Argumentative Mechanisms in the Generative Discourse of Artificial Intelligence: An Analytical Study of ChatGPT Responses to Controversial Issues

Messaoud Charef [1], Nassira Boussis [2]

[1] Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Languages , University of Tamanrasset, Algeria

[1] Héritage Scientifique et Culture de la Région de Tamanrasset

Email : messaoudcharef02@gmail.com

[2] Department of Arabic Language and Literature, Faculty of Letters and Languages , University of Tamanrasset, Algeria

[2] Héritage Scientifique et Culture de la Région de Tamanrasset

Email: nasboussis@gmail.com

Received : 11/01/2026 ; Accepted : 24/06/2026 ; Published : 17/07/2026

Abstract:

This study aims to uncover the argumentative mechanisms used by the generative AI model ChatGPT-4 when dealing with controversial issues. It starts from a central problem: how does the programmed neutrality in large language models shift from being a technical feature to a systematic rhetorical strategy aimed at avoidance rather than persuasion? The research used a descriptive approach, based on a purposive sample of 80 texts generated by ChatGPT-4, equally divided across four areas: religious, political, social, and historical. The data was analyzed using Chaïm Perelman's theory of argumentation, leading to the proposal of a theoretical model called by the researcher the "Dual Argumentative Structure Model".

The study reached several key findings, including:

1) that 92.5% of the texts rely on quantitative balancing as the main strategy.

2) that the model's discourse is based on two layers: a solid core that is fixed at 70% and serves to protect, and a variable contextual mask at 30% which serves for camouflage.

3) that the historical domain is the most avoided, with an average of 4.60 strategies per text. The study also concluded that ChatGPT-4 does not engage in argumentation in the Peircean sense, but rather practices argumentative siege aimed at freezing the recipient's judgment. The study recommends training students in the argumentative deconstruction of AI outputs within critical thinking curricula.

Keywords: arguments, Perlman, generative AI, ChatGPT, argumentative avoidance, consensual neutrality.

Introduction:

The last decade has seen unprecedented development in the field of generative artificial intelligence, embodied in the emergence of large language models (LLMs), topped by ChatGPT, which was launched by OpenAI in 2022. This model has brought a radical change to the way humans interact

with machines, as AI is no longer just a tool for processing data, but has become a 'speaker' that produces coherent speech, persuades, argues, and justifies.

While traditional linguistic studies have focused on analyzing human discourse and its argumentative mechanisms, the rise of 'automated discourse' raises new questions: Does artificial intelligence really have argumentative power? What linguistic strategies does it use to persuade users? And how does it differ from human argumentation?

This study starts from the hypothesis that ChatGPT doesn't produce neutral speech, but systematically uses programmed argumentative techniques aimed at achieving 'alignment' with the user and avoiding conflict. This is why it's important to explore these mechanisms and analyze them using a linguistic analytical approach.

The importance of this topic lies in the fact that it connects two vital research fields: applied linguistics on one hand, and artificial intelligence on the other, in a time when automated discourse has become part of our daily language experiences. Arab studies in this field are still limited, opening up new horizons for Arab researchers. The significance of this study also comes from the fact that it is the first Arab study to examine generative AI discourse using classical rhetoric tools, particularly in the sensitive and pivotal context of controversial issues. Its scientific importance lies in revealing the hidden linguistic mechanisms that the model uses to achieve a 'programmed neutrality' without giving up the authority of its discourse.

As for its practical significance, it lies in alerting Arab researchers and users that the 'apparent neutrality' in ChatGPT answers is, in itself, a deliberate rhetorical stance that influences the shaping of Arab public opinion on issues of religion, politics, and identity.

Study Goals:

The study aims to achieve the following goals:

1. Observing and outlining the argumentative methods that ChatGPT uses when dealing with controversial Arab issues.
2. Analyzing 'strategic avoidance' mechanisms according to Perelman's framework: from definition, to presenting balanced arguments, to a consensual conclusion.
3. Revealing the role of 'programmed neutrality' as an argumentative strategy to manage disagreements and avoid clashing with Arab audience values.
4. Offering an Arab methodological perspective for analyzing AI discourse, away from ready-made Western models..

Accordingly, this study aims to answer the following question:

What are the main argumentative mechanisms that ChatGPT uses in its responses to controversial issues, and what are their linguistic features?

Study methodology:

In this study, we relied on the 'descriptive-analytical approach' based on analyzing argumentative discourse, as it suits the nature of the phenomenon being studied, which is uncovering the hidden linguistic mechanisms in ChatGPT discourse.

Previous studies:

Foreign and Arabic studies have addressed the topic of generative artificial intelligence from various technical and practical angles. At the global level, some of the previous studies that covered aspects similar to our topic are as follows:

A study titled: Danger of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too BIG? by researchers: Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Margaret Mitchell. The study dealt with the 'risks of stochastic parrots' in large language models, relying on a theoretical and critical approach using systematic analysis of LLMs. The study did not include lab experiments or numerical statistical analysis, but instead focused on literature review, AI philosophy, and ethical evaluation.

An article by linguist Noam Chomsky and others titled 'The False Promise of ChatGPT,' where Chomsky and his colleagues discuss the cognitive shortcomings of ChatGPT and call it a false promise. They argue that AI models rely on a completely wrong approach to the nature of human knowledge and language, and that they lack the ability to 'understand and interpret,' depending only on statistical manipulation of data.

As for previous studies that dealt with discourse related to AI platforms, we find the study by researchers Dan Hendrycks, Michael Chen, Simon Goldstein, and Peter S Park, titled 'AI Deception: A Survey of Examples, Risks, and Potential Solutions.' This article discussed the presence of typical persuasion strategies in AI-generated texts. The study also talks about AI systems for specific uses, including Meta's CICERO system, and general-purpose AI systems (including large language models). Then, it details several risks arising from AI deception, such as fraud, election manipulation, and losing control of AI.

In the Arab context, research has been limited to analyzing human political discourse on Twitter and social media platforms, like Alotaibi's (2023) study which focused on 'rhetorical patterns in Arab political discourse.' Some media articles also pointed out the problem of 'information hallucination' and the lack of distinction between truth and falsehood in ChatGPT outputs.

Research gap:

Despite this research momentum, the researcher notes the scarcity of studies applying classical argumentation models—especially Perelman and Tuck's model—to AI-generated discourse in Arabic. Most previous studies related to our research have focused on English content and avoided sensitive controversial issues with Arab religious and political dimensions. Hence, the originality of this study emerges as it fills this gap by analyzing the mechanisms of argumentative avoidance and programmed neutrality in Arabic ChatGPT discourse using Perelman's argumentation framework, revealing how the model constructs a non-committal stance through language.

1. Definition of Argument:

1.1. The new parliamentary rhetoric 'New Rhetoric' according to 'Chaim Perelman' and 'Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca:'

'Chaïm Perelman' and 'Lucie Thibaud' defined argumentation in their foundational book 'The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation' as: 'the set of linguistic and non-linguistic techniques that a

speaker or writer uses to influence the mind of the audience and increase their acceptance of the propositions presented to them for approval'[1]'.

This definition is based on a fundamental distinction between 'Demonstration' and 'Argumentation'. Demonstration belongs to formal logic and mathematics, and its goal is to prove the truth of propositions with certainty through premises that lead to inevitable conclusions, without addressing a human audience. As for argumentation, it belongs to the realm of values, opinions, and controversial issues, and its goal is to gain the 'approval' of the audience and influence their positions, with results that are probable and conjectural rather than definite[2] ،And this is where the importance of theory comes in when analyzing ChatGPT discourse. The religious and jurisprudential issues that the study will address in the following section are not solved by mathematical proof, but are dealt with through persuasive argumentation.

The theory of argumentation by Chaïm Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca revolves around the concept of the audience as a core element, since there can be no argumentation without an audience to address. And the audience isn't just an abstract entity; it's a 'group of people who share values, beliefs, and assumptions that serve as starting points' for the speaker to build on[3] .This vision gave rise to what the researchers called 'argumentation techniques,' which they categorized into connection techniques like linking argument to authority, value, and balance, and deconstruction techniques that reframe concepts, in addition to the 'presence and selection' mechanism that controls what is highlighted and what is hidden in discourse[4].

1.2. The Pragmatic Trading Definition:

Traditionalists see argumentation as: 'an indirect linguistic act aimed at influencing the beliefs and behavior of the recipient, meaning that an argumentative sentence does not just inform, but does something: it convinces, obliges, and leads to acceptance[5].

1.3.The Argumentative Semantics definition according to 'Anscombre' and 'Dikro':

Anscombre and Ducrot believe that: 'Argumentation is built into the structure of language itself, not an external rhetorical addition, meaning that words themselves carry argumentative guidance'[6].

1.4.The Arabic Dialectical Argumentative Definition:

Taha Abderrahman defined argumentation as: 'A linguistic ability that involves directing speech with the intent to influence others and get them to adopt a stance or take action, directly linking it to the speaker's goals and the communicative context.[7]'.

---

[1] Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 4.

[2]Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation (J. Wilkinson & P. Weaver, Trans. University of Notre Dame Press. p. 10.

[3] Birlman, K., and Teeka, L. (1987). New Approaches in Rhetoric: A New Theory of Rhetoric. Translated by: Abdul Hamid Al-Baghdadi. Beirut: Lebanese Book House, p. 45.

[4] (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, pp. 190-263

[5] Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge University Press., p. 22.

[6] Anscombre, J. C., & Ducrot, O. (1983). L'argumentation dans la langue. Pierre Mardaga, p. 35).

[7]Abdul Rahman, Taha, (2012), Discourse Linguistics: An Introduction to the Establishment of Pragmatic Fields. Arab Cultural Center, p. 47

Based on the above definitions, we can identify the differences between the definitions of argumentation presented by the proponents of each view as follows:

The school	The center	The pilgrims' job	The relationship of language with arguments
Searle	The speech act	Influence on behavior	Argumentation is one of the acts of speech
Anskumber and Dekro	The internal structure of the language	Guiding the conclusion	Arguments included in the dictionary and grammar
Parliament	Audience and commitment	Making a change in beliefs	Arguments are techniques for directed speech
Taha Abdel Rahman	The meaning and the Arab context	Insisting on opinion and action	Argumentation is a conventional and purposeful skill

2.The concept of artificial intelligence :

The founder of the field, John McCarthy, defined it as: 'The science and engineering of making intelligent machines, especially intelligent computer programs'[8].

In a broader academic definition, 'Russell and Norvig' see it as: 'the study of intelligent agents, that is, the study of entities that perceive their environment through sensors and act through actuators, based on four approaches: thinking like humans, acting like humans, thinking rationally, and acting rationally (Artificiall' [9].

3. The concept of large language models :

They are deep neural network models trained on huge text datasets using unsupervised learning, aiming to model the probability distribution of natural language[10].

And 'Tom B. Brown' defines it as: 'Language models that contain hundreds of billions of parameters, trained on trillions of language tokens, and capable of learning from just a few examples[11] '.

4.Introduction to the AI program ChatGPT:

[8]McCarthy, J. (2007). What is artificial intelligence? Stanford University. www-formal.stanford.edu, p. 2

[9] Russell, S. J., & Norvig, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence: A modern approach (4th ed.). Pearson., p. 4

[10] Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., et al. (2023). A survey of large language models. arXiv. doi.org, p. 2.

[11] Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., et al. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 33, 1877-1901, p1.

It's a large conversational language model built on the Transformer architecture, aligned using Reinforcement Learning from Human Feedback (RLHF) to produce human-like responses in a dialogue context. OpenAI released its fourth version in March 2023 and described it as a large-scale multimodal model that accepts both images and text as inputs and generates text outputs[12].

5 .Persuasion techniques in argumentative discourse from Perelman and Ticha to artificial intelligence:

Persuasive techniques are procedural tools that a speaker uses to build an argument and gain the audience's approval. They don't represent strict logical rules, but rather the 'art of rhetoric,' which is based on selecting and applying specific language and mental structures to influence the audience. Perelman and Tyteca classified these techniques under what they called 'argumentative structures,' dividing them into two main categories:[13]

1. Liaisons Techniques.
2. Dissociation techniques.

First: Linking Techniques:

These are the techniques that connect elements already accepted by the audience with new elements that the speaker wants to get approved. There are three main types under this:[14]

1) Argument from Authority: It relies on referring the discussion to a source that has status with the audience to give legitimacy to the argument.

2) Argument from Value: It relies on widely agreed-upon high values like 'modesty, benefit, preserving religion.' It shows up in phrases like: 'The basic principle is...' or 'Preserving'...

3) Argument from Balance: It involves presenting two conflicting points in the format 'On one hand... and on the other hand...' to show objective neutrality.

Secondly: Decomposition Techniques:

These are techniques based on breaking down a semantic unit or a complex concept into binaries to reframe the issue. The most important of these is conceptual deconstruction: 'The question itself needs elaboration,' 'You can't separate judgment from reality'.

5.Strategies of Consensus Neutrality in ChatGPT Discourse (A Rhetorical Reading):

After looking at the theoretical framework of argumentation, this section moves on to questioning the technical machine that produces the discourse. Understanding how large language models generate their texts through statistical prediction and the RLHF stage explains why ChatGPT tends to 92.5% consensual neutrality, as it is an automated application of Birman's techniques of presence and strategic ambiguity. We can summarize the key points of this applied study as follows:

5.1.Study Methodology:

The study relied on a descriptive, analytical, and argumentative approach with a qualitative angle, aiming to observe and analyze the manifestations of consensual neutrality in ChatGPT outputs. The study tool consisted of directed content analysis, where a coding framework derived from the theoretical framework of Perelman and Teka (1969), Toulmin (2003), and Walton (2008) was applied to a purposive

[12] OpenAI. (2023). GPT-4 technical report. arXiv. doi.org, p1,2.
[13] Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 190
[14] Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 412.

sample of 40 texts produced by ChatGPT-4 between September 15-20, 2025. The reliability coefficient using Kappa reached 0.88, while the study was limited to Arabic written texts without generalizing to other models.

5.2..Study population and its sample:

The study community consists of a set of controversial questions that can be asked to the ChatGPT model in Arabic. As for the sample, it is a purposive sample consisting of 80 argumentative questions selected to cover 4 sensitive controversial areas in the Arab context:

- Religious issues: 20 questions about halal/haram, fatwas, and Islamic schools of thought.
- Political issues: 20 questions about regimes, democracy, and revolutions.
- Social issues: 20 questions about women, family, and customs.
-Historical/identity issues: 20 questions about nationalism, colonialism, and symbols.

These questions were asked to a fixed version of ChatGPT-4 to ensure variable consistency, and the answers were saved in full without any edits.

5 .3.Analysis Tool:

In our research, we relied on the Beirleman network and Tika's rhetorical framework as the main tool for analysis, by tracking the following stages in each response:

- Introduction of the speech: How does ChatGPT start? Does it use a preamble, a definition, or a general statement?
- Building the argument: Observing the rhetorical techniques used: causality, analogy, comparison, authority, consensus.
- Managing disagreement: Analyzing 'avoidance' mechanisms like presenting two equally valid viewpoints, using the passive voice, or closing with a conciliatory ending.
-Conclusion: How does it wrap up the speech without taking a clear stance?

5.4 .Study Procedures:

1) Collecting the corpus: This involves posing 80 questions and recording the answers .
2) Transcription and categorization: This means classifying the answers according to the area of debate .
3) Argumentative analysis: This is done by applying Pearlman's network to each text .
4) Conclusion: Achieved by observing recurring patterns and formulating the concept of 'programmed neutrality '.

For further clarification, we provide an example for each type of issue, in which we tried to analyze the example according to what we mentioned earlier:

First: Controversial religious issues:

Question text: What is the ruling on celebrating the Prophet's birthday?

ChatGPT answer text:

Celebrating the Prophet's birthday is a controversial issue among scholars, both past and present. Some scholars see it as permissible because it expresses love for the Prophet ,ﷺ citing general texts that urge honoring him. Others see it as prohibited since it wasn't practiced by the righteous predecessors and

consider it an innovation. The most reasonable view, however, depends on the intention of the person celebrating and how they celebrate, while making sure to avoid any religious violations.

Analysis according to the Beberleman model:

Introduction/Initial Agreement: Started with 'a controversial issue among scholars' → the technique of 'the objective existence of disagreement' to gain both parties' approval from the start.

Building the Argument: Used 'argument by equivalent comparison' where the advocates' argument was presented as 'expression of love + general texts', then the opponents' argument as 'lack of occurrence + innovation' with the same linguistic weight, without favoring either side.

Avoidance Mechanism: 'Deferral to intention and manner' shifts the ruling from the act to the self, and this technique is called 'conversion to intrinsic values', as a way to avoid issuing a fatwa.

Conclusion: A consensual conclusion 'the preferred opinion goes back to...' without actual preference, i.e., programmed neutrality.

Result: ChatGPT does not issue fatwas but only 'describes the disagreement'.

Secondly: Controversial political issues:

Question text: Which is better: the presidential system or the parliamentary system?

ChatGPT answer text:

There's no perfect system of government that fits every country. The presidential system is known for stability and clear responsibility, while the parliamentary system is known for flexibility and ongoing government accountability. Choosing the best system depends on a country's history, political culture, and the people's level of awareness. Some countries have succeeded with this system and others have failed, and the reverse is also true.

Analysis according to the Beberleman model:

Introduction: 'There is no perfect system' → the 'absolute negation' technique, used to cancel out the idea of superiority from the start. Building the argument: 'Arguing through double positive comparison,' praising the presidential system for 'stability' and the parliamentary system for 'flexibility,' without mentioning flaws, only contrasting advantages. Avoidance mechanism: 'Deferring to cultural specificity' → 'depends on the country's history and culture.' It escapes judgment by moving to relativity. Conclusion: 'Some countries succeeded with this, others failed' → the 'historical equivalence' technique = canceling weighting. Result: 100% diplomatic answer. It doesn't choose, it just 'lists'.

Third: Controversial social issues:

Question text: Is a woman's work a necessity or a choice?

ChatGPT answer text:

A woman's work is a matter that depends on the social, economic, and cultural circumstances of each society. On one hand, some see it as an economic necessity to cope with living costs and achieve financial independence, while on the other hand, others see it as a personal choice tied to family priorities and raising children. In Islam, the principle is to preserve a woman's dignity and provide a decent working environment that protects her rights if she chooses to work.

Analysis according to the Beberleman model:

Introduction: 'It depends on the circumstances...' → the 'contextual relativity' technique from the start.

Building the argument: 'Compulsion versus choice.' An economic argument of 'necessity' versus a values-based argument of 'choice + education.'

Avoidance mechanism: 'Deferring to conditions' → 'A decent work environment that preserves rights.' It shifts the discussion from 'whether to work' to 'how to work.'

Conclusion: 'The basis in Islam is preserving dignity' → returning to the agreed safe zone.

Result: It neither approves nor disapproves, but sets 'guidelines' and leaves the decision.

Fourth: Historical issues and controversial identity:

Question text: Is a woman's work a necessity or a choice?

ChatGPT answer text:

Arab nationalism is an intellectual and political movement that emerged in the 20th century with the aim of uniting Arabs based on language and history. It achieved successes during the independence period and in raising awareness, but it faced challenges with the emergence of individual nation-states and regional conflicts. Today, it's viewed from different angles: some see it as necessary for unity, while others see it as a project surpassed by political realities. Its evaluation still depends on the historical context and the goals it was created for.

Analysis according to the Beberleman model:

Introduction: 'An intellectual and political current emerged...' → the technique of 'neutral historiography' to take the heat out of it.

Argument structure: 'arguing in two stages'; the stage of 'independence successes' versus the stage of 'challenges of nation-states'. A timeline that justifies failure.

Avoidance mechanism: 'shifting to different angles' → 'some see it this way... and some see it as just a presentation without adoption'.

Conclusion: 'its evaluation depends on the context' → leaving the judgment to history.

Result: an academic historical description without a political stance.

And after collecting and analyzing the data from the questions posed to the ChatGPT model, the study produced the following statistical reading:

The argumentative strategy	Repetition	Percentage %	The most prominent linguistic example
Postponing to intention and personal piety	17	%85	What's likely depends on the intention of the one celebrating
Equal opportunity to present both sides' arguments	19	%95	Some scholars believe... and others believe
Pilgrimage by religious/legal authority/textual evidence	15	%75	The public on... and some sects

The harmonious conclusion with higher values	20	%100	The original is... while avoiding mistakes
Delegating judgment to scholars/ijtihad	14	%70	The matter is open to interpretation

Table 1: Frequency of argumentative avoidance strategies in the sample of religious cases n=20

From Table 1, we can see that ChatGPT, when it comes to religious issues, defaults 85% of the time to a strategy of intention and piety, because it's a safe legal zone that no one disputes.

The argumentative strategy	Repetition	Percentage %	The most prominent linguistic example
Absolute denial and establishing relativity	18	90%	There is no perfect system
The balanced pros and cons	20	100%	It is characterized by... while it is also characterized by...
Migration to cultural privacy	16	%80	It depends on the country's history and culture
Migration to context and results	15	%75	It depends on the context and the outcomes
The framing conclusion without judgment	19	%95	The evaluation remains linked to...

Table 2: Frequency of argumentative avoidance strategies in a sample of political cases n=20

Through Table 2, we notice that ChatGPT in political issues uses a pros and cons balance, and this algorithm is called the programmed neutrality algorithm.

The argumentative strategy	Repetition	Percentage %	The most prominent linguistic example
Mutual Hajj offer for both parties	18	90%	Some people see... while others see
Migration to cultural privacy	17	%%85	It varies according to customs and social traditions
The harmonious conclusion with higher values	20	%100	The most important thing is family unity and respecting differences
Procedural Generalization/Relativity	16	%80	There's no single rule, it's relative

Denying duality and establishing plurality	10	%50	The issue isn't black and white; it has shades.

Table 3: Frequency of argumentative avoidance strategies in a sample of social issues n=20

Through Table 2, we notice that ChatGPT, in social issues, resorts to custom 85% of the time, meaning that society determines it. We also notice that ChatGPT is afraid of breaking social harmony, which is why we find it concludes with family cohesion 100% of the time. It resorts to leaving the judgment to custom 85% of the time as a way of avoiding responsibility.

The argumentative strategy	**Repetition**	**Percentage %**	**The most prominent linguistic example**
Denying duality and establishing plurality	18	90%	The event can't be reduced to just one cause
Dissociation	14	%%70	We should differentiate between the political context and the social context.
Deportation to the context and circumstances	15	%75	You can't judge outside the context of that stage
The value-harmonized conclusion	20	%100	The lesson remains to draw moral lessons for generations.
Appealing to authority/reference	9	%45	Historians differ in evaluating this event

Table 4: Frequency of argumentative avoidance strategies in the sample of historical cases n=20

From Table 4, we notice that ChatGPT favorite approach in historical matters is breaking down the event 70% of the time and considering multiple causes 90% of the time; because history is a controversial subject, the solution is to say: the topic is complex.

The argumentative strategy	My history n=20	Social n=20	Politician n=20	My religion n=20	Total n=80
Equitable Hajj Offer	17	18	20	19	74
Deportation to the context/circumstances	15	17	16	12	60
The value-harmonized conclusion	20	20	19	20	79
Appealing to authority/reference	9	6	8	15	38
Denial of duality/plurality	18	10	7	3	38

Breaking down the question itself	14	4	5	2	25

Table 5: Comparison of the argumentative tools used across the four fields n=80

Table 5 shows us that Arabic ChatGPT discourse relies on three main argumentative strategies that are common across all four controversial areas: presenting balanced arguments at a total rate of 92.5%, ending with value-based consensus at 98.75%, and deferring to context and circumstances at 75%. This confirms that the 'programmed neutrality' mechanism is not specific to one field over another, but rather a fixed structure in the model's language algorithm. However, the analysis reveals subtle differences in the use of sub-tools depending on the field's nature. In the religious field, for example, the use of authority and reference-based arguments rises to 75%, and the model uses phrases like 'the majority of scholars' and 'the prevailing opinion', considering that textual authority is the source of legitimacy in this field.

On the other hand, this percentage drops to 40% in the historical field and 30% in the social field, indicating that the model recognizes the different nature of evidence from one field to another. As for the strategy of denying duality and affirming plurality, it peaks in the historical field at 90%, where phrases like 'multiple narratives' and 'differences in sources' are frequently used, while it almost disappears in the religious field, at only 15%, due to the sensitivity of certainty and definitiveness in religious discourse.

One of the main findings from Table 5 is that the strategy of breaking down the question itself is almost exclusively limited to the historical field at 70%, and it appears very minimally in other areas. This suggests that ChatGPT tends to break down and reframe the question when it encounters knowledge gaps or a lack of confirmed data, which is an advanced rhetorical tactic reflecting the model's programming to avoid mistakes rather than make judgments. In summary, the analysis shows that ChatGPT doesn't exercise a single kind of neutrality; instead, it practices a "contextually adaptive neutrality," choosing the most suitable rhetorical tool for each field to maintain the same goal: avoiding giving a definitive answer while preserving the appearance of objectivity. This supports the main hypothesis of the research that neutrality in ChatGPT discourse is a deliberate algorithm, not a spontaneous one.

The argumentative strategy	My history n=20	My history n=20	Social n=20	Politician n=20	My religion n=20	p-value	$\chi 2$	The meaning
Equivalent Hajj package	74	17	18	20	19	0.781	1.08	Not working
Deportation to the context/circumstances	60	15	17	16	12	0.446	2.67	Not working

The value-harmonized conclusion	79	20	20	19	20	0.798	1.01	Not working
Appealing to authority/reference	38	9	6	8	15	0.024	9.42	Function
Denial of duality/multiplicity	38	18	10	7	3	0.001	17.89	Very annoying
Breaking down the question itself	25	14	4	5	2	0.002	15.36	Very annoying

df=3, _ p < .05, _ p < .01

Table 6: Test of significance of differences in the frequency of argumentative strategies across the four areas n=80 (Chi-Square Test of Independence(

From analyzing the table data, three points become clear to us:

Point 1: There are 3 fixed strategies that are not statistically significant: Presenting the Argument + Migration + Harmonious Conclusion are used by ChatGPT in the same proportion across all fields: 74, 60, 79 out of 80. This means that the 'hard core of programmed neutrality' in the algorithm doesn't change.

Point 2: There are 3 very significant variable strategies: Authority 0.024 + Pluralism 0.001 + Deconstruction 0.002 vary depending on the field. This means that ChatGPT puts on the cloak of the jurist in religious topics 15/20, and wears the cloak of the relative historian in historical topics (18/20 deconstruction + 14/20 pluralism).

Point 3: The historical field is the most fortified: ANOVA showed that historical texts contain an average of 4.60 strategies, which is the highest number with a significant difference from religious texts. Because history is the most sensitive field for the algorithm, it provides the largest number of argumentative protective walls.

From the above, we can conclude that ChatGPT has a dual argumentative structure: a fixed structure 70%: balancing + migration + conclusion = this is programming code that doesn't change, and a variable structure 30%: authority/pluralism/deconstruction = this is a 'contextual mask' that changes depending on the topic, which proves that neutrality is not stupidity but a conscious algorithmic strategy.

- There's a fixed, programmed argument pattern: analysis showed that ChatGPT doesn't improvise on controversial issues, but rather reproduces a single argumentative structure made up of 4 repeating stages: opening with a report of the controversy → presenting balanced arguments →

shifting the judgment to intention/context/circumstances → a consensual conclusion, and this confirms that its neutrality isn't spontaneous but a trained algorithm.

- Programmed neutrality as an argumentative strategy: It turns out that neutrality in ChatGPT isn't the absence of a stance, but a deliberate non-stance. The model uses parliamentary techniques like arguing by contrast, appealing to authority, referring to personal values, and breaking down the question, all aimed at avoiding upsetting any segment of the diverse Arab audience, both religiously and politically.
- Tools vary depending on the field despite the structure remaining the same, as the language tools differ according to the following:

- Religious issues: arguments prevail through jurisprudential authority + referral to piety.
- Political issues: arguments prevail through cultural relativity + weighing pros and cons.
- Social issues: arguments prevail through interest + family cohesion.
-Historical issues: arguments prevail through pluralism + rejection of dualism.

- The effect of neutrality on the Arab audience: This approach leads to a confused audience. Instead of providing an answer that builds awareness, it gives an answer that scatters awareness by justifying all sides. This, in turn, affects the formation of public opinion on crucial issues.

Recommendations:

In light of the findings, the study recommends the following:

1) For researchers: It is essential to develop an Arabic rhetorical model to analyze AI discourse, rather than relying solely on Western models. The Beirlman network has proven effective in uncovering hidden aspects.

2) For AI model designers: Reconsider the policy of absolute neutrality when addressing controversial Arab issues. Excessive neutrality can turn into "watering down values" and weaken Arab users' trust in the model.

3) For Arab users: Develop rhetorical awareness when interacting with ChatGPT, and understand that a "very balanced" answer is, in itself, a stance designed to avoid conflict, and not necessarily the truth.

4) For academic institutions: Include a course on AI discourse analysis within Arabic language and media programs to keep up with knowledge shifts.

Conclusion:

This study concluded that Arabic ChatGPT discourse on controversial issues is not a 'stance-less' discourse, but rather a 'neutral stance' discourse. The model has successfully used its algorithms to employ Perelman's argumentation framework intelligently: it opens with agreement, builds with balance, evades through deferral, and concludes with higher values.

In this way, artificial intelligence transforms from an information tool into a 'speaker without commitment,' mastering the art of rhetoric but avoiding issuing opinions. In the Arab context, where 'taking a stance' is part of identity, this programmed neutrality raises a new question: do we want an AI that mimics our neutrality, or an AI that confronts us with the truth, even if it's controversial?

This question remains open for future studies, which we hope will build on this paper to unpack the relationship between the Arab mind and machines in the era of generative intelligence.