berlusconi strategically shifts ideographs by replacing 'liberation' with 'liberty'. Berlusconi effectively crafted a speech that was received by most of the nation's political forces. The study describes three options which were available in the Prime Minister's speech. The first one is ignoring liberation day, an option that Berlusconi has chosen for several years before 2009. The second option is participation in the celebrations supporting the idea that Repubblichini and Partigiani deserved the same respect and the same financial benefits because they both fought in faith for Italy. The third is acknowledging the founding value of liberation and the resistance for the Italian constitution. In this option, Berlusconi's choice of speech is interpreted as an attempt at reconciliation with the history of liberation and resistance. The rhetorical analysis in this study explains how and why a highly controversial text has been applauded by Berlusconi's followers. It also explains the uncommon reactions to Berlusconi's speech, specifically the analysis makes sense of the oddly favourable reaction to Berlusconi's attempt to appropriate liberation for his partisan aims. Along with rhetorical analysis for the strategic manoeuvring, another related study which is conducted by Xie (2017) argues that conductive arguments may be recognized from a rhetorical perspective. The author demonstrates that conductive arguments can be considered as a particular mode of strategic manoeuvring and their utilization can be adequately evaluated and analysed by adopting the theoretical tools that was developed in extended pragma-dialectics. Furthermore, the study emphasizes that conductive arguments should not be identified as representing the mechanism of weighing and balancing to attain a conclusion and thus, treating them as a new logical type might be misleading.

Other researchers like Toader (2016), for example, investigates strategic manoeuvring in presidential debates. He examines how language in discourse can be used strategically by the speakers in the construction of arguments and focuses on identifying how political figures can make use of different strategies and communicative competence in order to protect their points of view. On the other hand, from the pragmatic perspective, AL-Duleimi & Hammoodi (2015) did a pragmatic study of strategic manoeuvring in selected political interviews represented by Obama and Cheney. The research investigates strategies of manoeuvring and stages which highlighted the most questionable issues in political manoeuvring. The study reveals that strategic manoeuvring is an interpersonal process which involves three stages: the initiating, the response, and the evaluating stage. Each stage has its pragmatic speech acts. It also points out that politicians attempt to make their speech pragmatically influential by means of the hedges of cooperative principle in order to influence the audience that they are noticing what they are saying. They also avoid liability of the issue that make them appear to be in a undesirable light, mostly, by using various kinds of implicatures where they show that they are being receptive to a given demand.

To sum up the above-mentioned studies, it is important to mention that there is no alternative to persuasion to influence the standpoint to a specific audience since the goal is persuading an audience; it is all strategic manoeuvring from a rhetorical perspective. It also indicates that although the main aim of strategic manoeuvring is to reach dialectical and rhetorical objectives, however it does not automatically mean there is always a perfect balance between the two objectives.

III.   FINDINGS

3.1 Types of Strategic Manoeuvring used in Political Discours

Based on the analysis, it seems that politicians tend to use certain strategies to be persuasive and mobilize people to achieve their goals. Eemeren and Peter (2008) characterise them as the following:

3.1.1 Changing the Subject

The first type of maneuvering is the exercise of changing the subject. At any one time, there are a lot of differences in the public arenas, if a possibly destructive subject has unfolded, it could also be potential to redirect attention to a subject matter and to be more convenient to the arguer's interest (Mitchell, 2010). For example, in 2006 when President Bush concentrated on the strength of the economy instead of dealing with the subject dominating the public forum which was regarding the perception of a stalemate in Iraq.

3.1.2 Modifying the Relevant Audience

Regarding this type of strategic manoeuvring is related to modification of the scope of the relevant audience. It reflects the dictum of 'Schattschneider's' (1960) that can effectively explain the scope of an argument and has the preferable opportunity to win the argument (Zarefsky, 2008). For example, in 1962 the speech of President Kennedy at Yale in which he declared that practical management of a complex company has to be involved and economic policy no longer upraise wide-ranging of right and wrong inquiries, he tried to eliminate the issue from political argument reality and reallocate it to the procedural domain where experts have to concern about it freeing the masses from the same worry. During the early 1960s many people believed that budget deficits were wrong in principle, thus Kennedy did that as a strategic advantage for him.

3.1.3 Appealing to Liberal and Conservative Presumptions

Tonnard (2008) views that this type is related to organizing arguments that appeals to both the conservative and liberal presumptions. He also adds that people have the potential to share elements of both liberal and conservative world-views. For example, people could be conservative but publically liberal or they favour intervention of the government in the economy however they do not favour private relationships among consenting adults. Another illustrative example is when arguers enhance their success opportunities by strategically combining elements of conservative presumptions and liberal.

3.1.4 Reframing the Argument

Another type of strategic manoeuvring includes determining how to comprise a given argument. As far as a social realism is structured instead of 'given' in advance, based on the frame of reference a set of actual statuses can be comprehended in various ways in which they are cast (Kienpointer, 2013). For example, in some nations the loss of jobs could be framed as a proof of the comparative advantage of economic theory or threat to the economy and politicians can frame in whichever way that is advantageous to their political standing.

3.1.5 Using Condensation Symbols

According to Eemeren and Henkemans (2016) arguers usually employ condensation symbols that could be visual or verbal ones. It condenses a sort of several meanings into a commonly negative or positive connotation. The reaction of people will be the same to the symbol for different reasons. For example, the condensation symbol of a national flag except when it is used in ironic way. So, people could be positively expected to deal with it though the exact meanings will be changeable: pride, a consciousness of citizenship, nostalgic identification with the past, and so on.

3.1.6 Employing the Locus of the Irreparable

To Andone (2013) one of the characteristics of diverse audience is that a few members will be ready to take action, others may be reluctant, a greater number will be uncommitted and another category are those who are interested in the standpoint of an arguer, yet they are not prepared to do an action. For example, the suggestion by President Clinton which said if the U.S took budget benefits to resolve the incoming economic recession of Social Security, it might lose the chance to do that in political and economic viable way. This shows that politician argumentative discourse, to some extent, is almost taking dormant standards in addition to beliefs to the surface in a way that requires viewers to act even though they may have differing stands on it.

3.1.7 Using Figures and Tropes Argumentatively

The last type of manoeuvring is the use of what is usually considered as figures of speech and literary devices, such as, repetition, alliteration, and antithesis (Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2008). For example, the use of analogies specifically historical analogies. For their Iraq policies, both Presidents Bush extended traction and portrayed 'Saddam Hussein' as analogous to 'Adolf Hitler '. However, war antagonists considered Iraq as ''another Vietnam''.

3.2. Problems involved in Evaluating Argumentative Political Discourse Studies

Though political argumentation is highly related to using power and decision-making for the public, it is neither random nor unpredictable. There are some problems in analysing and evaluating argumentative political discourse that even Zarefesky (2008) referred to in his study of political argumentation discourse. One of the problems is the differentiation of frames within each political study. Frames generally determine the style of writing and analysing when evaluating a political discourse study. Each researcher produces his study with a certain type of frame but most ignore the essential role of pragmatics in interpreting strategic manoeuvring. Some researchers consider strategic manoeuvring as a multi-disciplinary phenomenon while others are of the opinion that it is a social one. In addition, there is also the absence of a comprehensive framework in these studies.

IV.   DISCUSSION

The studies reviewed in this paper are rhetorically oriented, yet they present useful background knowledge on how influential political argumentation is. It can be seen from the above studies and findings that each type of political discourse analysis represents a discourse of a particular participant. Hence, each participant presents discourses that are typical to them and their discourses are reflections of their ideological attitudes which confirm

Van Dijk (2006:321) take on evaluating political discourse: "for people acquire, express and reproduce their ideologies largely by text or talk, a discourse analytical study of ideology is most relevant". In tandem with this this review supports this and emphasises on the specific link between ideology and discourse.

As a case in point, argumentation scholars have highlighted the potential that exists in relating insights from the pragma-linguistic and discourse analysis literature with a concentration on the analysis of argumentative discourse within a framework such as the one proposed by pragma-dialectics (van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004; van Eemeren 2010). Based on the studies reviewed in this paper, it is apparent that many researchers also paid attention to the linguistic realisations on various argumentative indicators with its identification in actual discourse. However, most of them have not been interested in describing the pragmatic function of these linguistic indicators. Hence, this would be an area in which further research can be focussed on.

V.   CONCLUSION

In short, the studies quoted in this review indicate that strategic manoeuvring in political argument is widespread. Most considered strategic manoeuvring as a rhetorical and dialectical argumentative perspective. Each discourse has its own ideology and each argumentative political study has its own frame. The effect of manoeuvring on politicians' speeches could be seen as an intentional act which means that certain strategies are employed with certain objectives to achieve. As such, the studies underscore that strategic manoeuvring plays a crucial role in producing manipulative and persuasive political discourse particularly in political argumentation. Bearing in mind that strategic manoeuvring supports a better understanding of the political discourse. They also point out that political argumentation offers rich and beneficial material for reviewing strategic manoeuvring pitfalls and possibilities.

VI.   RECOMMENDATIONS

Firstly, politicians should be aware of the argumentative indicators and their functions in presenting their standpoints. Secondly, researchers ought to focus on the pragmatic structure of strategic manoeuvring in a given political discourse. They should also use a comprehensive framework in analysing and evaluating an argumentative discourse.

REFERENCES

1. Al- Duleimi, A.D. and Hammodi, W.R. (2015). *A Pragmatic Study of Strategic Maneuvering in Selected Political Interviews.* Babylon: University of Babylon.

2. Andone, C. (2013). *Argumentation in Political Interviews: Analyzing and Evaluating responses to accusation of inconsistency.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

3. Boland, A., Cherry, G., & Dickson, R. (Eds.). (2017). *Doing a systematic review: A student's guide*. Sage.

4. Eemeren, F. H Van and Henkemans, A. F.Sn. (2016). *Argumentation: Analysis and Evaluation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

5. Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2017). *Doing your literature review: Traditional and systematic techniques*. Sage.

6. Khan, M. T. (2017). Customer loyalty programs-concept, types, goals and benefits (a conceptual and review paper). *International Journal of Information, Business and Management*, *6*(1), 74.

7. Kienpointer, M. (2013). Strategic Maneuvering in Political Rhetoric of Barack Obama. *Language and Politics.* Volume 12, PP: 357-377

8. Mitchell, G. R. (2010). *Higher-Order Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentation.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

9. Nanba, H., Kando, N., & Okumura, M. (2017). Classification of research papers using citation links and citation types: Towards automatic review article generation. *Advances in Classification Research Online*, *11*(1), 117-134.

10. Pietrucci, P. (2014). Strategic maneuvering through shifting ideographs in political discourse: A rhetorical analysis of Silvio Berlusconi's first Liberation Day speech. *Journal of Argumentation in Context,* 1(3), 291-311.

11. Riker, W. H. (2016). *The Art of Political Manipulation.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

12. Sandle, T. (2016). A review of cleanroom microflora: types, trends, and patterns. *PDA Journal of Pharmaceutical Science and Technology*, *65*(4), 392-403.

13. Toader, A. (2016). *Strategic Maneuvering in Presidential Debates.* Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Brașov.

14. Tonnard, Y. (2008). *Comments on: "Strategic Maneuvering in Political Argumentation.* Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Company.

15. Van Dijk, M. P. (2006). Managing cities in developing countries. *Books.*

16. Van Eemeren, F. H., & Garssen, B. (Eds.). (2015). *Scrutinizing argumentation in practice* (Vol. 9). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

17. Van Eemeren, F. H., and Peter H. (2002b.). *"Strategic Maneuvering with the Burden of Proof." In Advances in Pragma-Dialectics, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren, 13–28.* Amsterdam: Sic Sat.

18. Van Eemeren, F. H., and Peter H. (2008). "Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse: Exploring the Boundaries of Reasonableness." *In Understanding Argumentation. Work in Progress, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren, David Cratis Williams, and Igor Z. Zagar, 13–25.* Amsterdam: Sic Sat

19. Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Eemeren, F. H. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation: The pragma-dialectical approach* (Vol. 14). Cambridge University Press.

20. Van Eemeren, F.H (2010). Fallacies as Derailments of Argumentative Discourse: Acceptance Based on Understanding and Critical Assessment. Department of Speech Communication, *Argumentation Theory and Rhetoric,* University of Amsterdam. Volume 59, PP: 141- 152.

21. Van Eemeren, F.H (2013). "In What Sense Do Modern Argumentation Theories Relate to Aristotle? The Case of Pragma-Dialectics*". Argumentation,* University of Amsterdam. Volume 27, PP: 49-70

22. Van Eemeren, F.H (2015). "Identifying Argumentative Patterns: A Vital Step in the Development of Pragma-Dialectics*". Argumentation,* University of Amsterdam. Volume 60, PP: 30:1–23

23. Van Eemeren, F.H (2017). "Argumentation Theory and Argumentative Practices: A Vital but Complex Relationship". *Argumentation,* University of Amsterdam. Volume 37, PP: 322-350

24. Van Eemeren, F.H. (2012). "The Pragma-Dialectical Theory under Discussion". University of Amsterdam and ILIAS. Volume 26, PP: 439-457.

25. *Van Eemeren, Frans H., and Peter H. (2002a.). "Strategic Maneuvering: Maintaining a Delicate Balance." In Dialectic and Rhetoric: The Warp and Woof of Argumentation Analysis, ed. by Frans H. van Eemeren and Peter Houtlosser, 131–159.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.

26. Xie, Y. (2017). "Conductive Argument as a Mode Strategic Maneuvering". *Institute of Logic and Cognition.* Volume 37, PP: 2-22

27. Zarefsky, D. (2008). *Strategic Maneuvering Through Persuasive Definitions: Implications for Dialectic and Rhetoric.* Volume 20, PP: 399-416

28. Vaithegi, H., & Vezhaventhan, D. (2019). An empirical research on media as a political power in india. Test Engineering and Management, 81(11-12), 4938-4944. Retrieved from www.scopus.com

29. Chandra Sekhar Prasad, K., & Vezhaventhan, D. (2019). Development and modernization of political system. Test Engineering and Management, 81(11-12), 4882-4885. Retrieved from www.scopus.com