

LOGICAL FALLACY IN SPEAKERS' ARGUMENTS: WHAT DO WE LEARN FROM FINAL ROUND DEBATE OF NUDC

Karina Estiani Agustin
Lambung Mangkurat University
1810117220025@mhs.ulm.ac.id

Novita Triana
Lambung Mangkurat University
novita_triana@ulm.ac.id

Nasrullah
Washington State University
nasrullah01@ulm.ac.id

Abstract: In debate, speakers often employ logical fallacies to bolster their statements in order to secure victory by persuasively introducing a collection of factual or belief errors. Numerous studies have analyzed the use of logical fallacies, primarily in presidential debates and public figures' speeches. However, there has been limited research specifically investigating the logical fallacies in students' debates. Therefore, this research aimed to examine the arguments presented by the speakers in the final round debate at NUDC. The objective is to identify and categorize the logical fallacies present in the arguments. The study employed descriptive-qualitative method. The data was taken from recorded video and transcript of the argument featuring eight speakers among NUDC's finalists. The data are reduced and organized into arguments containing only logical fallacies. They are classified into Damer's category of arguments. The study reveals that eight fallacies were identified. The most prevalent types of fallacies were those that violated the relevant criterion. Meanwhile, the most frequently occurred fallacy types are manipulation of emotion, appeal to common opinion, and causal oversimplification. The findings suggest that students should be taught to construct effective arguments that are based on evidence and logic, rather than relying on emotional appeals or popular opinions.

Keywords: *arguments, debate, logical fallacy*

INTRODUCTION

Debate has been part of English teaching and learning for many years, and is used to develop students' fluency in speaking. Through debates, students practice formulating arguments, responding to counterpoints, and expressing their ideas clearly and confidently. This active engagement with the language helps them improve their overall communication skills. Additionally, debates encourage critical thinking and research skills as students gather information and evidence to support their arguments. They also learn to respect different perspectives and engage in constructive dialogue, which are essential skills for success in both academic and professional settings.

Debate is a systematic procedure involving the presentation of arguments and the use of research to arrive at a logical conclusion regarding a topic (Freely & Steinberg, 2009). In a debate process, each participant in the discussion will argue or present their points in a specific manner so that the judges or other person agree with their position. The basic aim of any argument is to resolve the difference of opinion on the acceptability of the standpoint by appealing to the other party's reasonableness (Eemeren, 2010). Therefore, argumentation serves as one of the numerous applications of reasoning. The speaker who are presenting an argument must examine, evaluate, and make assumptions on data rather than just collecting them to support a predetermined conclusion. However, in debate, speakers may employ *fallacies*, or erroneous arguments that masquerade as fair and acceptable but are actually based on incorrect assumptions or flawed reasoning (Inch and Warnick, 2011). A fallacy is a logical or reasoning inaccuracy, claims Gula (2002). There were several studies conducted

examining the logical fallacies. So far, they mostly focused on examining the dialogue between political actors and individuals of high social standing in the realm of politics. Hence, the objective of this study was to discover the various types of logical fallacies employed by students in their arguments during the final debate round of NUDC 2022.

Debate

A debate is a speaking scenario where individuals deliver and convince opposite points of view (Dale and Wolf, 2000). It is also commonly known as a formal competition in which two sides or teams compete against one another by proposing reasonable arguments on the given topic or issue. Judges will weigh in on both sides of the debate and select the champion team based on the statement and the evidence proposed. Indonesia utilizes two distinct forms of parliamentary system debates. School debate tournaments employ the Asian Parliamentary system, while university debate competition employs the British Parliamentary system. That was also adopted as the style for the World University Debating Championship in 1994 and all future World Championships (Smith, 2011). According to Krieger (2005) a debate is an excellent activity for language learning since it involves students in several cognitive and linguistic ways. It is also beneficial for building argumentation abilities for persuasive speech and writing when relevant to speaking, reading, and listening practice. Kennedy (2007) contends that a debate is a learning method that improves learning in material mastery and active engagement, critical thinking skills development, oral communication skills development, and empathy development. Therefore, it is worth to include debate as one of the techniques in training students' speaking skills.

Argument

The speakers of a debate competition are assessed based on their arguments. Bierman and Assali (1996) states that an argument consists of a series of assertions that present certain statements – the premises – as evidence or reasons to support the truth of another statement – the conclusion. They must oppose the opposing team's arguments and points of view (Ristawati, 2019). An argument seeks to prove the truth or untruth of a specific claim by offering evidence that may persuade others to accept that assertion. An argument must consist of both a premise and a conclusion. Damer (2009) proposed standard format that exhibits the logical structure of an argument as follows:

*Since . . . (premise),
 which is a conclusion supported by . . . (subpremise),
and . . . (premise),
 which is a conclusion supported by . . . (subpremise),
and . . . (premise),
[and . . . (implicit premise)]
and . . . (rebuttal premise),
Therefore, . . . (conclusion).*

It is rare to come across an argument with all these features in such a clear form, but we can reconstruct any argument similar to this one by orderly separating the premises (and any of their subpremises) from the conclusion. While Damer's standard argument format provides a helpful framework, it's important to note that the number of premises and subpremises can vary significantly. Arguments may have as few as one premise or as many as needed to

establish the conclusion. Additionally, subpremises may not always directly support the premises. This flexibility allows for a wide range of argument structures.

Theory of Fallacy

Fallacies are mistakes in reasoning that typically do not seem to be mistakes. In fact, the word “fallacy” means “to deceive” or “deceitful” in Latin and Old French. Fallacious arguments usually have the deceptive appearance of being good arguments. This, perhaps, explains why they are so often misleading. Such deceptiveness may be unintentional on the part of the arguer.

Table 1 Damer’s categories of fallacies

Structure	Relevance	Acceptability	Sufficiency	Effectiveness of Rebuttal
<i>Begging-the-Question Fallacies</i>	<i>Fallacies of Irrelevant Premise</i>	<i>Fallacies of Linguistic Confusion</i>	<i>Fallacies of Missing Evidence</i>	<i>Fallacies of Counterevidence</i>
Arguing in a Circle	Genetic Fallacy	Equivocation	Insufficient Sample	Denying the Counterevidence
Question-Begging Language	Rationalization	Ambiguity	Unrepresentative Data	Ignoring the Counterevidence
Complex Question	Drawing the Wrong Conclusion	Misleading Accent	Arguing from Ignorance	
Question-Begging Definition	Using the Wrong Reasons	Illicit Contrast	Contrary-to-Fact Hypothesis	<i>Ad Hominem Fallacies</i>
		Innuendo	Fallacy of Popular Wisdom	Abusive <i>Ad Hominem</i>
<i>Fallacies of Inconsistency</i>	<i>Fallacies of Irrelevant Appeal</i>	Misuse of a Vague Expression	Special Pleading	Poisoning the Well
Incompatible Premises	Appeal to Irrelevant Authority	Distinction Without a Difference	Omission of Key Evidence	Two-Wrongs Fallacy
Contradiction Between Premise and Conclusion	Appeal to Common Opinion	<i>Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies</i>	<i>Causal Fallacies</i>	<i>Fallacies of Diversion</i>
	Appeal to Force or Threat	Fallacy of the Continuum	Confusion of a Necessary with a Sufficient Condition	Attacking a Straw Man
<i>Fallacies of Deductive Inference</i>	Appeal to Tradition	Fallacy of Composition	Causal Oversimplification	Trivial Objections
Denying the Antecedent	Appeal to Self-Interest	Fallacy of Division	<i>Post Hoc</i> Fallacy	Red Herring
Affirming the Consequent	Manipulation of Emotions	False Alternatives	Confusion of Cause and Effect	Resort to Humor or Ridicule
False Conversion		Is-Ought Fallacy	Neglect of a Common Cause	
Undistributed Middle Term		Wishful Thinking	Domino Fallacy	
Illicit Distribution of an End Term		Misuse of a Principle	Gambler’s Fallacy	
		Fallacy of the Mean		
		Faulty Analogy		

Furthermore, as seen in Table 1, Damer explains there are sixty types of logical fallacies and divided them into five categories: (1) fallacies that violate the structural criterion, (2) fallacies that violate the relevance criterion, (3) fallacies that violate the acceptability criterion, (4) fallacies that violate the sufficiency criterion, and (5) fallacies that violate the rebuttal criterion.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study proposes to identify the many sorts of logical fallacies made by the debaters final round debate of NUDC 2022. The researchers employ the descriptive-qualitative method to formulate the answer, analysing it as a combination of description and explanation. According to Cresswell (2012), qualitative research studies comprehend key individuals or groups associated with social or human problems. Furthermore, the data obtained was analysed in descriptions taken from the transcript of a video from the records of the final debate round. Wallen, *et al.* (2015) assert that descriptive research provides an explanation of

reality, typically obtaining data through questionnaires, surveys, interviews, and observations. Thus, after compiling data from the video into transcription and data reduction, the researcher uses several descriptions to identify principles and explanations that lead to conclusions.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research Findings

From the data transcript of the debaters' arguments, researchers identified ten arguments containing logical fallacies. However, after triangulation with experts, two of these arguments were deemed sound and free of logical fallacies or violations of standard argument form. Consequently, the analysis focused on the remaining eight arguments, all of which committed logical fallacies. These eight fallacies belonged to five distinct types. The most prevalent category was fallacies that violate the relevance criterion, accounting for four arguments. Within this category, two types were identified: manipulation of emotions and appeal to common opinion, with two arguments each. The second most common category was fallacies that violate the sufficiency criterion, with two arguments categorized as causal oversimplification. The remaining two fallacies were divided between the structural criterion category (arguing in a circle) and the rebuttal criterion category (attacking a straw man).

1. Fallacies that Violates Structural Criterion

The fallacy of this criterion was first committed by the leader of opening opposition. The speaker stated,

"It's very hard for them to eventually care in terms of identity politics, care about justice in law for example because most of them do not really have access towards the expansive newspaper or expansive knowledge". (33:30)

Within this argument, the speaker tried to convey the premise of the argument by explaining the factor of society's awareness towards politic. However, the conclusion stated did not convey the explanation or elaborate the premise as it is stated,

"It means that they also easy to manipulate, bribing 'serangan fajar', because they don't really have money". (33:40)

As a result, this argument consists of arguing in circle fallacy which means that the speaker premise and conclusion infer the same thing. The claim saying that Indonesian people are careless with politic because of their economic condition is equal as the society is easy to manipulate for their vote.

The reconstruction of the argument above is as follows,

Premise: It's very hard for them (poor society) to eventually care in terms of justice in law

Sub-premise: most of them (poor society) do not really have access towards the expansive newspaper or expansive knowledge into article for example because they are very hard working enough to eventually sustaining their own life

Conclusion: It means that they are easy to manipulate, bribing *serangan fajar*, because they don't really have money.

Within this argument the sub-premise is supporting the premise which claimed that Indonesian society are hard to eventually care about politic because they are busy to sustain their life which inferred that hard to care is the same as easy to manipulate.

2. Fallacies that Violates Relevance Criterion

There are two arguments contained of fallacies committed by the member of closing government under this criterion. First is under the type of Manipulation of Emotions specifically in assigning guilt within statement. The speaker contended,

“Even if you have a lot of money, you can’t enjoy it. Because in your side you will constantly feel guilty you questioning yourself.... you feel bad about yourself”. (59:59)

This claim then concluded by the speaker using this statement,

“....so you will all spend day by day in the office with feeling of guilty.” (01:00:04)

This argument contained the manipulation of emotions fallacies which committed by the speaker to explain a further impact of the opponent if they are disagree towards their idea.

The reconstruction of the argument is as follows,

Premise: Because in your side you will constantly feel guilty

Sub-premise: You questioning yourself why you did this for example that you complicit with the heart by the politician that you chose you feel bad about yourself because the job vacancy and increase of minimum wage that you have right now is from the ripping the benefit from minority differences that so vulnerable

Conclusion: So, you will all spend day by day in the office with feeling of guilty

The premise and the conclusion of this argument are the same. The argument posits that society would ultimately experience guilt if it rejects the proposed liberal ideology. This fallacy was committed in order that their opponent would feel guilty for choosing what they believed because it opposed their statement. Rather than providing detailed evidence, this government member attempted to manipulate the opponent through emotional appeals, hoping to allay societal guilt if they applied their ideology or proposal.

The second argument which also stated by the same speaker still fell down under the same type of fallacies that is manipulation of emotions which presented in their second closing argument that stated,

“Talking about happiness from money is bad, because you never gonna feel enough. You will constantly compare your benefit with other people that have high position with you.... therefore is gonna be not end game”. (01:00:26)

If we reconstructed the argument will look like this,

Premise: Talking about happiness from money is bad, because you never going to feel enough.

Sub-premise: You will constantly compare your benefit with other people that have high position with you

Implicit Conclusion: Therefore, prioritizing economy (like in Opposition proposal) is bad.

Conclusion: Therefore, is going to be not end game.

By seeing the reconstruction above it shows that the premise and conclusion infer the same thing as the expression of “never gonna feel” enough is equal to “not end game”. The Member of Government here use another emotional appeal argument which inferred that society will be impacted in an endless feeling of greed and unhappy if the proposal of opposition team applied.

The third statement, which also committed under the same category of fallacies that belongs to the type of appeal to common opinion, was stated by the leader of opening opposition within the following statement,

“...Because if it’s something that majority of people do not really care, it means we who care about democracy and the increase of them cannot really participate hugely in this kind of democracy and cannot really contribute that much.” (29:09)

From this statement it can be seen that the argument presented was ended up with the same premise and conclusion. The reconstruction of the argument above can be:

Premise: Because if it’s something that majority of people do not really care (about democracy)

Conclusion: We who care about democracy and the increase of them cannot really participate hugely.

In this statement the speaker talks about the current situation that because majority of people do not really care about politics, therefore, we (the minority who cares) cannot participate within the democracy. That premise does not give enough reasoning and evidence to explain why the at the end people who care or it can be referred as people are the minority will not be able to participate hugely within the democracy.

The fourth fallacy under the same category this fallacy committed by the member of closing opposition within the statement,

“...participation has never been a problem in Indonesian politics, right. Because Indonesian have high voter participation this is because people do not vote on the basis of politics but rather their personality and personal relatability towards the figure”. (01:04:09)

This statement contains the fallacies of appeal to common opinion which can be seen by that the speaker arguing based on the opinion. The speaker states that high voters were young voters that vote based on personality which she assumes that therefore all the young voters were choosing the political figure based on their personality. The reconstruction of the argument above can be

Premise: Participation has never been a problem in Indonesian politics

Sub-premise: Because Indonesia has higher voter participation, this is because people do not vote on the basis of politics but rather their personality

Implicit Conclusion: High number of voter equal to high participation in politics.

This argument demonstrates the fallacy of appeal to common opinion, which uses the sheer number of people to validate an opinion. The speaker asserts that Indonesians cast their votes based on the personalities and relatability of political figures, contributing to the large turnout in voting. Consequently, we can deduce that a high number of voters corresponds to a high level of political engagement. However, this type of reasoning cannot be considered valid because it relies solely on stating a large number or majority of people's opinions. This suggests that the argument is attempting to gain trust by appealing to quantity-based reasoning rather than relying on truth and substantial evidence.

3. Fallacies that Violates Sufficiency Criterion

The first speaker or the prime minister of the opening government committed causal oversimplification type of fallacy. The violation was committed through oversimplifying the reasoning by stating that

“Interest to choose a leader who can only represent is the biggest interest of young Indonesians right now have a very big idea on the interest of social issues, feminism, on social offenses”. (18:28)

which generalize all the young Indonesians to have such principle and idea about their political interest. Therefore, the speaker concluded that

“The value that will be able to represent the rich background that exist in young Indonesians right now is only liberalism.” (18:49)

which infer that the speaker assume that all Indonesian young generation is suitable with the liberalism ideology. The reconstruction of the argument above can be:

Premise: A leader who can only represent is the biggest interest of young Indonesians

Sub-premise: Young Indonesians have very big idea on the interest of social issues, feminism, on social offenses on things such as liberalism

Implicit premise: Young Indonesians are liberal and prefer the liberalism

Conclusion: The value that will be able to represent the rich background that exist in young Indonesians right now is only liberalism

Based on the reconstruction above, we can see that the premise inferred that most of young Indonesians or the majority of it only have high attraction towards the idea of liberal compare to other ideology in status quo. After that, the premise then supported with the sub-premise that explains on several issues that the current young Indonesian has the interest on such as social issues or feminism which assumed that young Indonesians are already liberal, which the speaker then though that it is sufficient to conclude that they are interested and believe that the one who can represent them is the one that is liberal too. Given that Indonesians come from diverse backgrounds and exhibit complexity, it's difficult to generalize and draw conclusions based solely on a single ideology like liberalism. Moreover, there is no sufficient evidence that the speaker can prove and bring to the table if that they were more interested in liberalism.

Member of closing government also committed the same category of fallacy with the following statement,

“We as younger voters uphold liberalism is the only voter base that they have right now because conservatives that incumbent inherently focused on their own internal problem”. (55:22)

The violation of this criteria is committed through taking a conclusion from an oversimplified reasoning within argument which stating about the value which suitable for young voters. The reconstruction of the argument above can be:

Premise: We as younger voters uphold liberalism is the only voter base that they have right now

Sub-premise: because conservatives that incumbent inherently focused on their own internal problem

Implicit premise: All the young Indonesians uphold liberal

Implicit Conclusion: Political party should return to liberal to get the vote from young Indonesian.

This argument inferred that a society with conservatives would not be able to be the voter base or target of a presidential campaign because of their internal problems within the figures, yet this one has no sufficient evidence, which leads to the conclusion that those who uphold liberalism can only be the targeted voters. It needs more complex reasoning and evidence to claim that liberalism is the only voter base; therefore, it is not sufficient to oversimplify the premise by oversimplifying the issue.

4. Fallacies that Violates Rebuttal Criterion

This category of fallacy was committed by the first speaker or the leader of opening opposition by stating,

“OG is very offensive generalizing Indonesia youngster only to debater that is in generally liberal I don't think that they can just fly by saying that every single individual are liberal in this particular case.” (27:25)

This fallacy fell down into the category of attacking straw man due to the misinterpreting opponent's argument by concluding that the debaters only were mentioned by the opening government while it was in fact they did not mention specifically or defined the accusation of the leader of opposition. Therefore, the leader of opposition attacked the distorted version or the oversimplified arguments and use to rebut the opening government's argument. The reconstruction of the argument above can be:

Premise: OG is very offensive Generalizing Indonesia youngster only to debater that is in generally liberal.

Sub-premise: I think young Indonesian is also includes those who are really care in case of conservatism, who really care about value like culture for example that also must be include in debate.

Conclusion: I don't think that they can just fly by saying that every single individual are liberal in this particular case.

In the premise, the speaker drawn inferences from Opening Government statement which is not mentioned or refer the young Indonesian were specifically all liberal like debater. In fact Opening Government explains on how diverse the background of young Indonesians despite stating they all are generally liberal as in their statement conclusion. Therefore, the argument made was a rebuttal which indeed taken from their opponent's distorted argument to attack a weak point of the opponent.

Research Discussion

This study aims to identify and categorize the logical fallacies present in the arguments made in a national debate competition. From the total of eight flawed arguments contained logical fallacy produced by the debaters in the NUDC 2022 final round there were four categories identified by the researcher. The four categories uttered were structural criterion, relevance criterion, sufficiency criterion and rebuttal criterion. Each category comprises multiple types that can be classified into one or two distinct types within each category.

The first category is the fallacies that violate the structural criterion. There were one flawed argument that belongs to this category and it was committed by the leader of the opposition team. The job of the first speaker of the opening team, specifically from the government team is mainly concern in mapping the whole debating foundation or the structure of the debate under the topic assigned. On the other hand, the leader or opposition or the first speaker from opening opposition team is assigned to present the counter proposal or set up brought by the government team. In other words, these two particular speakers need to be able to set the whole debate into certain direction or prepare the counter of the proposed issues. Therefore, we can conclude that the very first speakers of both teams were the most crucial one to the debate and they carry a lot of jobs in maneuvering the flow of the debate, such as to define the motion, bring certain mechanism and urgency of their proposal and lastly giving the supporting arguments.

The fallacy that violates the structural criterion is the category of fallacy happened in the structure of the arguments rather than the substance of the arguments. That is why it was named as the category that violates the structural criterion. Therefore, such flawed argument was occurred when the premise or explanation is inconsistent with the conclusion. That indicates if the speakers tried to utter the same claim by neglecting point which is crucial to prove their argument. That explains why it is undeniable for the first speaker to make flaw on their argument especially to which falls into this category, since they were only focusing on the setting up the foundation of the debate, and making flaws on the arguments that they present.

The second category, the fallacies that violate the relevance criterion, which appeared the most compared to other categories of fallacies. This category of logical fallacy was committed by three speakers from the debate. They were the leader of opposition, the member of the closing government, and the member of closing opposition. This category of fallacy was occurred as an effort from the speaker to move the direction of the argument by using several factors that irrelevant towards the issue proposed. Such factors that often used were the fallacies that use the name of popular people or those who have the authority to make society belief on certain point of view, or the emotions that might attract the feelings of

the listeners. Therefore, it can be seen that the production of this category fallacies are often happened when a speaker gives an irrelevant premise or argument that lacks relevance to the truth or its conclusion, rather than providing evidence based on the issue discussed (Eemeren et al, 2002). This category of fallacies happened four times and committed by the last two speakers of the closing teams which can be inferred as their last effort to try to save the victory to their team by involving ideas which has not been brought by the previous team from the opening sides.

The third category consists of fallacies committed by the two speakers, they were the deputy prime minister from the opening government and the member of government from the closing government, which violate the sufficiency criterion. The arguments that violate the sufficiency category weigh on one of the crucial component of an argument namely evidence, which used to prove whether an argument is sound or acceptable or not. Therefore, the logical fallacy that belongs to this category occurs when an argument fails to adhere to the evidence component. This indication can be observed when an argument is relying on insufficient evidence, biased evidence, or the omission of crucial evidence. When an argument contained one or more of these criteria, it indicates that the speaker who committed this fallacy in presenting their argument has failed to present their evidence and to use it to strengthen their premise and conclusion.

The fourth category is the fallacies that violate the rebuttal criterion. The opposition leader's argument encompasses this category of fallacies. As it shows within the name, this category of fallacies can be found in the arguments that used to counter or attack the previous targeted to the previous speaker. It can be inferred that, this category of fallacy typically arises when a speaker attempts to defend their own position through a rebuttal, only for the opponent to attack their argument. If these fallacies occurred, it means that the argument failed to defend its own position. In other words, it also means that the speaker failed to attack the arguments that were previously targeted to them. As a result, during the debate, the opposition leader failed to defend their team's argument and position regarding the statement which can be effected towards their victory point at the end of the debate if the judges noticed this failure.

In terms of the types of logical fallacies, the debaters produced a total of eight flawed arguments. Those eight arguments identified into five different types of logical fallacy. Three types of fallacies that were uttered by the speakers in the video, which appeared most frequent are: manipulation of emotion, appeal to common opinion, and causal oversimplification, and the other two types were arguing in circle and attacking straw man. There were two types of fallacies, which are manipulation of emotion and appeal to common opinion that belong to the same category namely the fallacies that violate relevance criteria. The type causal oversimplification was in the category of fallacies that violate the sufficiency criterion, the arguing in circle was in the category of fallacies that violates the structural criterion, and the attacking straw man was in the category of fallacies that violate the rebuttal criterion.

The flawed arguments that belong to the fallacies that violate the relevance category were stated by the first speaker of the closing government or also known as the member of the government team, which committed the type of fallacy known as manipulation of emotion twice within the debate. Damer posits that the fallacy of manipulation of emotion often stems from a desire to emphasize passion over evidence, thereby omitting the rational reasoning necessary for a compelling argument. The occurrences of this type of logical fallacy indicates

that the speaker from the closing government team tried to persuade the judges by attacking their opponent's argument through other segments of belief.

In debate, the speakers from the closing benches were assigned to present the arguments that were different compare to the opening benches. Therefore, the debate is not only circling in a repeated circumstance. In other words, the teams that belong to the closing benches, whether the closing government or closing opposition, were required to introduced a new spectrum of argument, but still need to be in lined with the set up built by the first speaker of the opening team. Given that the two previous speakers from the opening government had already presented several arguments, the speaker's inability to introduce new arguments in the closing government context led to the emergence of fallacies. Therefore, in an effort to provide new justification and persuade the audience, the speaker attempted to use emotional appeal to convince the judges regarding their proposal.

The second type of logical fallacy that also frequently appeared after the manipulation of emotion belong to the relevance category namely as the appeal to common opinion type of fallacy. There were two instances of this fallacy. The first came from the leader of the opposition from the opening opposition, and the second came from the member of the government from the closing government team. This type of fallacy, which falls under the same category as manipulation of emotion, also employs an additional appeal to persuade the audience. In this case, the arguments use the appeals of a large number of people to force others to believe that if the majority of people believe it, then it is inarguably true. This is due to the fact that the veracity of an argument or notion is not determined by the number of individuals who support it. Instead, the variables that a speaker relies on should impact the truth of the argument's conclusion (Inch and Warnick, 2011).

The other most frequent logical fallacy produced was the oversimplification type of fallacy. Within the debate, there were two instances of the fallacy of causal oversimplification. The prime minister of the opening government team committed the first fallacy, and the member of the closing government team committed the second. Causal oversimplification often happens as it indicates when the context that the speaker pointed out has a minimal impact on the subject at hand. This suggests that the speakers lack the ability to construct a sequence of detailed causes and form logical reasoning before reaching conclusions based on their own initial statement.

The other two types of logical fallacies which appeared once are the arguing in circle and attacking straw man. The arguing in circle was uttered by the leader of opposition as it failed on giving the elaboration or deep explanation on its premises. The attacking straw man type of fallacy was occurred as a failure of the speaker to produce an effective counter towards the previous speaker and shows on its content which not appeared in the previous speaker or it was assumed by the speaker himself.

The analysis of logical fallacies in this debate found out that, the common fallacies uttered resulted different types of fallacies unlike the previous studies. As in Zhou (2018) identified that *ad hominem* as is one of the frequent fallacies in their study of logical fallacies in political debate. This is possible to happen since the environment and the subject of the debate were different. Therefore, the speakers do not have the interest in attacking their opponent's background personality as in political or presidential debate. While in Ali, et.al (2021) the most frequent type of logical fallacy was manipulation of emotions which in lined with the study. This is due to the reason that both of the study analyzed the same subject which is student but with different environment.

Lastly, there were two speakers who presented the most logical fallacies during the final round of debate. They are the opposition leader from the opening opposition team and the government member from the closing government team, each with three fallacies. The leader of the opposition made three different types of fallacies: arguing in circles, appealing to common opinion, and attacking a straw man. On the other hand, the members of government from the closing government team committed only two types of fallacies, which are two of manipulation of emotion and one of causal oversimplification. The remaining fallacies were therefore committed once each by the prime minister of the opening government team and the opposition member from the closing opposition team.

From these results, it can be inferred that the subject or the speaker of the debate and the environment or the context of the debate played an important effect towards the arguments and the logical fallacies that were produced. The result shows the difference on the types of fallacies depends on who the speaker is, such as a political figure or a student compare to the previous studies. When the speaker is a political figure, the arguments presented were most likely attacked the opponent personally and conveyed these two types of logical fallacies such as red herring or abusive ad hominem, such as in Warman (2022). Meanwhile, if the speaker is a student, it was resulted into different types depend on the situation. However, most of it shows big frequencies in manipulation of emotions such as in Wiranda and Hamzah (2019) and Ali, et.al (2021), which in line with this study that showed if students tend to produce this type of logical fallacy compare to the other types.

There are several reasons that, probably, cause why these certain categories occur. First, debaters often face strict time limits, which can lead to rushed arguments and a tendency to include irrelevant points to fill the allotted time. Second, some students may prioritize memorizing arguments over understanding their underlying logic and relevance. Third, Indonesian culture often values politeness and indirectness. This could lead to debaters avoiding direct confrontation and including irrelevant points to soften their arguments. To validate these reasons, further study in the field of logical fallacies within debate competition needs to be carried out.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

The result of fallacy analysis on the arguments of speakers in the NUDC Final Round Debate 2022 showed that some of the speakers made a number of fallacies during the debate. The analysis produced four out of five categories. Fallacies that violated the relevant category, occurring four times within the debate, emerged as the most frequent category. Additionally, a total of eight fallacies that occurred belong to five out of the sixty types. The fallacy that was found to have occurred the most within the debate was manipulation of emotion, appeal to common opinion, and causal oversimplification, which consisted of two incidents of each type. To address these issues of logical fallacies in debate competitions, further research and targeted interventions are necessary. ELT programs can focus on developing critical thinking skills, teaching effective argumentation strategies, and providing opportunities for students to practice debating in a supportive environment. By addressing these factors, we can help Indonesian debaters improve the quality and relevance of their arguments.

REFERENCES

- Ali, Muhammad Z. F., Faridi, A., & Sakhiyya, Z. (2021). Performance of Critical Thinking and Existence of Logical Fallacies in Indonesian Varsity English Debate 2020 in Jakarta. *The International Journal of High Education Scientists*, 1-12.
- Bierman, A. K., & Assali, R. N. (1996). *The critical thinking handbook*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Cresswell, J. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Pearson Education. Inc.
- Dale, P., & Wolf, J. C. (2000). *Speech communication made simple*. NY: Miami-Dade Community College.
- Damer, T. E. (2009). *Attacking Faulty Reasoning Sixth Edition (A Practical Guide to Fallacy-Free Arguments (6th ed))*. United States of America: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Eemeren, F. et al. (2002). *Argumentation, Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Emeren, F. (2010). *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Freely, A. J. (1969). *Argumentation and debate (2nd ed.)*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Freely, A. J. and Steinberg, D. L. (2009). *Argumentation and debate: critical thinking for reasoned decision making (12th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Gula, R. J. (2002). *Nonsense: A handbook of logical fallacies*. Axios Press.
- Inch, E. S., & Warnick, B. (2011). *Critical thinking and communication: the use of reason in argument (6th ed.)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Kennedy, R. (2007). In-class debate: Fertile ground for active learning and the cultivation of critical thinking and oral communication skills. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 42-44.
- Krieger, D. (2005). Teaching debate to ESL students: A six-class unit. *The internet TESL journal*, 11(2), 25-45.
- Ristawati, R. (2019). *Student's perception on joining English debate program toward the student's critical thinking ability*. Published Dissertation. Gresik: Universitas Muhammadiyah Gresik.
- Smith, N. H. (2011). *Practical Guide to Debating World Style*. New York: International Debate Education Association.
- Udayana TV. (2022, September 16). [NUDC 2022] Grand Final - Airlangga vs ITB vs Gajah Mada vs Diponegoro [Video]. YouTube. <https://youtube.com/live/7wjlx7Vmoso?si=SQp-IrK2lCeh46eE>
- Wallen, N. E., Hyun, H. H. and Fraenkel, J. R. (2015). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education (9th Ed.)* New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Warman, J.S & Hamzah. (2019). An Analysis of Logical Fallacy on Joko Widodo's Arguments during 2019 Indonesia Presidential Debate. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature*, 77-82.
- Wiranda, A., & Hamzah. (2022). Analysis of Logical Fallacy on the Arguments Made by Student from 2019 Indonesian Protest and Riots in Television Debates. *E-Journal of English Language & Literature* , 323-327.
- Zhou, Z. C. (2018). The logical fallacies in political discourse. *Summer Research Program*. 5.