



Unpacking Argumentative Fallacies in Indonesia's 2024 Presidential Debates: A Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis

Mengungkap Kesalahan Argumentatif dalam Debat Capres Indonesia 2024: Analisis Kognitif-Pragmatik

Yuliana Setyaningsih¹, R. Kunjana Rahardi², Wahyudi Rahmat³

¹ Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta. E-mail: yuliapbsi@gmail.com

² Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta. E-mail: kunjana@usd.ac.id

³ Faculty of Cultural Sciencies, Andalas University, Padang. E-mail: wahyudirahmat24@gmail.com

Corresponding Author:

Yuliana Setyaningsih
email: yuliapbsi@gmail.com
Universitas Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Article History:

Received 9 February 2025
Revised 10 Maret 2025
Accepted 13 April 2025

Abstract: This study examines the presence of argumentative inaccuracies in the 2023–2024 Indonesian presidential and vice-presidential debates through the lens of cognitive linguistics and contextual pragmatics. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, data were drawn from transcripts of five debate rounds and analyzed using Toulmin's model of fallacies combined with situational context theory. The research identifies five dominant fallacies: evading the issue, argument from ignorance, appeal to authority, ad hominem attacks, and hasty generalizations. Each fallacy is interpreted within its political and situational context—revealing how historical references, ethical deflections, appeals to seniority, lack of mastery, and satire are strategically employed. The findings offer insight into how these inaccuracies diminish the integrity of public political discourse and obscure substantive discussion of policies. Furthermore, the study underscores the critical role of context in shaping the interpretation and reception of political arguments. It contributes to the growing body of work on cognitive-pragmatic approaches in political linguistics, and emphasizes the need for educational efforts to cultivate critical thinking and argumentative literacy among citizens and students alike. This research also suggests practical implications for debate organizers, moderators, and media analysts—calling for clearer standards to reduce manipulative rhetoric in public forums. Future studies are encouraged to apply computational methods to expand this work or examine comparative debate formats across cultures.

Keywords: Inaccuracy of Argumentation; Situational Context; Election Debates

Abstrak: Studi ini meneliti keberadaan ketidakakuratan argumentatif dalam debat capres dan cawapres Indonesia 2023–2024 melalui sudut pandang linguistik kognitif dan pragmatik kontekstual. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif, data diambil dari transkrip lima putaran debat dan dianalisis menggunakan model kekeliruan Toulmin yang dikombinasikan dengan teori konteks situasional. Penelitian ini mengidentifikasi lima kekeliruan dominan: mengelak dari isu, argumen dari ketidaktahuan, seruan kepada otoritas, serangan ad hominem, dan generalisasi tergesa-gesa. Setiap kekeliruan

ditafsirkan dalam konteks politik dan situasionalnya—mengungkapkan bagaimana referensi historis, penyimpangan etika, seruan kepada senioritas, kurangnya penguasaan, dan sindiran digunakan secara strategis. Temuan ini memberikan wawasan tentang bagaimana ketidakakuratan ini mengurangi integritas wacana politik publik dan mengaburkan diskusi substantif tentang kebijakan. Lebih jauh, studi ini menggarisbawahi peran penting konteks dalam membentuk interpretasi dan penerimaan argumen politik. Penelitian ini berkontribusi pada semakin banyaknya karya tentang pendekatan kognitif-pragmatis dalam linguistik politik, dan menekankan perlunya upaya pendidikan untuk menumbuhkan pemikiran kritis dan literasi argumentatif di kalangan warga negara dan siswa. Penelitian ini juga menyarankan implikasi praktis bagi penyelenggara debat, moderator, dan analis media—yang menyerukan standar yang lebih jelas untuk mengurangi retorika manipulatif di forum publik. Penelitian di masa mendatang didorong untuk menerapkan metode komputasional guna memperluas karya ini atau meneliti format debat komparatif lintas budaya.

Kata kunci: Ketidakakuratan Argumentasi; Konteks Situasional; Debat Pemilu

1. Introduction

The importance of the quality of the arguments of the Indonesian people needs to be emphasized continuously. Argumentation skill are very important because they can affect your ability to communicate and negotiate. The weakness of a strong argumentation culture in society has a major impact on the quality of arguments delivered by public figures. The debate of presidential and vice-presidential candidates in 2024 is an important moment for the people of Indonesia to understand the vision, mission, and work program of each pair of candidates. Politicians compete in arguments to demonstrate a deep understanding of various aspects of government as potential leaders of the country. Argumentation has a central role in this debate because it displays breadth, depth, sharpness of view, and strategy in formulating policies and solving the nation's problems. The public's confidence in their prospective leaders is built through their ability to argue (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2019).

The presidential and vice-presidential debate discourse is included in the category of argumentative discourse consisting of *claim*, *ground*, and *warrant*. These three elements are the main elements in the construction of arguments that have been studied a lot (Toulmin et al., 1984; Setyaningsih, 2020; Shalatun, 2021). The implementation of these argumentative elements is widely studied in the context of both learning to write argumentatively and the quality of writing in the mass media (Adhi, 2022; Berkle et al., 2023). Arguments in debates often apply various ways to avoid, reject, or avoid the issues raised by the opponent to strengthen the argument.

The right way will strengthen the claims defended by the candidates. However, the improper way to support the claim causes inaccuracy in the argument or what is often called logical *fallacy*. The study of argumentation inaccuracies is urgent to educate the public, especially students, to have good argumentative skills. In this paper, the term "misguided thinking" is not used as a translation of "logical fallacy" because the term is not a translation with a cultural dimension but a word-for-word translation. Instead, the term "inaccuracy of argumentation" is used because, in essence, the presidential and vice-presidential debates are arguments.

The inaccuracy of arguing in the debate can be recognized from the responses of the presidential and vice-presidential candidates to the panellists' questions and the

responses of each pair of candidates. Several studies on the inaccuracy of arguments in presidential candidate debates have been conducted by previous researchers both in presidential candidate debates abroad and in Indonesia. The Hillary Clinton & Donald Trump presidential debate by Santoso found six types of inaccuracies in the arguments, and the most dominant was *the straw person while the audience based*. It was further argued that Clinton's arguments were all reasonable, while Trump's arguments contained inaccuracies in his arguments, namely *hasty generalization* and *the ad populum fallacy* (Santoso, 2018).

Daeli's research focuses on the types of inaccuracies in the debate arguments of the Joko Widodo Team and the Prabowo Subianto Team. In Daeli's research, there are 12 types of inaccuracies in the arguments of the Jokowi team and 9 types of inaccuracies in the arguments of the Prabowo team. The most dominant type of argumentative inaccuracy of the Jokowi Team is incorrectly inferring, while the most dominant type of error of the Prabowo Team is using wrong reasoning and hypotheses that contradict the facts.

Furthermore, Warman & Hamzah's research also focuses on the types of mistakes that presidential candidate Prabowo Subianto made in the 2019 debate. In total, 13 types of argumentation inaccuracies were found in the study. Of the 13 findings, 3 inaccuracies of argumentation are ordered from the most dominant, namely, (1) using the fallacy of false alternatives, (2) drawing wrong conclusions, and (3) using irrelevant authority (Daeli, 2020; Warman & Hamzah, 2020).

Research related to the inaccuracy of argumentation has expanded to other areas. Some of the studies in question are research conducted by Srimayasandy (2021) on the inaccuracy of arguments in the content of testimonials on *homehoping television* shows that found errors in generalization, *fallacy of composition*, *appeal to wealth fallacy*, *appeal to pity*, and *appeal to force* (Srimayasandy, 2021). Istiningdias' research found three types of inaccuracies in CNN Indonesia's online reporting, namely the argument against the reason, the appeal to the population type, and the missing-the-point type *ignoratio elenchi*. This research is different from the studies that have been carried out above. The focus that distinguishes this study is the theory used, the scope of the data, and the context behind the occurrence of argumentative inaccuracies that were not discussed earlier (Sri Istiningdias & Argenti, 2019).

The theory of argumentative inaccuracy used in this article refers to the perspective of Toulmin, et al. In their perspective, argumentative inaccuracy can be classified into two types, namely (1) fallacies of unwarranted assumptions and (2) fallacies of ambiguity (Toulmin et al., 1984). Fallacies of unwarranted can include hasty generalization, accident, false cause, false analogy, poisoning the wells, begging the question, evading the issue, appeals to authority, the argument against the person, the argument from ignorance, the appeal to the people, the appeal to compassion, and the appeal to force. Fallacies of ambiguity can be detailed into equivocation, amphiboly, accent, composition and division, and figure of speech. (Pineau, 2013; Toulmin et al., 1984).

Fallacies of hasty generalization are inaccuracies in arguments caused by arguments that are not supported by adequate and relevant data. Data and facts as a *ground* that support conclusions or claims in argumentative constructions are not representative and then concluded in a hurry. *Fallacy of accident* is the inaccuracy of argumentation as a result of someone mistakenly generalizing a statement without considering a specific situation that may be different. This inaccuracy occurs when a person takes a statement that applies in a particular circumstance and imposes it on all situations without considering the exceptions due to differences in the relevant context. *The fallacy of false cause* occurs when a person concludes that because two events occurred simultaneously or consecutively, one event caused the other without sufficient evidence to support the cause-effect relationship (El Khoiri & Widiati, 2017; Hasibuan et al., 2020). For example, the erroneous statement that reads, "Every time I carry medicine, I am always healthy. So, carrying medicine causes me to be healthy."

The fallacy of false analogy is a form of inaccuracy in an argument that uses a false analogy or a comparison that seems to be correct but is actually incorrect (Botting, 2017; Pineau, 2013). *The fallacy of poisoning the wells* is the inaccuracy of the argument because it overstates the claim with the intention of making a strong conclusion that existed. *The fallacy of begging the question* is the inaccuracy of the argument caused by *the ground* that is substantially the same as the claim put forward. *The fallacy of evading the issue* is the inaccuracy of the argument because it avoids the question asked instead of giving a real answer to the question. *The fallacy of appeals to authority* is a type of inaccuracy of argument that applies authority as a conclusion on the topic in question without further evidence or data. *The fallacy of the argument against the person* is a type of inaccuracy of the argument because it attacks the opponent's personality. This type of argument inaccuracy basically rejects the claim submitted by the opponent by attacking his facts. *The fallacy of the argument from ignorance* is the inaccuracy of the argument because it is wrong to argue that a statement can be justified just because the opposite cannot be proven. *The fallacy of the appeal to the people* is the inaccuracy of an argument based on the presumption of popularity/society to justify a claim. For example, the fact that many members of a group adhere to a belief is offered as proof that the belief is true. *The fallacy of the appeal to compassion* is the inaccuracy of the argument by calling for compassion. This type of argumentative inaccuracy takes advantage of human sympathy in decision-making. *The fallacy of the appeal to force* is the inaccuracy of arguments by calling for the use of violence and unwarranted assumptions.

Fallacies of Ambiguity, as conveyed by Toulmin et al., include *the fallacy of equivocation*, *the fallacy of amphiboly*, *the fallacy of amphiboly*, *the fallacy of accent*, *the fallacy of composition and division*, and *the fallacy of figure of speech* (Doerfler, 2020; Toulmin et al., 1984; Walton, 2020). *The fallacy of equivocation* is the inaccuracy of argumentation because of the inconsistent use of a word or phrase that causes various confusing meanings. *The fallacy of amphiboly* is a type of inaccuracy of an argument due to grammatical misuse, such as the omission of commas or other punctuation, improper placement of phrases or words, and the like. *The fallacy of accent* is the application of the wrong accent so that it confuses the understanding of an argument. In oral

arguments, accents can lead to confusion when our gestures or tone of speech distort the meaning of our speech. *The fallacy of composition and division is the fallacy of composition and division like two sides of the same coin.* Composition occurs when we affirm about the whole of a group something true about all its parts. Divisions occur when we declare that all parts of a thing are true for the whole. *The fallacy of figure of speech* is an argument that contains grammatical or morphological similarities between words as an indication of the similarity of meaning.

The discourse of the presidential and vice presidential debates cannot be separated from the theory of context. Rahardi said that context has a very important role in conveying the meaning of speech. It is further explained that in pragmatic studies, social, social, cultural, and situational contexts are known (Rahardi, 2019, 2020a, 2022, 2023). Argumentation cannot be separated from pragmatics, and pragmatics cannot ignore the context. In addition, from the perspective of technology and multimodality, Rahardi referred to it as a cybertext context that can be differentiated into visual, aural, spatial, gestural, and linguistic cybertext contexts. All types of contexts are complementary, mutually supportive and complementary. Interpreting the meaning of the argument in the presidential and vice presidential debates must also involve all types of contexts and their elements Rahardi et al., 2024; Rahardi et al., 2023). The typology of argumentative inaccuracies cannot be separated from the context that has been described above. The context theory used to reveal the background of the emergence of inaccuracies in the arguments of political figures is the situational context (Rahardi, 2018; Rahardi & Firdaus, 2023).

This study aims to describe the inaccuracy of arguments in the 2023-2024 presidential and vice presidential debates and the situational context behind them. The formulation of this research problem is presented as follows: (1) What are the types of inaccuracies in the 2023-2024 presidential and vice presidential debates? (2) What is the situational context behind the inaccuracy of arguments in the 2023-2024 presidential and vice presidential debates? This research will make a significant contribution to the field of language teaching, especially argument learning. The urgency of conducting this research is to educate the people of Indonesia so that in the future, they will become a superior society in arguing and negotiating to welcome the Golden Indonesia 2045. This research problem will be solved by the match analysis method and the content analysis method, which are described in detail in the following section.

2. Method

This study applies a qualitative descriptive approach to describe the types of inaccuracies in arguments and the context behind them. The source of substantive data is in the form of text transcription of the video of the 2023-2024 presidential and vice presidential debates rounds 1-5. The data of this study are text snippets from the video transcription of the 2023-2024 presidential and vice presidential debates, which contain inaccuracies in the arguments of the candidates. The argumentation data containing the inaccuracy of the argument was obtained from the following segments: (1) deepening the vision-mission and work program, answering questions from the panelists, and (2) questions and answers from the panelists about the sub-sub-themes raised, such as

defense, security, international relations, globalization, geopolitics, and foreign policy. The data collection method used is the reading and recording method (Sudaryanto, 2016). The data analysis method applied is a contextual matching method with the following steps: identification, classification, analysis, and interpretation. In addition, data analysis was carried out by applying content analysis techniques based on the theory of argumentation inaccuracy from Toulmin et al. and pragmatic theory, especially related to situational contexts to describe the background of the emergence of inaccuracies in the arguments of political figures (Mayring, 2022; Serafini & Reid, 2023).

3. Result

This research has produced findings in the form of 5 types of inaccuracies in the presidential and vice-presidential debates and the situational context behind them. The five types of inaccuracies in the arguments and the context behind them are presented in the following table.

Table 1. Types of Inaccuracies in Argumentation and the Situational Context Behind It.

No.	Data	Types of Argumentative Inaccuracies	Situational Context Behind the Inaccuracy of Argumentation
a	<p>KB01 Data:</p> <p>Mas Anis, Mas Anis. Saya berpendapat, Mas Anis ini agak berlebihan. Mas Anis mengeluh tentang demokrasi ini dan itu dan ini. Mas Anis dipilih menjadi gubernur DKI menghadapi pemerintah yang berkuasa, saya yang mengusung Bapak.</p> <p><i>Mas Anis, Mas Anis. In my opinion, Mas Anis is a bit excessive. Mas Anis complained about this democracy and that and this. Mas Anis was chosen to be the governor of Jakarta to face the ruling government, I am the one who carries you.</i></p>	The <i>fallacy of evading the issue</i>	Distract yourself by bringing up past facts.
b	<p>KB02 Data:</p> <p>Jadi, semua data yang Saudara ungkapkan itu keliru semua. Jadi saya bersedia kita duduk, kita buka-bukaan. Mau bicara food estate, mau bicara apa, PT Teknologi Militer Indonesia, kita buka. Jadi, di mana masalahnya? Saudara bicara etika, saya keberatan.</p> <p><i>So, all the data that you revealed are all wrong. So I'm ready for us to sit down,</i></p>	The <i>fallacy of the argument from ignorance</i>	Lack of a deep and detailed understanding of the topic of discussion being debated.

	<p><i>we're open. If you want to talk about the food estate, what do you want to talk about, PT Teknologi Mili Indonesia, we will open. So, where is the problem? You talk about ethics, I object.</i></p>		
c	<p>KB03 Data:</p> <p><i>Saya kok banyak setuju dengan Pak Ganjar, ya kalau benar masuk akal saya setuju kalau ngomong-ngomong ya kumaha. Jadi, leadership apakah negara, apakah perorangan harus dengan contoh ing ngarso sung tuladha. Kita mau memimpin, kita mau membawa agenda, kita mau cerita itu ngomong, omon-omon. Tidak bisa. Mengapa negara-negara selatan sekarang melihat ke Indonesia karena kita berhasil membangun ekonomi kita. Jadi tidak hanya omon-omon-omon. Kerjanya omon saja.</i></p> <p><i>I agree with Mr. Ganjar a lot, of kalau benar masuk akal saya setuju kalau ngomong-ngomong ya kumaha. So, leadership is the state, whether individuals must be with an example ing ngarso sung tuladha. We want to lead, we want to bring an agenda, we want the story to talk, omon-omon. Cannot. Why are southern countries now looking at Indonesia because we have succeeded in building our economy. So it's not just omon-omon-omon. The work is just omon.</i></p>	<p>The fallacy of appeals to authority</p>	<p>Knocking down the interlocutor by calling for his authority as a presidential candidate who feels more senior, more experienced, more supported by many parties so that he feels strong or authoritative.</p>
d	<p>KB04 Data:</p> <p><i>Maaf ya, karena Anda mendesak saya, saya menilai Anda tidak pantas bicara soal etika. Itu saja. Saya merasa bahwa Anda itu posturing menyesatkan. Itu saja.</i></p> <p><i>I'm sorry because you urged me. I don't think you deserve to talk about ethics. That's it. I feel that you are misleading posturing. That's it.</i></p>	<p>The fallacy of the argument against the person</p>	<p>Defending yourself by showing that the interlocutor has the same ethical weaknesses as he or she does.</p>
e	<p>KB05 Data:</p> <p><i>Gus Muhaimin ini lucu ya, menanyakan masalah lingkungan hidup, tapi itu kok pakai botol-botol plastik itu, padahal</i></p>	<p>The fallacy of hasty generalization</p>	<p>Satirizing the opponent because it is considered inconsequential.</p>

saya, Pak Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud menggunakan botol kaca. Gimana itu komitmennya, botol plastik semua itu, tapi ngga papa, kita kembali lagi ke topik ya. Intinya kita berkomitmen pembangunan tidak boleh lagi Jawasentris, harus mulai Indonesiasentris. Kemarin, Gus Muhaimin menolak IKN, tidak apa-apa akan kita lanjutkan dan akan kita perkuat itu...

Gus Muhaimin is funny, asking about environmental problems, but that's why he uses those plastic bottles, even though I, Mr. Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud use glass bottles. That's the commitment, plastic bottles, all that, but no, let's go back to the topic. The point is that we are committed to development should no longer be Jawascentris, we must start Indonesiacentric. Yesterday, Gus Muhaimin rejected IKN, it's okay We will continue and we will strengthen that...

The types of argumentative inaccuracies and the situational context behind the occurrence of argumentative inaccuracies are discussed one by one as follows.

3.1. The fallacy of evading the issue

The KB01 Data Argument contains argumentative inaccuracies that fall into the category of shifting the topic of discussion (*the fallacy of evading the issue*). The relevant reason submitted should be related to the issue of "the cost of political parties that have never been considered in the political process". However, the reason given by the P02 presidential candidate to support the claim actually brings up the past of the number 1 presidential candidate as seen in the speech "*Mas Anis, Mas Anis. In my opinion, Mas Anis is a bit excessive. Mas Anis complained about this democracy and that and this. Mas Anis was chosen to be the governor of Jakarta to face the ruling government. I am the one who carries you.*" The reasons submitted are not based on claims that must be supported by relevant evidence, namely about political costs that have never been considered in the political process. Thus, it can be concluded that diverting the issue that is the topic of debate is a type of argumentative inaccuracy that is often used in debate strategies (Yuyun, 2014).

The inaccuracy of the above argument is caused by the context of the situation that describes the relationship between presidential candidates number 2 and number 1, which is not good. The context behind the inaccuracy of the argument in the debate above is to distract attention by bringing up past facts. The facts of the past that were

raised can be seen in the speeches that read: (1) "*Mas Anis was elected as the governor of Jakarta to face the ruling government, I am the one who carries you.*", (2) "*I was the opposition to Mas Anis.*", (3) "*You go to my house, we are the opposition, you are elected.*" P02 revealed the three past facts to divert the topic of debated discussion about the cost of political parties that were never considered in the political process. Thus, it can be emphasized that there is an inaccuracy in the argument carried out by diverting the topic (Dwi Atmaja & Alvin, 2023; Gonçalves-Segundo, 2022). The following KB01 data snippet is one example that represents the type of argument inaccuracy by shifting the topic of discussion.

Data KB01

P01: *Menurut saya masalah yang mendasar partai politik ini memerlukan biaya dan biaya politik ini tidak pernah diperhatikan dalam proses politik...."*

I think the fundamental problem of this political party requires a cost and this political cost has never been considered in the political process...."

P02: *Mas Anis, Mas Anis. Saya berpendapat, Mas Anis ini agak berlebihan. Mas Anis mengeluh tentang demokrasi ini dan itu dan ini. Mas Anis dipilih menjadi gubernur DKI menghadapi pemerintah yang berkuasa, saya yang mengusung Bapak. Kalau demokrasi kita tidak berjalan, tidak mungkin Anda jadi gubernur. Kalau Jokowi diktator, Anda tidak mungkin jadi gubernur. Saya waktu itu oposisi Mas Anis. Anda ke rumah saya, kita oposisi, Anda terpilih."*

"Mas Anis, Mas Anis. In my opinion, Mas Anis is a bit excessive. Mas Anis complained about this democracy and that and this. Mas Anis was chosen to be the governor of Jakarta to face the ruling government, I am the one who carries you. If our democracy does not work, it is impossible for you to become a governor. If Jokowi is a dictator, you cannot become a governor. I was the opposition to Mas Anis at that time. You come to my house, we are the opposition, you are elected." (Source: <https://youtu.be/zB0RvKAc2kw?si=Nj-swWPzQ8PkvPEV>)

(Context: In the first round of the 2024 Presidential Debate, presidential candidate number 1 answered questions related to the issue of strengthening democracy about public trust in political parties and was responded to by presidential candidate number 2. The conversation situation is a bit uncomfortable.)

3.2. The fallacy of the argument from ignorance

KB02 data includes a type of argument inaccuracy due to the weak mastery of the topic of discussion (*the argument from ignorance*) (Toulmin et al., 1984). *The claim* that must be responded to by presidential candidate number 2 cannot be proven with relevant data. The statement that reads, "So, all the data you disclosed is all wrong." is not accompanied by relevant evidence. The statement reads "So I am willing for us to sit down, we are open. If you want to talk about the food estate, what do you want to talk about, PT Teknologi Military Indonesia, we will open. So, where is the problem?" this is not data that corresponds to the claim being discussed. The last sentence that reads

"You talk about ethics, I object." confirms that the argument in Data KB02's speech is wrong because it is irrelevant to the topic of conversation (Jin et al., 2022).

Furthermore, the background of the inaccuracy of the argument in the KB02 Data is the lack of a deep and detailed understanding of the topic of discussion being argued. The statement of the P02 presidential candidate, which reads "You talk about ethics, I object." shows evidence of a firm rejection because P02 feels that he does not have the material to respond to ethical issues. Thus, it is clear that there is an inaccuracy in the argument in the speech caused by a weak mastery of the topic of discussion in the debate. The following excerpt is presented to represent the inaccuracy of the argument based on the lack of mastery of the material in question.

Data KB02

P01: Artinya ada kompromi atas standar etika. Ini fakta dan kemudian dalam pidato Bapak, Bapak mengolok-olok tentang pentingnya etika. Pertanyaanya apa penjelasan Pak Prabowo tentang itu semua?

.... This means that there is a compromise on ethical standards. This is a fact and later in your speech, you made fun of the importance of ethics. The question is, what is Mr. Prabowo's explanation of all of that?

P02: Jadi, semua data yang Saudara ungkapkan itu keliru semua. Jadi saya bersedia kita duduk, kita buka-bukaan. Mau bicara food estate, mau bicara apa, PT Teknologi Militer Indonesia, kita buka. Jadi, di mana masalahnya? Saudara bicara etika, saya keberatan.

So, all the data that you revealed are all wrong. So I'm ready for us to sit down. We're open. If you want to talk about the food estate, what do you want to talk about, PT Teknologi Militer Indonesia, we will open. So, where is the problem? You talk about ethics, I object.

(Source: <https://youtu.be/FKImOfLQTbw?si=oCB1cBC83xKbJb7i>)

(Context: Anies asked about ethical standards that should be carried out by leaders and are associated with various problems that occur in the Ministry of Defense.)

3.3. The fallacy of appeals to authority

The *fallacy of appeals to authority* is an argumentative construction that applies authority as a conclusion on the topic of discussion without further evidence or data (Toulmin et al., 1984; Goffredo et al., 2023). In KB03 data, claims that focus on roles or south-south agendas are not supported by facts and data as ground at all. The P02 presidential candidate used his authority as a politician who felt more senior and more experienced to advise P01 in a mocking tone that the figure of the country's leader must be able to set an example or example, not just be smart with rhetoric. P01's rhetorical cleverness is considered unsuitable as a state leader. The call for authority conveyed by P02 serves as a conclusion. However, it is not supported by data that is substantially related to the topic of discussion, namely the south-south agenda.

The background to the inaccuracy of the argument in the data above is inseparable from the type of inaccuracy of the argument. Presidential candidate P02 as, a politician who feels more experienced, feels more senior, feels supported by many parties, mocked the

P01 presidential candidate that if he becomes a leader, he is not only smart with rhetoric, likes to "talk", and does not become an example (Rahardi et al., 2024). In this case, the context behind the inaccuracy of the argument is to bring down the opponent by calling for something that becomes authority as a presidential candidate who feels stronger and superior. Thus, it can be concluded that the KB03 data falls into the inaccuracy of arguing by calling for authority. The inaccuracy of arguing by calling for authority, the following KB03 data snippet is presented.

Data KB03

P01: *Penjelasan tadi tidak menggambarkan peran Indonesia di selatan-selatan. Itu hanya menggambarkan bagaimana kita membangun Indonesia dan ketika membangun dengan baik tidak otomatis menjadi contoh. Yang harus dilakukan adalah seperti yang dilakukan di era Bung Karno. Pada waktu itu Ali Sastro Amijoyo, apa yang dilakukan yakni merangkul semua. Membawa apa yang menjadi agenda selatan-selatan bukan menceritakan agenda kita.*

The explanation does not describe Indonesia's role in the south. It only describes how we build Indonesia and when we build well, it does not automatically become an example. What must be done is like what was done in the Karno era. At that time, Ali Sastro Amijoyo, what he did was to embrace all. Bringing what is on the south-south agenda is not telling our agenda.

P02: *Saya kok banyak setuju dengan Pak Ganjar, **ya kalau benar masuk akal saya setuju kalau ngomong-ngomong ya kumaha.** Jadi, leadership apakah negara, apakah perorangan harus dengan contoh ing ngarso sung tuladha. **Kita mau memimpin, kita mau membawa agenda, kita mau cerita itu ngomong, omon-omon. Tidak bisa.** Mengapa negara-negara selatan sekarang melihat ke Indonesia karena kita berhasil membangun ekonomi kita. **Jadi tidak hanya omon-omon-omon. Kerjanya omon saja.***

I agree with Mr. Ganjar a lot, *of kalau benar masuk akal saya setuju kalau ngomong-ngomong ya kumaha.* So, leadership is the state, whether individuals must be with an example *ing ngarso sung tuladha. **We want to lead, we want to bring an agenda, we want the story to talk, omon-omon. Cannot.*** Why are southern countries now looking at Indonesia because we have succeeded in building our economy. ***So it's not just omon-omon-omon. The work is just omon.***

(Source: <https://youtu.be/FKImOfLQTbw?si=owlkotwxcjDSjM49>)

(Context: Prabowo answered a panellist's question about the political strategy of south-south cooperation that can be carried out in Indonesia by strengthening domestic resilience first, such as the economy, etc., before being able to lead the southern country and was responded to by Anies Baswedan)

3.4. The fallacy of the argument against the person

KB04 data contains inaccuracies in arguments by attacking the opponent's person. The inaccuracy of the argument can be seen from the inconsistency of the questions about ethical standards put forward by Presidential candidate number 1 and the response to the reasons submitted by presidential candidate number 2. The response to the speech

reads: "... *I don't think you deserve to talk about ethics. ... I feel that you are misleading posturing.*" does not support the ethical issues that occur in the Ministry of Defense. Judging from the substance that builds a good argument, the argument of KB04 data is not correct. The argument is weak because the data presented as *ground* substantively attacks the opponent's personality. Santoso's research also supports this finding that type errors are dominant in the context of debate (Santoso, 2018).

The background to the inaccuracy of the argument in Data KB04 is to defend himself by showing that the interlocutor has ethical weaknesses as he has. This can be explained by the fact that the P01 presidential candidate alleged that the P02 presidential candidate committed an ethical violation through the context of the question asked as *a claim*. On the contrary, P02 considered that P01 also committed ethical violations. This is emphasized through the P02 statement, which reads: "*You don't deserve to talk about ethics. You're a misleading posturing.*" accompanied by a loud tone of speech and in tense situations (Rahardi et al., 2024; Rahardi, 2020b). Thus, the context behind the inaccuracy of the argument is self-defence by showing that the interlocutor has the same ethical weakness. The inaccuracy of the argument can be done by attacking the opponent's personality. The following data can be examined further.

Data KB04

P01: ... lalu ada kejadian-kejadian di mana kita semua menyaksikan ketika ada pelanggaran etika, Bapak tetap jalan terus dengan cawapres yang melanggar etika. Artinya ada kompromi atas standar etika. Ini fakta dan kemudian dalam pidato Bapak, Bapak mengolok-olok tentang pentingnya etika. Pertanyaannya apa penjelasan Pak Prabowo tentang itu semua?

... Then there are incidents where we all witness when there is a violation of ethics. You continue to walk with the vice presidential candidate who violates ethics. This means that there is a compromise on ethical standards. This is a fact, and later in your speech, you made fun of the importance of ethics. The question is, what is Mr. Prabowo's explanation of all of that?

P02: Maaf ya, karena Anda mendesak saya, saya menilai Anda tidak pantas bicara soal etika. Itu saja. Saya merasa bahwa Anda itu posturing menyesatkan. Itu saja.

I'm sorry because you urged me. I don't think you deserve to talk about ethics. That's it. I feel that you are misleading posturing. That's it. (Source: <https://youtu.be/FKImOfLQTbw?si=oCB1cBC83xKbJb7j>)

(Context: Anies asked about ethical standards that should be carried out by leaders and are associated with various problems that occur in the Ministry of Defense.)

3.5. The Fallacy of hasty generalization

KB05 data contains inaccuracies, arguing with *hasty generalizations*. A small case of the use of plastic bottles is a fact that supports the *claim* that the strategy to implement bioregional-based development is not representative as evidence. The reasons needed to support the argument in the KB05 Data should include bioregional-based

development strategies to realize (1) climate justice, (2) social justice, (3) ecological justice, (4) intergenerational justice, and (5) social justice. So, the data presented is not accurate enough and not representative, so the argument is weak (Hasibuan et al., 2020).

The context of the situation plays a very important role in describing the intention of argumentative speech. In the KB05 data, the context behind the inaccuracy of the argument due to hasty generalizations is satirizing the opponent because it is considered inconsequential. W02's statement, which reads *Gus Muhaimin is funny, yes, asking about environmental problems, but why is he using those plastic bottles*, even though I, Mr. Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud use glass bottles." is a satire addressed to W01. W01 was considered inconsistent in his attitude towards the questions posed to W02. The following presents a snippet of data that represents the inaccuracy of the argument caused by hasty generalizations.

Data KB05

W01: *Bagaimana strategi Anda melaksanakan pembangunan berbasis bioregional itu agar keadilan iklim terjaga, keadilan sosial terwujud, keadilan ekologi terlaksana dengan baik, keadilan antargenerasi juga terwujud sekaligus keadilan sosial? Mohon dijelaskan.*

How is your strategy to implement bioregional-based development so that climate justice is maintained, social justice is realized, ecological justice is implemented well, and intergenerational justice is also realized as well as social justice? Please explain.

W02: *Gus Muhaimin ini lucu ya, menanyakan masalah lingkungan hidup, tapi itu kok pakai botol-botol plastik itu, padahal saya, Pak Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud menggunakan botol kaca. Gimana itu komitmennya, botol plastik semua itu, tapi ngga papa, kita kembali lagi ke topik ya. Intinya kita berkomitmen pembangunan tidak boleh lagi Jawasentris, harus mulai Indonesiasentris. Kemarin, Gus Muhaimin menolak IKN, tidak apa-apa akan kita lanjutkan dan akan kita perkuat itu...*

Gus Muhaimin is funny, asking about environmental problems, but that's why he uses those plastic bottles, even though I, Mr. Ganjar, Prof. Mahfud use glass bottles. That's the commitment, plastic bottles, all that, but no, let's go back to the topic. The point is that we are committed to development should no longer be Jawascentris, we must start Indonesiacentric. Yesterday, Gus Muhaimin rejected IKN, it's okay We will continue and we will strengthen that... (Source: <https://youtu.be/V033ckLwcE?si=jr2CiXfGKdrIzBRY>)

(Context: Muhaimin asked Gibran about a bioregional development strategy, to which he replied with sarcasm.)

4. Discussion

The results of the study provide important findings regarding different notions of argumentation quality, in particular, to be considered for future presidential and vice-presidential debates (2023-2024). The five principal types of inaccuracies—alive a red

herring, disrespectful personality attack at arguing with, claiming authority to speak on this subject easily about respecting understanding the topic simultaneously worst mastery in, and speculating—are ubiquitous issues that contribute to the debate being less effective (Goffredo et al., 2023; Pineau, 2013). Beyond adding noise to important discussions, these inaccuracies illustrate a larger issue in public discourse. The most obvious inaccuracy I see is the trend of topic hopping. Red Herring This is a tactic used to take attention away from the central issue and turn it towards irrelevant or incidental issues instead.

During the presidential and vice-presidential debates, this was very often a manoeuvre to ignore challenging queries or challenge answers by attempting to shift the conversation onto friendlier terrain. Changing the focus allows debaters to ignore real weaknesses in their arguments or policies. Yet, it also undermines the integrity of the debate because a full examination of issues is not possible and people do not get to see where candidates really stand on tough questions. Attacking the personality of another, or an ad hominem attack, is yet another common fallacy (Martini, 2018; Rivera-Novoa, 2022). Meaning a direct challenge to an opponent focusing on character, history or previous behaviors rather than their arguments. Those attacks were on view in the debates, where candidates tried to undermine their opponents by depicting them as lacking in ethics or morals. It is a powerful way to shape public opinion as it can create lines of discredit that hit with cut-throat force. The problem with the approach is that it distracts from talking about policy and leads to an aggressive debate culture, which in turn brings all levels of conversation down.

Another of the identified inaccuracies that were found in the study was calling for authority (or appealing to authority). This is claiming that an argument must be true because it was from some authority or expert, and which case, no real evidence has been presented in support. One of the pillars they used to back up their cases in many of the debates was support from certain influential people or organizations. Provided that these establish lead to credible sources, they add strength to the argument, but over-reliance on authority without any critical examination will erode the foundation. Debaters need to back their claims up with evidence and reasoning, not just endorsements of powerful authorities (Lewiński, 2022; Walton & Koszowy, 2017).

A lack of mastery is perhaps the most critical problem affecting how well one argues. The survey states that the candidates demonstrated some of these same dynamics, and those unscripted moments portrayed a less than complete understanding of topics being argued, with comments coming out either broad or wrong. This shallowness can lead to incredibly bad ideas and an inability, or worse yet, lack of awareness as need be, to counter objectors' points. A deep knowledge base on a subject is important for meaningful debates, as it leads to more intelligent engagement with candidates and well-informed arguments. We also found examples of hasty generalization in which we draw sweeping universal conclusions based on a very limited set. Debaters would take a tiny incident or just an anecdotal piece of evidence and use it as the basis for far-reaching statements. This fallacy deceives listeners and over-simplifies complex issues. Good argumentation needs thorough examination and strong data to support claims

(Samosa, 2021; Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2022). Following that advice will necessarily make arguments sound since no premature generalizations are being made, and they are credible.

The study looks at the environmental conditions aiding in these argumentative failures. Over the course of presidential and vice-presidential debates between 2023-2024, multiple contextual effects were found: (1) Taking Eyes off the Ball with Historical Facts: Candidates frequently led focus away from current issues via history or actions of years gone by. This tactic is employed to mislead the viewers because, ultimately, it drags them right out of their current conversation and canon so people aren't forced to interact with important views head-on; (2) Highlight Mutual Ethical Weakness: In some cases, candidates defend themselves by arguing that their opponents have the same ethical shortcomings. Moving to the middle or attacking Mitt Romney with these issues is puerile in nature and attempts only to polish it distract from his record on social freedom, but one can smell this coming already; (3) Seeking to thwart an opponent by invoking authority: Candidates evoked authoritative endorsements or associations against their opponents. They sought to avail of the backing of any venerable personality or institution in order to strengthen their credibility while undermining that of their rivals; (4) There is a knowledge deficit: The debates disclosed that some candidates did not have the depth of their discussions. That deficiency led to shallow debates and an inability to deal with serious matters; (5) Criticism of the Opponent: Critics made satirical comments to harass opponents and belittle their arguments. Even if that can have a strong rhetorical effect, it undermines the debate in discourse and pure quality.

5. Conclusion

The results of this study show that there are five types of inaccuracies in argumentation, namely shifting the topic of discussion, attacking the opponent's personality, calling for authority, weak mastery of the topic of discussion, and hasty generalization. The findings of the context behind the inaccuracy of arguing in the 2023-2024 presidential and vice-presidential debates include (1) shifting the topic, (2) attacking the opponent's person, (3) calling for authority, (4) weak mastery of the topic, and (5) hasty generalizations. The situational context behind these inaccuracies includes: (1) distracting attention with past facts, (2) defending by highlighting mutual ethical weaknesses, (3) undermining opponents with authority, (4) lacking deep topic understanding, and satirizing opponents. The findings also underscore the importance of fostering better argumentation practices to improve the quality of public discourse. This research has an impact on the importance of stimulating the practice of arguing in quality debates for academics. Arguments in debates need to be supported by adequate data and use debate strategies that are respectful, sportsmanlike, and responsible in providing accurate evidence to strengthen claims. The study still has a number of limitations, namely in the amount of data that must be analyzed in this study. In different studies, researchers will increase the amount of data to be analyzed, so that the results of the study more reliably describe the true reality of argumentation in presidential election debates and presidential candidates. Other researchers who have similar attention to

the issue of inaccuracies in general election debates are welcome to research the same topic so that the issues raised in this study can be solved more clearly and in detail.

Declaration of Conflicting Interest

Yuliana Setyaningsih, R. Kunjana Rahardi, and Wahyudi Rahmat declare that there is no conflict of interest concerning the publication of this paper.

Funding Acknowledgments (Optional)

Recognize those who helped in the research, especially funding supporters of your research. Include individuals who have assisted you in your study: Advisors, Financial supporters, or may other supporter i.e. Proof-readers, Typists, and Suppliers who may have given materials.

References

- Adhi, Y. T. (2022). Sesat Pikir dalam Tuturan Warganet di Facebook (Logical Fallacies In Internet Citizen Speech On Facebook). *Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pembelajarannya*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.20527/jbsp.v12i2.10942>
- Berkle, Y., Schmitt, L., Tolzin, A., Janson, A., Wambsganss, T., Leimeister, J. M., & Leuchter, M. (2023). Measuring university students' ability to recognize argument structures and fallacies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1270931>
- Botting, D. (2017). Toulmin's Logical Types. *Argumentation*, 31(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-016-9414-6>
- Daeli, R. (2020). An Analysis of Logical Fallacy in Argument of Campaign Team of Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto. *English Language and Literature*. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ell.v9i4.107977>
- Doerfler, R. D. (2020). The "ambiguity" fallacy. In *George Washington Law Review* (Vol. 88, Issue 5).
- Dwi Atmaja, B. S., & Alvin, S. (2023). Phubbing By Gen-Z And Gen-Y: Exploring Smartphone Usage And Its Implications On Interpersonal Communication In The Workplace. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Teknologi*, 4(8). <https://doi.org/10.59141/jist.v4i8.665>
- El Khoiri, N., & Widiati, U. (2017). Logical Fallacies in EFL Learners' Argumentative Writings. *Dinamika Ilmu*. <https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.638>
- Goffredo, P., Espinoza, M. C., Cabrio, E., & Villata, S. (2023). Argument-based Detection and Classification of Fallacies in Political Debates. *EMNLP 2023 - 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing, Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2023.emnlp-main.684>
- Gonçalves-Segundo, P. R. (2022). Fake news, moral panic, and polarization in Brazil: A critical discursive approach. *Linguistic Frontiers*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.2478/lf-2022-0013>
- Hasibuan, S. H., Yusriati, Y., & Manurung, I. D. (2020). Examining Argument Elements and Logical Fallacies of English Education Students in Oral Discussion. *Tell : Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.30651/tell.v8i2.5771>

- Jin, Z., Lalwani, A., Vaidhya, T., Shen, X., Ding, Y., Lyu, Z., Sachan, M., Mihalcea, R., & Schölkopf, B. (2022). Logical Fallacy Detection. *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP* 2022. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.findings-emnlp.532>
- Kunjana Rahardi, R., Handoko, H., Rahmat, W., & Setyaningsih, Y. (2024). Javanese Silly Gags on Daily Communication on Social Media: Pragmatic Meanings and Functions Approach. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 11(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.11.1.49-59.2024>
- Lewiński, M. (2022). Challenging Authority with Argumentation: The Pragmatics of Arguments from and to Authority. *Languages*, 7(3). <https://doi.org/10.3390/languages7030207>
- Martini, C. (2018). Ad Hominem Arguments, Rhetoric, and Science Communication. *Studies in Logic, Grammar and Rhetoric*, 55(1). <https://doi.org/10.2478/slgr-2018-0033>
- Mayring, P. A. E. (2022). Qualitative content analysis. In *International Encyclopedia of Education: Fourth Edition*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818630-5.11031-0>
- Pineau, A. (2013). The abuses of argument: Understanding fallacies on toulmin's layout of argument. *Informal Logic*, 33(4). <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v33i4.3900>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2018). Elemen dan fungsi konteks sosial, sosial, dan situasional dalam menentukan makna pragmatik kefasihan berbahasa. *Language in the Digital Era: Opportunities or Threats?*, 2.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2019). *Pragmatik: Konteks Intralinguistik dan Konteks Ekstralinguistik*.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2020a). Konteks Eksternal Virtual dalam Pragmatik Siber. *LOA: Jurnal Ketatabahasaan dan Kesusastraan*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.26499/loa.v15i2.2347>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2020b). Triadic Functions Of Situational Context Of Hate Speeches : a Cyberpragmatic Perspective. *Metalingua*.
- Rahardi, R. K. (2022). Triadicities of Indonesian Phatic Functions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(12), 2641–2650. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1212.22>
- Rahardi, R. K. (2023). Social–Societal Context Element Changes in Cyberpragmatics Perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(11), 2771–2779. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1311.06>
- Rahardi, R. K., & Firdaus, W. (2023). Expert Judgements of Integrated Cyberpragmatics Learning Model with Socio-Semiotics Multimodality-Based Cybercontext Contexts. *Aksara*, 35(2). <https://doi.org/10.29255/aksara.v35i2.4160.211-227>
- Rahardi, R. K., Rahmat, W., & Kurniawan, Y. (2023). Pseudo-Directive Speech Act in the Javanese Language: Culture-Specific Pragmatic Perspective. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_JSLHR-23-00223
- Rahardi, R. K., Setyaningsih, Y., Rahmat, W., & Lateh, N. H. M. (2024). A Stylistic Pragmatics Perspective on Metaphors of Emotive Words in Anak Bajang Menggiring Angin. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(8), 2417–2425.
- Rivera-Novoa, Á. (2022). Ad hominem arguments and virtue epistemology: How to attack the person without committing a logical or moral failure in the attempt. *Theoria (Spain)*, 37(3). <https://doi.org/10.1387/theoria.23046>

- Samosa, R. C. (2021). Effectiveness of Claim, Evidence and Reasoning as an Innovation to Develop Students' Scientific Argumentative Writing Skills. *Journal of Multidimensional Research & Review*, 2(1).
- Santoso, J. M. (2018). A Fallacy Analysis of the Arguments on the First U.S. Presidential Debate Between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. *K@ta Kita*. <https://doi.org/10.9744/katakita.5.2.65-71>
- Serafini, F., & Reid, S. F. (2023). Multimodal content analysis: expanding analytical approaches to content analysis. *Visual Communication*, 22(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470357219864133>
- Setyaningsih, Y. (2020). Argument Constellation in Journal Articles: Toulmin Stephen Perspective (Konstelasi Argumen dalam Artikel Jurnal: Perspektif Stephen Toulmin). *Gramatika STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat*. <https://doi.org/10.22202/jg.2020.v6i2.4079>
- Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. K. (2019). Quality of Arguments Used in The First-Round Presidential Debate: Critical Pragmatics and Stephen Toulmin's Perspective. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(5C), 716–725. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.e1102.0585c19>
- Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. K. (2022). Tendencies of Argumentative Claim Types of Indonesian Academic Writers. In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2022)*. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-91-6_102
- Shalatun, R. (2021). Analisis Teks Argumentasi dalam Tajuk Rencana Harian KOMPAS. *LITERASI: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Bahasa, Sastra Indonesia Dan Daerah*. <https://doi.org/10.23969/literasi.v11i2.3647>
- Sri Istiningdias, D., & Argenti, G. (2019). Logical Fallacy dalam Narasi Media CNN Indonesia "Pemerintahan Boneka di Era Jokowi." *Jurnal Akrab Juara*, 4(4).
- Srimayasandy, S. (2021). Logical Fallacy Argumentation on Testimonials on Homeshopping Television Show. *MEDIASI*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.46961/mediasi.v2i2.368>
- Sudaryanto. (2016). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa* (1st ed.). Sanata Dharma University Press.
- Toulmin, S., Rieke, R., & Janik, A. (1984). An Introduction to Reasoning (2nd ed.). In *Book* (Vol. 86, Issue 4).
- Walton, D. (2020). Profiles of Dialogue for Amphiboly. *Informal Logic*, 40(1). <https://doi.org/10.22329/il.v40i1.5997>
- Walton, D., & Koszowy, M. (2017). Arguments from authority and expert opinion in computational argumentation systems. *AI and Society*, 32(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-016-0666-3>
- Warman, J. S., & Hamzah, H. (2020). An Analysis of Logical Fallacy on Prabowo Subianto's Argumentation during 2019 Indonesia Presidential Debate. *Lingua Didaktika: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Pembelajaran Bahasa*. <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v14i1.106901>
- Yuyun, I. (2014). A study of assertiveness in a debate setting. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v3i2.275>