AN ANALYSIS OF LOGICAL FALLACY IN ARGUMENT OF CAMPAIGNE TEAM OF JOKO WIDODO AND PRABOWO SUBIANTO

Rahmaddin Daeli[1], Hamzah Hamzah[2]
English Department
Faculty of Languages and Arts
Universitas Negeri Padang
email: rahmaddindaely@gmail.com

Abstract

This research was aimed to find the types of logical fallacies in argument of campaign team debate of Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto. This research was descriptive qualitative. The data were analyzed by using theory of Damer (2009). The result of the research showed that of all sixty types of fallacy, there were only fifteen types were found. There are twelve types of fallacies produced by campaign team of Joko Widodo with twenty six occurrences and nine types of fallacies produced by campaign team of Prabowo with thirty three occurrences. Drawing the wrong conclusion fallacy was the most dominant type produced by campaign team of Jokowi with the proportion 19.23 %. The most dominant types produced by campaign team of Prabowo are using the wrong reasons and contrary-to-fact-hypothesis with the proportion 33.33%.

Key words: Logical fallacy, argument, campaign team debate

A. INTRODUCTION

Discourse analysis is a study in linguistics field dealing with the relationship between the language use and its context. Discourse analysis is the discipline which investigates the relationship between form and function in verbal communication (Renkema, 2004). In the process of social interaction, people use language to communicate with others. A language is a tool of communication to reveal their selves, to communicate the meaning of their messages as well as their feelings and values. These, essentially, are the most important functions of language in communication. To be successful in applying these functions, the ability to communicate effectively is highly required. The problem is people sometimes

---

unaware of what they are dealing with so that the intended purpose of communication or speech cannot be achieved.

Moreover, Aditomo 2017 states that debate is one of argumentative discourse practices. In the debate, the speakers have to stand on their case with argumentation, a speech has to be supported by facts to make it more persuasive and convincing. As a speaker is performing his speech, he will carry ideas. In this case, he has particular burden of making his ideas hang together with apparent logic. The process of logical thinking is expressed in the delivery of argument as an aspect of the matter that is being assessed. Therefore, the speakers must have good argumentation and critical thinking to make their arguments clearer and acceptable.

Critical thinking is defined as the ability to identify errors in reasoning known as logical fallacies. A logical fallacy is an error in reasoning that renders an argument invalid; in logic, an argument is a list of statements (Macri, 2018). Arguments are used to support viewpoints and include premises, assumptions, and conclusions. It is important to understand that one negative premise results in a false conclusion. Freeley and Steinberg (2008) add that the ability of every decision-maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions rely heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its parts to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates.

The logical fallacy has been studied in various areas and objects. First, the logical fallacy has been studied in the area of argumentative writing. Indah and Kusuma (2015) researched logical fallacies found in English department students' claims of fact, value, and policy. The result of this study showed that on claims of fact, the errors students made in reasoning occur when the reason does not adequately support the claim in one of several ways. On claims of value, more faulty reasoning is found compared to the discussion on other topics that are considered less familiar. On claims of policy, the topics are chosen deal with a bigger issue or nationwide concern which makes the students overuse the references which may cause faultier reasoning compared to the discussion on other topics that are considered less familiar. Another study which related to argumentative writing was conducted by Elkhoiri and Widiati (2017); this research analyzed logical fallacies in Indonesian EFL Learners' argumentative writing. The result of this study showed that students still produced some logical fallacies in their work, some of which were very basic they can be avoided through simple, explicit instruction.

Second, the logical fallacy has been studied in the political area. The study of logical fallacies have been conducted by Zhou (2018) analyzed the logical fallacy in political discourse. This researcher attempted to analyze logical fallacies in debates about political issues focused on abortion, immigration, and gun control made by politician in America. The result of this study showed that among 18 types of fallacies, the slippery slope fallacy, the straw man fallacy, the hasty generalization fallacy, and the post hoc fallacy are the most popular ones that are most frequently used. Also, Melakopides (2018) has conducted the study focused

on the methodical use of logical fallacy on President R.T Erdogan and his allies. The result of this study showed that there are several logical fallacies found, there are red herring, begging the questions and ad hominem.

The next is the research conducted by Santoso (2017) who analyzed logical fallacy between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump First U.S. Presidential Debate. The goal of this research was to find the similarities and differences between the two candidates in the fallacies. The result of this study showed that all of the sound arguments were made by Hillary Clinton while Donald Trump made all of the "hasty generalization" and "ad populum" fallacy. Last is the research conducted by Al-Hindawi., et al (2015) have analyzed the presence of logical fallacy in the political speech presented by David Cameron. The result of this study showed that fallacy is a process composed of various stages in which each stage is distinct for its pragmatic components and strategies.

Based on the previous studies above, the logical fallacy has been studied in areas argumentative writing and politics. This research will apply logical fallacy in the area of politics but in different thought pattern, which is a campaign team debate in Indonesia. There are two gaps why this research is highly needed to be analyzed. First, the previous studies analyzed logical fallacies in English thought pattern. However, this study will analyze logical fallacies produced by politicians in Indonesia which different thought pattern from English has thought pattern. It means, the logical fallacies made by people from different country will be different as well. Second, so far there is no research conducted about logical fallacy produced by the campaign team debate of presidential candidates. Mostly, the researchers merely focused on the presidential candidate and politicians in general, none of them focused on campaign teams. This gap needs to be analyzed because campaign teams also have a big influence on succeeding in the presidential election. Therefore, the researcher attempts to fulfill these gaps which focus on finding the types of logical fallacy, the differences, and similarities produced by the presidential campaign team.
.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The type of this research is descriptive qualitative research because this research wanted to look at the significant value held by language to differentiate the types of logical fallacy. According Moleong (2013:6), qualitative research is used to explain and understand holistically a phenomenon that is experienced by the subject of the research in a certain natural context by using various scientific methods, and describe it in forms of words and languages. The findings were obtained by describing, explaining, and interpreting the data. Consequently, this study applied the qualitative method.

The source of data of this research was video transcripts of Jokowi and Prabowo campaign teams' debate in Mata Najwa TV program. The data are in the forms of clauses that contain logical fallacies uttered by campaign team members. There are two instruments: the researcher and personal computer. The researcher was the person who collected and analyzed the data. The researcher analyzed the data based

on the related theories in order obtain the findings. The personal computer was used for collecting the data. It was used to access internet for obtaining the data.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION
1. Research Finding
a.Types of Logical Fallacies in the Argument of Campaign Team of Joko Widodo

There are five categories of fallacies and there are totally sixty types of fallacies. After analyzing the data, it was found that campaign team of Joko Widodo made a number of fallacies that belong to four categories. Of all sixty types of fallacies only thirteen types of fallacies were found. The frequency and percentage of the thirteen types are shown in the following table.

Table: Types of Fallacy Produced by Campaign Team of Joko Widodo

Categories of Fallacies	No	Types of Fallacies	F	%
Fallacies that Violate the Structural Criterion	1	Arguing in a circle	1	3.84 %
Fallacies that Violate the Relevant Criterion	2	Drawing the Wrong Conclusion	5	19.23 %
	3	Using the Wrong Reasons	4	15.38 %
	4	Appeal to Common Opinion	1	3.84 %
	5	Manipulation of Emotion	1	3.84 %
Fallacies that Violate the Sufficiency Criterion	6	Insufficient Sample	2	7.69 %
	7	Unrepresentative Data	2	7.69 %
	8	Contrary-to-Fact Hypothesis	3	11.53 %
	9	Omission of Key Evidence	3	11.53 %
Fallacies that Violate the Rebuttal Criterion	10	Abusive Ad Hominem	2	7.69 %
	11	Attacking a Straw Man	1	3.84 %
	12	Red Herring	1	3.84 %
Total			26	100%

From the table above, it is visible that there are only four categories from five categories produced by campaign team of Joko Widodo. It indicates that there is no types of fallacies that violate the acceptability criterion found in argument of campaign team of Joko Widodo. The second and the third category appeared with the highest number of types of fallacies. There are five types of fallacies found in these categories. Meanwhile, the first category appeared with the least types of fallacy. There was only one type found; arguing in a circle.

With regard to the type occurrences, drawing the wrong conclusion appeared with the highest frequency of five occurrences (19.23 %). Then, using the wrong reasons fallacy appeared as the second highest with four occurrences (15.38 %). Mostly the rest (arguing in a circle, appeal to common opinion, manipulation of emotions, attacking a straw man and red herring) appeared as the least occurrences with only one occurrence (3.84 %).

b. Types of Logical Fallacies in the Argument of Campaign Team of Prabowo Subianto

Campaign team of Prabowo produced a number of logical fallacies that only belong to four categories. There are nine types of sixty types of fallacies found in their arguments. The frequency and percentage of the ten types of fallacies can be seen in the table below.

Table: Types of Fallacy Produced by Campaign Team of Prabowo Subianto

Categories of Fallacies	No	Types of Fallacies	F	%
Fallacies that Violate the Relevant Criterion	1	Drawing the Wrong Conclusion	4	12.12%
	2	Using the Wrong Reasons	11	33.33 %
	3	Appeal to Self-Interest	1	3.03 %
Fallacies that Violate Acceptability the Criterion	4	Fallacy of Composition	1	3.03 %
	5	False Alternatives	1	3.03 %
Fallacies that Violate the Sufficiency Criterion	6	Unrepresentative Data	1	3.03 %
	7	Contrary-to-Fact Hypothesis	11	33.33 %
	8	Omission of Key Evidence	2	6.06 %
Fallacies that Violate the Rebuttal Criterion	9	Red Herring	1	3.03 %
Total			33	100%

From the table above, it is visible that there are only four categories from five categories produced by campaign team of Prabowo Subianto. It indicates that there is no types of fallacies that violate the structural criterion found in argument of campaign team of Prabowo Subianto. The first and the third category appeared with the highest number of types of fallacies. There are three types of fallacies found in these category. Meanwhile, the last category appeared with the least types of fallacy. There was only one type found; red herring.

With regard to the type occurrences, using the wrong reasons and contrary-to-fact-hypothesis appeared with the highest frequency of eleven occurrences (33.33 %). Then, drawing the wrong conclusion fallacy appeared as the second highest with four occurrences (12.12 %). Mostly the rest (appeal to interest, fallacy of composition, false alternatives, unrepresentative data and red herring) appeared as the least occurrences with only one occurrence (3.03 %).

2. Discussion

In terms of category, there were significant difference and similarity between the two campaign teams in producing the fallacies. First, from five categoriesbased on Damer's theory, there were only four categories found in each team. Campaign team of Jokowi did not produce the third category; fallacies that violate the acceptability criterion. Meanwhile, campaign team of Prabowo did not produced fallacies in the first category; fallacies that violate structural criterion. Second, the most dominat occurences produced by two teams are in the second category of fallacies; fallacies that violate the relevance criterion. This means both teams tended to deliver their argument irrelevantly.

The fallacies produced by campaign team of Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto were dominated by the category of fallacies that violate relevance criterion. In team of Jokowi found four types of fallacies and eleven occurences while in team of Prabowo found three types of fallacies and sixteen ocurrences. According to Damer (2009, p.92) fallacies that violate the elevance criterion is are fallacies that breach a successful argument's significance criteria by using irrelevant assumptions or referring to reasons that are unrelated to the truth or validity of their conclusions.This means that, both of teams had a tendency to use assumptions which has no relevant reason rather than giving relevant eveidences to support their claims.

In terms of types of fallacies, there were twelve types of fallacies with twenty six occurrences found in team of Jokowi. The fallacy of drawing the wrong conclusion appeared as the most dominant among them. According to Damer (2009, p.99) the fallacy of drawing wrong conclusion occurs when the arguer misses the point of his/her own evidence. This means that campaign team of Jokowi had tendency to draw the conclusion of their argument without giving supported evidence. It might possibly happen because they lack of evidence since the debates were impromptu. They had to persuade the audiences to support their candidate.

The types of fallacy produced by Prabowo team were fewer than tem of Jokowi; only nine types of fallacies. However, the total number of occurrences is higher than team of Jokowi with thirty three occurrences. The most dominat fallacy in team of Prabowo is using the wrong reason and contrary-to-fact-hypothesis. There were eleven occurrences found in each types of fallacy. According to Damer (2009, p.99), using the wrong reason occurs when an arguer is attempting to defend a particular conclusion and uses evidence that does not support the conclusion, while contrary-to-fact-hypothesis occurs an arguer makes a claim without sufficient evidence about what would have happened in the past if other conditions had been present or about an event that will occur in the future (2009, p.168). That means, team of Prabowo tend to conduct their argument by making assumption about what happen in the past and in the future. This team also had tendency to conduct their argument by not giving data to support their argument.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The results of fallacy analysis on the argumentation between campaign team of Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto lead to a number of conclusion. First, campaign team of Jokowi produced fallacies in twelve types of fallacies with twenty six occurrences. The types of fallacies found in team of Jokowi are arguing in a circle, drawing the wrong conclusion, using the wrong reasons, appeal to common opinion, manipulation of emotions, insufficient sample, unrepesentative data, contrary-to-fact-hypothesis, omission key evidence, abusive ad hominem, attacking a straw man and red herring. Second, campaign team of Prabowo produced fallacies in nine types with thirty three occurrences. The types of fallacies found in team of Prabowo are drawing the wrong conclusion, using the wrong reasons, appeal to self-interest, fallacy of composition, false alternatives, unrepesentative data, contrary-to-fact-hypothesis, omission key evidence, and red herring.

The studies of logical fallacies on campaign team debates are currently still limited. There were only a few researches found and most of them were from western countries. Moreover, the recent researches mostly focused on finding the types of fallacies. Therefore, future research regarding the topic on other debates, and deeper researches that can associate the presence of fallacies to the pursuit of human interests and irrational desires are highly recommended.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-hindawi, F. H., Alkhazaali, M. A. R.., & Al-Awadi, D. (2015). A Pragmatic Study of Fallacy in David Cameron's Political Speeches. *Journal of Social Science Studies,* 2 (2): 214-239.

Damer, T. E. (2009). *Attacking Faulty Reasoning* (6th Edition ed.): Wadsworth Publishing.

El Khoiri, N., & Widiati, U. (2017). Logical Fallacies in Indonesian EFL Learners' Argumentative Writing: Students' Perspectives. *Dinamika Ilmu ,* 17 (1).

Freeley, A. J., & Steinberg, D. L. (2008). *Argumentation and Debate "Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making" (12th ed.)*. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Melakodipes, C. (2018). Brief Remarks on President R.T. Erdogan and His Allies' Methodical Use of Logical Fallacies. *Journal of Political Science*. 20 (3): 376-385.

Moleong, L. J. (2013). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif (Edisi Revisi)*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Santoso, J. M. (2017). A Fallacy Analysis of the Arguments on the First U.S. Presidential Debate Between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. *Journal Kita.* 5 (2): 65-71.

Zhou, Z. C. (2018). The Logical Fallacies in Political Discourse. Summer Research Program. http:/crossworks.holycross.edu/mellon summer_research/5