ANALYSIS OF LOGICAL FALLACY ON THE ARGUMENTS MADE BY STUDENT FROM 2019 INDONESIAN PROTESTS AND RIOTS IN TELEVISION DEBATES.

Ayu Wiranda[1], Hamzah Hamzah[2]
English Department
Faculty of Languages and Arts
Universitas Negeri Padang
email: ayu.wiranda2001@gmail.com

Abstract

This study sought to identify the many sorts of logical fallacies used in Indonesian television debates, notably those made by students who participated in the 2019 protests and rioting there. This is a descriptive study that takes a qualitative approach. In this study, the five categories and sixty-two types of fallacies introduced by Damer's (2009) theory of fallacy classification were used. There were eighteen of the sixty different types identified. First, the results revealed that students consistently violated the acceptability and rebuttal criteria in their arguments, using five different fallacies in each category. Second, with a frequency of 27.98%, poisoning the well was the type of fallacy that students used the most frequently, followed by the two-wrong fallacy with a frequency of 10.29% and manipulation of emotion with a frequency of 8.82%.

Key words: Logical fallacy, arguments, debate, demonstration

A. INTRODUCTION

According to Gamut (1991), logic is the science of reasoning. Argumentation is one of the many applications of reasoning. To present an argument, people must think, evaluate evidence, and make assumptions, rather than simply collecting evidence to support predetermined conclusion. Critical thinking is crucial, particularly when arguing against someone. The intellectually disciplined process of actively and deftly using knowledge gleaned from, or generated by, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication as a guide to belief and action is known as critical thinking. It is founded on universal intellectual principles that are exemplified by the following and transcend the boundaries of subject matter: clarity, accuracy, precision, consistency, relevance, strong evidence, compelling arguments, depth, breadth, and fairness. (scriven dan paul, 1987).

---

[1] English ELLSP of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang graduated on September 2022
[2] Lecturer of English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

According to Gula (2002), a fallacy is a logical or reasoning error. It is not, strictly speaking, a mistake of fact or belief. It is about the thought process, so it is about the conclusions, not the statements that form those conclusions. The logical fallacy has been researched in a variety of fields and objects. Earlier research on logical fallacies in marketing-related disciplines has been done (See Lieto and Vernero, 2013; Srimayasandy, 2021). Furthermore, logical fallacy also has been studied in the field of argumentative writing (See Indah and Kusuma, 2015; Widiati and Khoiri, 2017; and Lismay, 2020). Also, investigation of logical fallacies in political discourse is a common practice (see Zhou, 2018; Al-hindawi, 2015; santoso, 2017; Warman and Hamzah, 2019; and Hidayat et al., 2020).

Logical fallacy analysis can be found in both marketing and political discourse, but it is more common in political debate. Furthermore, all of the discourse types being examined aim to persuade. Previous researchers who investigate in the field of political discourse are mostly looking into the debate between political figures or people that have a high position in society. Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine and identify the different types of logical fallacies used by students in their arguments on television debates during the 2019 Indonesian protests and riots.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

The data in this study were analyzed using descriptions and explanations, making it a descriptive research. To strengthen the outcome of the descriptive analysis, a small number of quantitative calculations were nevertheless performed. The lack of empirical or field data made this research a type of library research. It also has a textual foundation, making it appropriate for corpus library research.

The data was presented as clauses or statements made by students in television debates during 2019 protests and riots in Indonesia. The first data for this study were gathered from video transcripts of *Ujian Reformasi* debate in Mata Najwa TV program and the next source of data of this research was from the debate entitled "*Reformasi Dikorupsi*" which aired on KOMPAS TV

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION
1. Research Finding
Students produced fewer fallacies that belong to the five categories. From a total of 62 fallacies, 18 had been found in the arguments of students. The table below shows the frequency and percentage for each of the eighteen kinds of fallacies.

Table 1. the fallacies types made by Students

Categories of fallacies	No.	Types of fallacies	F	%
Fallacies that violate the structural criterion	1	The question-begging language	3	4.41%
Fallacies that violate the relevance criterion	2.	Drawing the wrong conclusion	2	2.94%
	3.	Appeal to irrelevant authority	2	2.94%
	4.	Appeal to force or threat	3	4.41%
	5.	Manipulation of emotion	6	8.82%
Fallacies that violate the acceptability criterion	6.	Ambiguity	1	1.47%
	7.	Misleading accent	4	5.88%
	8.	Argument by innuendo	5	7.35%
	9.	Fallacy of composition	1	1.47%
	10.	False alternatives	1	1.47%
Fallacies that violate the sufficiency criterion	11.	Insufficient sample	3	4.41%
	12.	Confusion of a necessary with a sufficient condition	1	1.47%
	13.	Post hoc fallacy	3	4.41%
Fallacies that violate the rebuttal criterion	14.	Ignoring the Counterevidence	3	4.41%
	15.	Poisoning the Well	19	27.98%
	16.	Two-wrongs fallacy	7	10.29%
	17.	Attacking a strawman	3	4.41%
	18.	Trivial Objection	1	1.47%
Total			68	100%

From the table above, the third and fifth categories, out of a total of five, contain the most fallacies, each with five different types. They are fallacies that violate acceptability and rebuttal criterion. To be more precise, out of the 16 fallacies that fall under that category's acceptability criterion, 5 were discovered. Of the nine different forms of fallacies in the rebuttal criterion category, 5 were discovered. In acceptability criterion, there are ambiguity, misleading accent, argument by innuendo, fallacy of composition, false alternatives. Furthermore, in rebuttal criterion, there are Ignoring the Counterevidence, poisoning the well, two-wrongs fallacy, attacking a strawman, trivial objection. The category with the second-highest number of fallacies is fallacies that violate the relevance requirement, with four different types, while the category with the third-highest

number of fallacies types is fallacies that violate the sufficiency condition, with three different types. Last but not least, fallacies that violate the structural requirement with only one type of fallacy detected are the least common forms of fallacies found in the first criterion.

There are 68 arguments in all of the 18 fallacies types. The most prevalent fallacies in student arguments are poisoning the well by occurring 19 times (27.98%). Fallacy of two-wrongs had the second-highest frequency, with 7 instances (10.29%). Then, with six instances (8.82%), comes the fallacy of emotion manipulation. Furthermore, there is fallacy of argument by innuendo with 5 occurrences (7.35%). Next with 4 occurrences (5.88%) is misleading accent. There are six types of fallacies that have less frequent types of fallacies with 3 occurrences (4.41%). They are the question-begging language, appeal to force or threat, insufficient sample, post hoc fallacy, ignoring the counterevidence, attacking a strawman. Draw the wrong conclusion and appeal to irrelevant authority each have two occurrences, making them the second least common forms of fallacies with the percentage of 2.94% each. Finally, ambiguity, fallacy of composition, false alternatives, confusion of a necessary with a sufficient condition, and trivial objection are the fallacies with the fewest occurrences with one instance (1.47%) overall.

2. Discussion

In terms of category, the students created two categories that were more prevalent than the others. They are fallacies that fail to meet the standards for acceptable and rebuttal. The identical number of types—5 types in each of these two categories—appears in both. As previously mentioned, the students also presented a significant number of arguments that fell under the acceptability category. Even though there are fewer than those generated by the government, this category nonetheless contains the most common sort of student-made fallacies. Regarding the rebuttal standard, this sort of fallacy, according to Damer (2009, p. 193), occurs when an arguer fails to provide a convincing response to any anticipated major criticisms made by the counterargument. Therefore, it implies that the students generally did not offer strong refutations to his opponent's criticisms. The reason might occur is that they are so firmly convinced of their own opinion that they don't even consider the possibility of another viewpoint.

In terms of the types of fallacies, the fallacy of poisoning the well appeared as the most dominant type made by students. Damer (2009, p. 200) claims that this fallacy is known as "poisoning the well" because its intended outcome is to denigrate the originator of an argument or point of view in a way that eliminates the need to assess the soundness of that viewpoint. Gula (2002) argues that when an opponent poisons a well, the water is ruined; regardless of how good or pure the water was before, it is now poisoned and hence useless.

When an opponent employs this tactic, he creates such doubts on a person that he is unable to defend himself without making the situation worse.

The frequent use of "poisoning the well" by students suggests that they dispute by levelling numerous charges against one another in an effort to discredit the other side and give their arguments zero credibility. Poisoning the well, a fallacy that is part of the ad hominem fallacy, has been shown to be commonly employed in debates between the government and students. (Zhou, 2018) identified ad hominem as one of the frequent fallacies in their study of logical fallacies in political debate.

It is also strongly related to other popular sorts of argument, including the bias type and the situationally disqualifying type of ad hominem argument, arguments from bias, arguments alleging group bias, arguments from position to know, etc (Walton, 2006). The ad hominem argument is a personal attack that calls into question or discredits the credibility of the argumentator, diminishing the strength of her case. Poisoning the well is a similar type of assault because it challenges the source's intellectual honesty and dependability, challenging their objectivity or sincerity in a way that causes the audience to question the validity of their claims.

The second fallacy presented most by the students, known as the fallacy of two-wrongs, is a subset of the ad hominem fallacy. The person making the argument who uses this fallacy is imply telling the critic, "Your argument is not worthy of my consideration since you are guilty of doing exactly the same thing or thinking the same way that you are criticizing me for." As a result, the high incidence of this fallacy indicates that students frequently reject criticism of their arguments or behavior by blaming the critic or other people for having similar thoughts or behaviors.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

According to the results, students have a considerable impact on the frequency of occurrences. The students presented a total of 68 fallacious arguments. Additionally, the students created 18 various types of fallacies in reference to the types. The three fallacies with the greatest frequency made in the students' arguments are "poisoned well," "two-wrong fallacy," and "emotional manipulation."

Research on logical fallacies is still in its early stages. A lot of research has been done on the logical fallacy in the political debate, but there is still a lack of variation in terms of who is debating. Additionally, current study has mostly focused on identifying different forms of fallacies in political debates. Future studies on logical fallacies in a variety of disciplines, aside from political arguments, such as business, advertising, news, and so forth, are therefore highly advised.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Damer, T.E., 2008. Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-Free Arguments.

El Khoiri, N. and Widiati, U., 2017. Logical Fallacies in EFL Learners' Argumentative Writings. *Dinamika Ilmu: Jurnal Pendidikan*, pp.71-81.

Gamut L. T. F. (1991). Introduction to Logic (Vol. 1). Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press

Gula, R.J., 2002. *Nonsense: A handbook of logical fallacies*. Axios Press.

Hidayat, D.N., Defianty, M., Kultsum, U. and Sufyan, A., 2020, October. Logical Fallacies in Social Media: A Discourse Analysis in Political Debate. In *2020 8th International Conference on Cyber and IT Service Management (CITSM)* (pp. 1-5). IEEE.

Indah, R.N. and Kusuma, A.W., 2015. Fallacies in English Department students' claims: A rhetorical analysis of critical thinking. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora*, *3*(4), pp.295-304.

Lieto, A. and Vernero, F., 2013, July. Unveiling the link between logical fallacies and web persuasion. In *Proceedings of the 5th Annual ACM Web Science Conference* (pp. 473-478).

Santoso, J.M., 2017. A Fallacy Analysis of the Arguments on the First US Presidential Debate Between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. *K@ ta Kita*, *5*(2), pp.65-71.

Scriven, M. and Paul, R., 1987, August. Defining critical thinking. In *8th Annual International Conference on Critical Thinking and Education Reform, Summer* (p. 1987).

Srimayasandy, S., 2021. Logical Fallacy Argumentation on Testimonials on Homeshopping Television Show. *MEDIASI*, *2*(2), pp.150-162.

Walton, D., 2006. *Fundamentals of Critical Argumentation*. Cambridge University Press.

Warman, J.S. and Hamzah, H., 2019. An Analysis of Logical Fallacy on Joko Widodo's Arguments during 2019 Indonesia Presidential Debate. *English Language and Literature*, *8*(3).

Zhou, Z.C., 2018. The logical fallacies in political discourse