

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. The Background of the Study

Debating is all around us; on the television, in the newspapers, and in our own homes. As a society, we debate about almost everything. Debating is everywhere, and everyone can do it (Quinn, 2005: 01). In life, there are always two sides under the sunshine. Some particular people might agree with the government decision for increasing fuel price for example, and some others might not. Individual or groups may use debate to achieve their own goal and to bring others to their way of thinking. Debate is the process of inquiry and advocacy, a way of arriving at a reasoned judgment on a proposition (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009: 06). People who agree with the government decision for increasing fuel price might argue that it aims to save the national budget and it teaches people to be more independent relating to the economic condition in this globalization era for instance. This group of people might influence other to get a reasoned decision that the government decision is appropriate to be done. On the other hand, some others have the different perspective towards this case.

Debate requires two competitive sides engaging in a particular issue or case, which is called as a motion - the topic to be supported or negated by both teams. Therefore, debate indeed demands critical thinking. Debate provides reasoned arguments for and against a proposition (Freeley & Steinberg, 2009: 06). Amstrong & Fogelin (2010: 03) in *Understanding Arguments: An Introduction to Informal Logic* defined that an argument is a connected series of sentences,

statements, or propositions (called “premises”) that are intended to give reasons of some kind for a sentence, statement, or proposition (called “conclusion”). Whenever and wherever we encounter arguments, we can always depend on three things; they are (1) claim, (2) data, and (3) assumptions or reasoning process (Lapakko, 2009: 13). The sense of argument that we find in daily life often differs from the concept of argument in a more formal circumstance, such as when someone participates in a debate. This everyday sense of argument are typically disagreements or differences of opinion, while a proper argument is usually guided by conclusions and premises, or opinions that backed up by evidence.

A debate is basically an argument. Therefore, in debate, matter (the arguments are presented) tends to be more considered than manner (the way a particular speech is presented) and method (the structure of speech is presented) as the most significant criteria of assessment to deal with. Flynn (1977: 36-37) explained that there are several elements of matter, i.e. matter should be relevant, logical and consistent. Matter should be relevant means it should relate to the issues of the debate: positive material should support the case being presented and rebuttal should refute the material being presented by the opposing team. Matter should be logical means that arguments should be developed logically in order to be clear and well-reasoned and therefore plausible. The conclusion of all arguments should support the member’s case. Matter should be consistent means that members should ensure that the matter they present is consistent within their speech, their team and the remainder of the members on their side of the debate.

A good debater should be able to build a good argument towards the issue of the debate. In building the argument, debaters should recognize the characteristics of argumentation. As a comparative analogy, for example, the advertisement can be said persuasive if they fulfill the requirements of fundamental persuasive characteristics. The persuasive advertisement should fulfill the personal character of the advertisement, the ability of adviser to control the viewer emotion, and showing the evidence to the viewer (Nasihah, 2009). It shows that a persuasive advertisement has its own characteristics, so does the argumentation. Smalley & Ruetten (1986) mentioned five characteristics of a good argument; they are (1) Argumentation should introduce and explain the issue or case, (2) Argumentation should offer reason and support for the reason, (3) Argumentation should refute the opposing arguments, (4) If an opponent has a valid point, concede the point, and (5) The conclusion should logically follow from the argument. These argumentative characteristics should be fulfilled by the debaters in line with their role of speakers in delivering and proposing their argumentation.

Studies on argumentation have been done by several people. For example, Nasihah (2009) described the characteristics of argumentation used by Indonesian-English debaters in Indonesian Varsity English Debate (IVED) 2009 and elaborated the consistency of each speaker in running their role of each speaker in the debate. She found out that some debaters do not apply the theory of argumentative characteristics to play their roles in delivering their team's proposal. The present research, however, specifically focuses on the most dominant kinds of argumentative characteristics used by the debaters in ASEAN

Law Student Association English Competition (ALSA E-Comp) Grand Final 2011. The ALSA English Competition is one of the well-known competitive debates, claimed as the longest-running annual English debating tournament in Indonesia. It began in mid 1990s long before Indonesian students knew about internationally accepted debating styles. Therefore, the argumentations which brought by its debaters can be a path for constructing a good argumentation.

B. The Problem of the Study

Based on the elaborated background of the study, this research obtains the questions below :

1. What kinds of argumentative characteristics are dominantly used by each debater in ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition (ALSA E-Comp) Grand Final 2011 ?
2. Why does each debater in ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition (ALSA E-Comp) Grand Final 2011 use different dominant kinds of argumentative characteristics in proposing and defending their proposal which in line with their role of speakers in Asian Parliamentary Debate Format ?

C. The Objective of the Study

According to the problem of the study, the objectives of the study are :

1. To describe the most dominant kinds of argumentative characteristics used by each debater in ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition (ALSA E-Comp) Grand Final 2011.
2. To elaborate 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 which in line with their role of speakers in Asian Parliamentary Debate Format.

D. The Significance of the Study

The significance of doing the research is directed to the students for enhancing their critical thinking by arguing in debate. Nowadays, students are easily influenced by someone else by accepting information that might not true from the first place. In other words, they should be able to analyze it wisely. It doesn't mean that by debating, people can rape every single word what other people say and say no for it every time. The result of this research hopefully gives significant skills toward the students in making well-organized arguments. Moreover, for those students who would like to grab a trophy in the competitive debate can be guided by fulfilling the argumentative characteristics used by debaters in ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition (ALSA E-Comp) Grand Final 2011 as the path of guidance to begin with.

This research is significant for some reasons. First, by studying argument, it is about to learn a variety of important issues. People have to argue about

something in their daily life. Second, a course in argument can bear people to be an effective advocate. During this life, people have to convince others to believe on your perspective under particular circumstances for particular context of belief. Third, by learning argumentation in debate, it can make people become an out of the box thinker. People are always pushed to give better solution towards problems they face in life.

E. The Scope of the Study

Each debate format has its different rules, and each debater has the specific roles. In other words, each debater in one team has the different duty to propose their proposal which is assessed by the adjudicator - somebody who has watched and followed the debate carefully in order to decide the result.

The ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition is a competitive debate particularly held in University of Indonesia by English Debating Society *Universitas Indonesia* (EDS-UI) which applies the Asian Parliamentary debate format. It means that the competitive debate consists of two competing teams, and each team has three debaters. The result of this research will be taken from such limitations on Grand Final round of The ASEAN Law Student Association English Competition 2011. The scope of limitation of this research will be taken from the argumentation of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd speaker of proposition team, and the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd speaker of opposition team which indicate the theory of argumentative characteristics.