

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

A. Conclusion

Based on the result of discussion in Chapter IV, the conclusion is made as follows :

The most dominant kind of argumentative characteristics used by the prime minister is the second one, i.e. an argumentation should offer reasons and supports for the reason. It happens because she would like to establish more substantives in proposing their argumentations. While the deputy prime minister who should make engagement to the opponent uses the third kind as his most dominant kind of argumentative characteristics, i.e. an argumentation should refute opposing arguments. On the hand, the proposition whip sets his strategy to impose more refutations and to weaken his opponent's substantives by showing that their valid points can be compared with better logical rebuttal. Therefore, it affects the use of his dominant kind of argumentative become the third and the forth ones, i.e. an argumentation should refute opposing arguments, and if an opponent does have a valid point, concede the point.

Having the same perspective to establish more substantives from the very beginning, the opposition leader uses the second argumentative characteristics, i.e. an argumentation should offer reasons and supports for the reason as her most dominant kind of aspect. The same decision is also taken by the deputy leader of opposition. She establishes the second argumentative characteristics, i.e. an

argumentation should offer reasons and supports for the reason for strengthening the opposition's stance to negate the issue given in this debate. Finally, the opposition whip tries to sum up all of the opposition's proposal by using the third argumentative characteristics, i.e. argumentation should refute opposing arguments as the weapon to attack their opponent's proposal.

There are two major aspects that should be analyzed to seek the reason why each debater in ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition (ALSA E-Comp) Grand Final 2011 uses the different dominant kinds of argumentative characteristics in proposing and defending their proposal in Asian Parliamentary Debate Format. Firstly, it relates to the role of each speaker in Asian Parliamentary Debate Format which is different one another. Secondly, it relates to the heat of debate which might be so dependable to each speaker's capability to make clashes and engagement to their opponent's proposal.

B. Suggestion

The next researchers also can analyze others argumentation expression, such as types of argumentation (Marie & Jeanne theory, 2004) provided by each speaker in other competitive debates. It is also suggested for those students who are interested in competitive debates to use this pattern of analysis in constructing their argumentations toward their proposal in order to establish a strong and plausible point. It can be an example of appropriate strategy for strengthening team's position and weakening opponent's proposal.