

**LAPORAN PENELITIAN**

**PROGRAM BANTUAN DANA PENELITIAN  
DOSEN FAKULTAS HUMANIORA**

**FLAWS OF REASONING IN THE DISCOURSE ON  
INDONESIAN ISSUES IN SOCIAL MEDIA**



**Dr. Rohmani Nur Indah, M.Pd  
NIP. 19760910 200312 2002**

**ENGLISH LETTERS AND LANGUAGE DEPARTMENT  
HUMANITIES FACULTY  
MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF  
MALANG  
2016**

**Dibiayai oleh Dana DIPA Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim  
Malang Tahun Anggaran 2016. Nomor DIPA 025.04.2.423812/2016.  
Tanggal 7 Desember 2015**

## **HALAMAN PENGESAHAN**

Penelitian dengan judul:

# **FLAWS OF REASONING IN THE DISCOURSE ON INDONESIAN ISSUES IN SOCIAL MEDIA**

Disahkan oleh Dekan Fakultas Humaniora

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

Pada tanggal 1 Oktober 2016

Mengetahui,  
Ketua Lab. Penelitian dan  
Pengabdian pada Masyarakat,

Peneliti

Dr. Susilo Mansurudin, MPd  
NIP 19700728 200801 1 007

Dr. Rohmani Nur Indah, M.Pd  
NIP. 19760910 200312 2 002

Mengesahkan,  
Dekan

Dr. Hj. Isti'adah, MA  
NIP 19670313 199203 2 002

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Research Background

Reasoning or the skill to show logical thinking is a prominent issue as people express their thought freely during this era of information today. It is relevant with the freedom of expression that begins since Reform Era in 1998 (Emilia, 2010). In this case, it is also relevant with the 4R basic competences comprising *reading, writing, arithmetic, and reasoning* (Hayat & Yusuf, 2010). Each of the competences support one another and the last element, reasoning has become more significant particularly in facing the more challenging world. In terms of the rapid information in the latest century, it demands the reasoning skill to filter the information to be valid and reliable.

Reasoning skill is also a criteria of one's critical thinking. The rhetorical strategies used in one's speech characterizes his way of making inferences. A good inference shows the logic of an argument that refers to some questions such as how the claim presented is sound or unsound (Dowden, 2010). To do this, any critical thinker must be able to identify potential fallacies. A fallacy is a misleading or unsound argument. Therefore this study focuses on the fallacies or flaw of reasoning showing the defect of one's argumentation.

In common discourses, argumentation often involves flaw in logic as one tries describe his/her deduction in his/her way. The flow in reasoning generally occurs in the context of conversation or discussion on familiar topic. The more familiar one with a topic, the more opportunities he/she has to express his/her view which may lead to fallacies. It is in line with the finding of Indah (2013) studying the relationship between critical thinking and fallacies and topic based on familiarity in Indonesian student's writing. Similarly, Stapleton (2001) also arrived at the same conclusion that Japanese students tend to express fewer fallacies in writing about American topics which are less familiar to them

compared to Japanese issues. Indah and Agung (2015) also find various types of flaw of logical thought in English department student's writing. More faulty reasoning is found in the issues which are considered not new such as illegal logging, woman emancipation and becoming career woman compared to the discussion on other topics. In this case, more faulty deduction on the logos is found as the most frequent type. Because the issues are considered more familiar to the students, there is tendency of leaping the premises to come to the direct conclusion (Indah & Agung, 2015). When writing on global issues, students still cannot avoid the occurrence of fallacies especially on the type of the logos as the dominant flawed reasoning. The most obvious one is the tendency to make hasty generalization. In this case the students believe that the general fact will be exactly the same as what s/he has assumed through his/her claims (Indah, 2016).

Based on the empirical finding above, it is clear logical reasoning is still an area which needs more exploration. Moreover when the discourse is much larger than student's writing context. This study concerns with the flaws of reasoning in the discourse of social media as it involves broader coverage involving various issues and participants. Therefore, it is expected more various finding is obtained through investigating the argumentation among the users of social media.

## **1.2 Research Objectives**

Based on the aforementioned research background deciphering the bases of this study relating with the urgency of deciphering the flaw in argumentation and logic, the main goal of this study is to explore the fallacies in the discourse of social media. As the delimitation of the analysis, there are two objectives formulated to do this research.

*First*, this study is to identify the types of the fallacies found in social media especially in conversing Indonesian issues.

*Second*, the analysis done in this study aims at describing the pattern of logical flaw occurring in the contexts of social media discourse in Indonesian issues.

### **1.3 Research Significance**

Based on the background explained above and the research objectives as mentioned earlier, the starting point of this study is to portray the identification of potential fallacies produced by users of social media. The finding is contributed to the area of critical thinking which explores the various logic, reflected by social media users. The identification will be the empirical bases which can contribute to the further aspects relating to linguistics area.

To understand the pattern of fallacies in social media is important given that the issue of critical thinking is becoming significant due to the freedom of expression and argumentation in Indonesia. By reaching to an explanatory level, this study will be significant for identifying the pattern on the phenomenon of critical thinking discourse on Indonesian issues. Considering that the empirical data on the critical thinking skills especially on assessing sound argument through fallacies and critical discourse in Indonesian context is still inadequate, the findings of the study will be significant to understand of critical thinking today.

The result of this study also brings important pedagogical contribution. Understanding the pattern of fallacies among the various types of argumentation in above is an important step to figure out the level of critical thinking of the social media users. This will also lead to further studies on the area of linguistics.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **2.1 The Nature of Fallacy**

A fallacy is a kind of error in reasoning. As described by Dowden (2010), fallacies should not be persuasive, but they often are. Fallacies may be created unintentionally, or they may be created intentionally in order to deceive other people. The vast majority of the commonly identified fallacies involve arguments, although some involve explanations, or definitions, or other product of reasoning. In this study the fallacies observed are those involved in the claims which explain an evaluation or value claims, define an issue or factual claims, and proposing something or policy claims.

Sometimes the term “fallacy” is used even more broadly to indicate any false belief or cause of a false belief. There are two basic types of fallacies, the formal and the informal fallacies. Most fallacies involve kinds of errors made while arguing informally in natural language. Formal fallacies are invalid arguments due to mistakes in the reasoning or the logic which occur independently from the actual content of the arguments. They are simply invalid or unjustified deductions or conclusions. While, informal fallacies are invalid arguments due to mistakes in reasoning that are related to the content of the argument (Dowden, 2010). Since informal fallacies are not linked with a logical error in the structure of the argument, we need to look closer at how the argument has been interpreted.

An informal fallacy is fallacious because of both its form and its content. The formal fallacies are fallacious only because of their logical form. For example, the slippery slope fallacy has this form: Step 1 “leads to” step 2. Step 2 leads to step 3. Step 3 leads to ... until we reach an obviously unacceptable step, so step 1 is not acceptable. That form occurs in both good arguments and

fallacious arguments. The quality of an argument of this form depends crucially on the probabilities that each step does lead to the next, but the probabilities involve the argument's content, not merely its form.

The discussion that precedes the long alphabetical list of fallacies begins with an account of the ways in which the term "fallacy" is vague. Attention then turns to the number of competing and overlapping ways to classify fallacies of argumentation. For pedagogical purposes, researchers in the field of fallacies disagree about the following topics: which name of a fallacy is more helpful to students' understanding; whether some fallacies should be de-emphasized in favor of others; and which is the best taxonomy of the fallacies. Researchers in the field are also deeply divided about how to define the term "fallacy" itself, how to define certain fallacies, and whether any theory of fallacies at all should be pursued if that theory's goal is to provide necessary and sufficient conditions for distinguishing between fallacious and non-fallacious reasoning generally. Analogously, there is doubt in the field of ethics regarding whether researchers should pursue the goal of providing necessary and sufficient conditions for distinguishing moral actions from immoral ones.

It is commonly claimed that giving a fallacy a name and studying it will help the student identify the fallacy in the future and will steer them away from using the fallacy in their own reasoning. As Steven Pinker says in *The Stuff of Thought* (in Dowden, 2010), if a language provides a label for a complex concept, that could make it easier to think about the concept, because the mind can handle it as a single package when juggling a set of ideas, rather than having to keep each of its components in the air separately. It can also give a concept an additional label in long-term memory, making it more easily retrievable than ineffable concepts or those with more roundabout verbal descriptions.

## **2.2 Types of Fallacy**

Informal fallacies are the ones that are more often met in arguments around us, in the media for example. There are many varieties of informal fallacies. Here are some of the most common examples.

*First*, the false dilemma fallacy. It occurs when an argument offers only 2 possible conclusions when many more are possible. For instance, “To lose weight, you should either stop eating fries or have liposuction”. This is a fallacy as many other options are possible to lose weight such as taking up exercise for instance.

Another fallacy or the *second* example is: that “correlation proves causation” fallacy. Here an argument assumes that when 2 events occur, one causes the other. For instance, “whenever I clean my car it rains”. This is clearly a fallacy as I don’t have any power to make rain.

Another very common fallacy as the *third* example is the cherry picking fallacy when an argument uses supporting evidence selectively, and contradicting evidence is simply ignored. For instance, claiming that climate change has been stabilised by looking only at certain periods where little change has taken place rather than the longer term trends.

*Fourth*, as the last step is the most important: ‘evaluation’. This is when you can conclude what you think of the argument.

Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001) state that the errors in reasoning occur when the reason does not adequately support the claim in one of a number of ways. The flawed relationship can exist between the statements in an argument attempt. These are called logos fallacies and they include fallacies such as irrelevancy, false analogy, hasty generalization, slippery slope, oversimplification, and begging the question.

In addition, a flawed relationship can exist between the argument and the character of those involved in the argument. These are called fallacies of ethos and include appeals to false authorities, attacking the character of the arguer, and strawperson (oversimplifying an opponent’s argument to make it easy to refute). Flawed relationships can also exist between what is argued and the audience. These flawed arguments, called fallacies of pathos, include, appealing to stirring symbols (such as nationalistic values), provincialism, appealing to emotional premises, and red herring (shifting the audience’s attention). Examples from Stapleton (2001) include:

- “America is trying to rule the world economy.” (appeal to stirring symbols)
- “Japan already imports so much food from the U.S.” (irrelevant)
- “All guns are only used for killing.” (oversimplification)

## **2.3 State of The Art**

For pedagogical purposes, researchers in the field of fallacies disagree about the following topics: which name of a fallacy is more helpful to students’ understanding; whether some fallacies should be de-emphasized in favor of others; and which is the best taxonomy of the fallacies. As reviewed by Dowden (2001) fallacy theory is criticized by some teachers of informal reasoning for its over-emphasis on poor reasoning rather than good reasoning. Do colleges teach the Calculus by emphasizing all the ways one can make mathematical mistakes? The critics want more emphasis on the forms of good arguments and on the implicit rules that govern proper discussion designed to resolve a difference of opinion. But there has been little systematic study of which emphasis is more successful.

Concerning the empirical bases supporting this study, Browne and Keeley (1994), Leki (1995), and Ramage and Bean (1999), include sections on fallacies using similar terminology of fallacies. Ramage and Bean (in Stapleton, 2001) identify three broad types of fallacies based on appeals to pathos, ethos, and logos. Fallacies of pathos characterize flaws in the relationship between what is argued and the audience, one example being emotional misdirection. Ethos fallacies characterize flaws in the relationship between the argument and the character of those involved in the argument, one example being attacking the character of the opponent. Logos fallacies characterize flaws in the relationship between the claim and the reasons or evidence in an argument, one example being hasty generalization on the basis of too little evidence.

Some researchers emphasized on what raters noted and counted the fallacies by name. This process of assessing arguments as fallacious is rife with difficulties. A lack of shared assumptions and values among individuals can result

in one person judging an argument completely logical whereas another finds it fallacious. Nevertheless, even while one person's fallacy can be another's logical argument, at some point a decision must be made about whether a reason supports a conclusion. It is at this point that the dichotomy between universalists and postmodernists again enters the debate. As reviewed by Dowden (2001) postmodernists argue that the legitimacy of judgments is bound by the perspective from which they are made. In other words, almost any statement that is grounded in one's perspective can be considered part of a legitimate argument. Siegel (1997) counters, "Though we judge from the perspectives of our own schemes, our judgments and their legitimacy regularly extend beyond the bounds of those schemes" (in Stapleton, 2001). This implies that some universal standard must exist for evaluating arguments.

On the occurrence of fallacies across different language, it is important to note that the key role they are given in critical thinking textbooks suggests that they are also common in the writing of L1 students. This is significant because many of those who claim that Asians do not think critically, and imply that critical thinking instruction to them is unwise as reported by Stapleton (2001), also imply that L1 learners are well versed in critical thought. Yet critical thinking textbooks for L1 students usually include prominent sections on fallacies, so L1 students must also often have problems with them. In response to claims that L2 learners have difficulty with issues of audience and voice compared to their L1 counterparts, Raimes and Zamel (in Stapleton, 2001) ask, "Who are these L1 students who have a relatively easier time in writing classes? They are certainly not the students who populate the composition courses at public, urban institutes [in the United States] where we teach".

In summary, it appears that it is not only in Japanese, Asian, or even L2 students in Indonesia as a whole who have problems in generating and formulating ideas into sound, cogent arguments. It is also their L1 counterparts, who have served as the implied object of comparison for this study. Not surprisingly, then, fallacies of several different types appeared in roughly one third of the participants' essays on both topics. All of these could be categorized into the conventional types such as irrelevancy, oversimplification,

overgeneralization, and misleading emotional appeal. Again, the existence of these fallacies in recognizable forms suggests some similarity with what might be expected from L1 students.

In his research, Stapleton (2001) found that the greater number of fallacies in the familiar topic essays may be explained by the participants' greater emotional involvement with the topic due to their familiarity. Many of the fallacies fell in the "appeal to stirring symbols" category, which may indicate that participants, in their zeal to support ideas, failed to recognize that they had gone beyond a point of reasonableness. Therefore this can be the strongest bases for this study to identify the tendency of the fallacies based on the topic of the various claims.

## **2.4 Research Road Map**

The research on writing topic is linked with the area of English language teaching on the writing course in which the researcher has been involved since 2003. It is also relevant to her qualification as explained in the appendix. Most of her researches are related to EFL writing the title of which can also be seen in the appendix. The following are the current researches done by the researcher relevant to the topic of this study:

1. *Critical Thinking Based Instruction in Australian Primary Schools*  
(2013). International Collaborative Research with University of Deakin
2. *Topic Familiarity, Writing Proficiency and Critical Thinking Skills*  
(2013). Doctorate dissertation submitted to State University of Malang
3. *Stabilized Errors in Argumentative Essay Writing: Learners' Perspective*  
(2010) Linguistics research
4. Communicating Critical Thinking through bilingual Reflective Writing  
(2012). In Cahyono, B. Y & Yannuar, N. (Eds.) *Englises for Communication and Interaction in the Classroom and Beyond*, Malang: State University of Malang Press

5. *Discovering Student's Expertise to Augment Claim Quality in Writing Class at UIN Maliki Malang* (2010) The 1st National Conference on Linguistics and Literature. Ma Chung University
6. *Developing Students' Critical Thinking Awareness through Interest-based Claims Writing Publication* (2009) The 56<sup>th</sup> of International Conference of Teaching English as Foreign Language in Indonesia. UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim
7. *A Psycholinguistic Analysis on Children's Language in Reader's Digest 'As Kids See It'* (2007) Competitive research funded by the research center of UIN Malang
8. *Claims of Fact on Issues in Islamic Countries in Newsweek International Magazine* (2007) Journal of Language and Linguistic Study vol.19 UMS

From the chronological process, the researcher's interest on writing topic was first established in the form of research in her thesis entitled *Enhancing Content Area Reading Skill through Summary Writing* (Indah, 2002) which incorporated reading and writing. Then, she started exploring rhetorical analysis by research no. 7 which resulted in her understanding on the aspect supporting well formed claims. The finding guides her in teaching critical writing course therefore she inferred from research no.5 that a successful writing class should end with the development of critical thinking which is initiated by finding the learner's interest or expertise (Indah, 2009). In addition, successful claim production is geared from collaborative writing activities (Indah, 2010) as the research finding no. 4.

The topic on critical thinking is observed from the simplest stage (Indah, 2007) namely the expressions from children language as explored in research no. 6 to those of university students in no.3 which concluded that reflective writing can express critical thinking in bilingual (Indah, 2012). To some extent the writing may also consist error as found in research no. 2 which hinder the reflection of meaning (Indah, 2010). To come to ideal critical thinking expression, the instruction should be well managed (Indah, 2013) as found in research no. 1. The focus on fallacy also becomes the minor finding on her dissertation as research no.

2 stating that on familiar topic students tend to produce more fallacies (Indah, 2013).

By identifying the logical reasoning on the occurrence of fallacies in the writing of the chats in social media, this research will specify on the uniqueness of the rhetorical competence of social media users. The various arguments may result in diversity of fallacies which needs more understanding to see whether there is certain pattern reflecting the phenomenon of fallacy occurrence in social media especially when conversing on Indonesian issues.

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

The present study employs qualitative design as the object is the real occurrence of flaws in reasoning in the discourse of social media on Indonesian issues. In qualitative work, the intent is to explore the rhetorical perspective of the social media users by seeing the variety of fallacies found. Therefore, in this study the types of fallacies in different type of argumentation become the basis to uncover what is specifically happening in the discourse of social media. By identifying ‘how’ and understanding ‘to what extent’ the social media users shape their claim into either sound or unsound argument, the study can result in a more comprehensive interpretation on the phenomenon on the dynamic of critical thinking skills in social media discourse.

#### **3.2 Data and Data Source**

The data needed for revealing the pattern of fallacies in social media discourse are in the form of the sentences written in the argumentation found. Therefore the main instrument used in this study is the researcher herself who conducts the whole process starting with collecting the data covering the statements containing flaws of reasoning, doing the analysis as well as drawing the research conclusion. The source of the data is the chatting of social media users in Facebook that is limited to the chats which involve a lot of responses or comments from the social media users.

### **3.3 Data Collection**

As stated formerly the design of this research is qualitative therefore the key instrument is the researchers. The data collection used snowball method taking the various data from the most prominent social media namely Facebook and Whatsapp messenger.

### **3.4 Data Analysis**

The data analysis began with categorizing the argumentation based on flaw category namely logos, pathos and ethos. Then, it proceeds with detail description on its type and contextual analysis referring to the issues which become the topic of conversation among the social media users. The data analysis moved in a cycle process, repeated again and again to identify the differences and similarities of the identification of the fallacies. The last step is drawing conclusion so that the result of the analysis reaches the adequate explanatory level.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDING AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 Finding

Some Indonesian issues are taken as the topic of the chat in the social media chosen for the data of this study. In the following analysis, each issue is presented separately by exploring the context followed by explaining the type of flaws of reasoning which occurs. Some other characteristics of the fallacies are also elaborated.

Data 1:

The first issue is on the reshuffle of the ministry in the current governmental board. The title of the posting is “When Rizal Ramli Holds the Key to Unlock the Secret”. It is written by Jonru, a reputable figure in facebook as he posts controversial issues available in <https://www.facebook.com/jonru.page/?fref=ts>. This issue is chosen as the data as it has reached twelve thousand responses and shared by more than three thousands people on July 30th, 2016. The posting is as the following

#### KETIKA RIZAL RAMLI MENJADI KUNCI PEMBUKA RAHASIA

1. Dulu, Kwik Kian Gie sempat berkata bahwa ada 9 naga (investor China) di balik Jokowi
2. Ahok ngotot banget melanjutkan reklamasi, padahal tak ada kepentingan rakyat di situ. Yang ada hanya kepentingan investor (*datum 1.1*).
3. Rizal Ramli sangat lantang menolak reklamasi
4. JOKOWI MEMECAT RIZAL RAMLI
5. Ahok pernah berkata bahwa Jokowi tak mungkin jadi presiden jika tidak dibeking oleh para investor China (*datum 1.2*).

6. Ahok belum jadi tersangka juga, walau bukti korupsinya sudah sangat terang-benderang (*datum 1.3*).

7. Ahok pernah sesumbar bahwa jika dia jadi tersangka, maka dia akan membongkar kasus TransJakarta (SEBUAH ANCAMAN YANG ANEH, KARENA AHOK KATANYA ANTI KORUPSI, NAMUN DARI ANCAMAN INI KELIHATAN BANGET BAHWA DIA MELINDUNGI KORUPTOR) (*datum 1.4*).

Dan sebagaimana kita ketahui bersama, Udar yang menjadi tersangka pada kasus Transjakarta, sekarang justru dibebaskan karena dianggap tidak bersalah. Lalu siapa yang bersalah? Hm... siapa ya? Yang jelas, atasan Udar ketika itu adalah Jokowi (*datum 1.5*).

8. FAKTA TAMBAHAN: Megawati ambisius jadi presiden. Tapi anehnya, dia justru mendukung Jokowi. Padahal dia tidak suka pada Jokowi. Sampai-sampai dia pernah berkata bahwa Jokowi hanya petugas partai (*datum 1.6*).

Hm, kenapa Megawati mendukung Jokowi padahal dia tidak suka dan dia sendiri ingin jadi presiden? SANGAT ANEH, BUKAN? Megawati tidak mungkin berbuat seperti itu, jika dia tidak dipaksa. Hm. siapa yang memaksa dia? (*datum 1.7*).

Pertanyaan saya: Bisakah Anda menarik BENANG MERAH dari DELAPAN poin di atas?

Orang cerdas dan otaknya dipakai dengan baik, pasti bisa segera membuat kesimpulan yang jitu. Sedangkan orang yang masih cinta buta, tunggu saja... mereka akan menuduh status ini sebagai fitnah (*datum 1.8*).

In data 1 conversing on Rizal Ramli, some flaws of reasoning occur which concern with the way the writer views the issue. The second statement: "Ahok insisted on reclamation project despite the absence of public interest. It only refers to investor interest" belongs to informal fallacy as it has the evaluation based on inadequate reason. The flaw of reasoning is related to the **logos** type as it manipulates the opinion. Therefore datum 1.1 involves **begging the question** as it leaves reader's curiosity without further explanation.

Similar analysis also happens to the fifth statement: "Ahok once said that it is impossible for Jokowi to get the presidential position without the support of Chinese investors". It would be different if the statement is changed into:

one of the reasons enabling Jokowi to get the presidential position is the support from Chinese investors. Accordingly, through his evaluation, the writer has tried to shift the reader from the current issue being conversed which reflects the flaw on **pathos**. It is called **red herring** as it makes the readers believe to the fact which has not been proven yet. Similar to the previous datum, in 1.2 the writer also has the flaw of **logos** that **begs reader's questions** on the evidence that Chinese investors hold that crucial support.

Related to Ahok, the writer also accuses him with the statement in datum 1.3: "Ahok has not been a suspect though his corruption evidence is crystal clear". This evaluation refers to the flaw of **logos** as it also belongs to **begging the questions** from the readers. The problem also occur with the **pathos** as the writer judge the person in his statement which shows **appeal to emotional premises**.

Datum 1.4 has different type of reasoning flaw as it belongs to **formal fallacy** where the writer has dissimilar deduction to the statement. The first sentence: Ahok boasted that if he became a suspect, he would uncover the case of TransJakarta. While, the sentence in brackets with capital letters stated the writer's inference that it makes the statement wierd as Ahok is fame for anti-corrupt, yet through his threat it seems that he protects the corruptor. These sentences contain different inference in the word "uncover" which is not always analogous to "protect". Ahok wanted to help ending the case which does not mean that Ahok protected the corruption process.

In the next sentence, the writer stated: "As known that Udar, a suspect for TransJakarta case, has been released and considered not guilty. Then, who is the culprit? Hm... who's on earth? It's obvious that Udar's superior at that moment is Jokowi" (datum 1.5). This statement belongs to informal fallacy on **logos** as the writer makes **correlation proves causation** or posthoc. Jokowi appears to be Udar's boss but it does not mean that Jokowi automotically can be accussed as guilty.

Datum 1.6 also contains infomal fallacy as it stated: "ADDITIONAL FACT: Megawati was ambitious to be president. But strangely, she supports Jokowi. Eventhough she disliked him so that she said that he is only a party

official.” In this statement, the writer shows flaw in **pathos** by showing his willing to shift reader’s attention by putting his opinion which he labeled “additional fact”. It belongs to **red herring** as the conversation topic is enlarged to other issues which may not be relevant.

Similar flaw also happen in datum 1.7 which stated: “Hm, why did Megawati support Jokowi though she really wanted to become president? IT’S TOTALLY WEIRD. She couldn’t do it without any compulsion. Hm..who forced her?” The last words asking about anyone who might force her belongs to flaw of **pathos** where the writer shows **appeal to emotional premises** by scorfully accusing her of being pushed by someone else as if she is inferior to the one impulsing her.

The writer closed his facebook status with the staments: “Smart people who use his brain well can possibly make quick inference. While those who are still blindly in love, just wait... they will accuse that this status is a defamation.” In datum 1.8 which ends the status, the writer again used informal fallacy with the category of **pathos** as he makes use of **appeal to emotional premises** by attacking and criticizing the readers. This is provoking readers to argue and commented as shown by the enormous number of the facebookers commenting and responding his status.

## Data 2

In the following data presentation, some responses are selected from the status mentioned in data 1 above. It is also available in <https://www.facebook.com/jonru.page/?fref=ts>.

Itumah pasti saling melindungi bang jon...kalau salah satu dari mereka tidak saling melindungi...berabeh dah...(datum 2.1)  
44 responses

Si Fulan ya....hanya di era jokowi ini lah yg memang paling baik pemerintahan nya di mana yg korupsi di sambut bak pahlawan saat di bandara, memberikan kesempatan pekerjaan buat warga aseng lalu pribumi nya di phk agar bisa nyantai dirumah sambil tangan di dahi. dan di mana orang bego yg menghina di jadiin duta, yg mana anak blangsak di bela saat si pendidik nya mendidik si anak malah di penjara, ibu punya warteg di

bantu karena di warteg nya di sita pol pp yg gak menghargai aturan yg di tetap kan. nyambung gak nyambung komentar saya.... benar apa tidak yg terjadi di negri ini? (*datum 2.2*)

23 responses

Penjahat, Penjajah dan pengkhianatnya sudah jelas, para aparat hukum SIPIL dan POLISI jelas sudah TERBELI, harapan kekuatan satu-satunya tingal kepada TNI yang katanya dari dahulu selalu bersama Rakyat, Mana TNI?...sudah tergadai jugakah mereka? (*datum 2.3*)

153 responses 15 commented

Cina itu yg bngun ekonomi indonesia klian orang jawa cuma bisa korupsi. .dasar jawa budak belanda (*datum 2.4*).

mungkin pil kau sdh habis,jd ngomong kayak kesurupan (*datum 2.5*).

Negara seperti tdk berdaya dgn kedua orang brengsek ini...pasti ada tenaga besar dibelakang manusia lemah ini sehingga dia merasa perkasa dan melakukan banyak penyelewengan...

Indonesia skrg sedang dalam masa jajahan! (*datum 2.6*)

Barangkali waktu itu otak kagak tepake, karena urusan perut lebih penting..ah, semoga saja negara ini tidak memelihara jiwa-jiwa kotor itu, dan Saya yakin akan banyak pemimpin yg bersih dan cinta rakyatnya (*datum 2.7*)

In datum 2.1 as a response commenting Jonru's status, the writer stated:

"That was when one covers another... if each of them does not cover the other... it can be chaos.." In this case, informal fallacies occur both on logos and pathos. On **logos** the writer has **hasty generalization** meaning that he easily makes inference on the behavior of political people which must cover for other's mistakes. In terms of **pathos**, the writer also has **appeal to emotional premises** by chaffing the readers who might support Ahok and Jokowi. The use of double fallacies has effectively raised reponses so that it gains fourty four responses.

Datum 2.2 also gained more responses (twenty-three) as it stated: "Only in Jokowi era is the best period, corruptors are welcome as heroes at airports, giving job opportunities for foreigners while eliminating local workers who are now being stressful at their homes, and stupid people who like bullying become figure,

criminal students are protected while teachers are sent to jail, food seller lady who violated the rule got a lot of sympathy, whether my comments are relevant or irrelevant...what happens with this country?" This long statement has informal fallacies which deal with **pathos** as the writer mention some opinions that not directly support the topic of the discussion. The type of fallacy occurring is **red herring** as all of the mistakes are directed to the president authorities which are not sufficiently proven.

The next datum (2.3) also contains informal fallacy which can raise the number of responses (153) and commented by fifteens others. The statement is: "Criminals, invaders and traitors are clear, the law enforcement agencies and the CIVIL POLICE obviously already bought, the only hope of powers to the military which he said remained disenfranchised from the former is always with the people, where's TNI? ... Are they already pawned?" This type of informal fallacy belongs to **logos** which **begs the questions** from readers as not enough evidence is presented and described by the writer. In addition, this statement also has **faulty dilemma** as the writer limits the choice that is to leave the hope for TNI only.

The fallacy in the following datum (2.4) belongs to **pathos** in the statement: "Chinese build the Indonesian economy while you Javanese can only corrupt. You are Dutch slave." The writer makes **appeal of emotional premises** as the readers are accused as corrupt Javanese.

Another informal fallacy occur in datum 2.5 which stated: "probably you are out of pills so that you are like being tranced." This type of reasoning flaw is a **logos** statement as it is irrelevant or **non sequitur** to the topic. In addition, it also involves **pathos** as it shows **appeal to emotional premises** by teasing the readers.

In datum 2.6, informal fallacy is shown in the statement: "The country is powerless because of these jerks...certainly there is great power behind this weak man so that he felt strong and did a lot of fraud....Indonesia is in a period of being colonialized!". This belongs to **logos** as the writer **begs the questions** from the readers. In addition, **hasty generalization** is also made by stating that the country is colonialized.

The following statement (datum 2.7) has informal fallacy as it said:  
“Perhaps at that time they don’t make use of their brain, because stomach affair is more important, ...ah I hope this country does not keep the dirty souls, and I am sure there will be many leaders who are clean and more loved.” This belongs to **pathos** as the writer makes evaluation by showing **appeal to emotional premises** accusing the people to have dirty souls.

### Data 3

In the following data presentation, the flaws of reasoning are selected from the status in facebook which is available in <https://www.facebook.com/groups/TemanAHok/>. This status has 2929 responses and shared by 4 people.

Amien Rais: Ahok itu Pemimpin yang Beringas Seperti Bandit  
(datum 3.1).

dia itu org jogja, nah dia sendiri sdh berbuat apa utk Jogja? knp dia gak pernah blg koruptor2 itulah yg bandit!!? (datum 3.2)

Amien Rais: Ahok itu Pemimpin yang Beringas Seperti Bandit

Amien Rais menilai Basuki Tjahaja Purnama alias Ahok tak boleh lagi jadi gubernur DKI Jakarta

“Karena dia beringas, bengis dan hampir-hampir seperti bandit. Saya tahu ini akan dikutip, enggak apa-apa” kata Amien dalam sambutannya di pembukaan Kongres V Barisan Muda PAN di Hotel Royal Kuningan, Jakarta Selatan.

Amien menegaskan sebagai pemimpin Ahok tidak pro terhadap rakyat kecil. Ia memastikan Ahok harus dilawan karena sudah kelewatan menjalankan tugasnya (datum 3.3).

In the data, some flaws are found with the category of evaluation on **pathos**. As seen in datum 3.1 which stated: “Amin Rais: Ahok is a fierce leader like bandit” has **appeal to emotional premises** reflecting his hatred. This

sentence also shows the flaw of reasoning on **logos** namely **hasty generalization** that all fierce people are bandit.

Similarly, datum 3.2 shows another flaws in the sentence: “He’s from Jogja, then what has he done for Jogja? Why not saying that the corruptors are the bandit?” In this statement the fallacy on **pathos** occurs in the type of **red herring** as the writer tries to post another issue concerning the existence of corruptors which he also can label as bandits.

Datum 3.3 shows fallacy in the statement: “Amien confirmed that as a leader Ahok isn’t pro to grass root . It ensures that Ahok should be opposed because he delays his job”. This evaluation statement is categorized into **pathos** as the writer makes **appeal to emotional premises** relevant to his expression of anger and hatred toward the person in his opinion.

#### Data 4

Data 4 concerns with the response on the facebook status shown in the previous data. The flaws of reasoning are selected from the chat in facebook which is available in <https://www.facebook.com/groups/TemanAHok/>

sdh twir bau tanah.. (datum 4.1)

Ya ampun Mbah, sampeyan ini tokoh apa preman (datum 4.2)

Ini orang uda tua bangsa...bukannya buat amal dan kebaikkkan malah bikin MUAK Rakyat.. (datum 4.3)

Amin Rais(in)...katanya mau jalan kaki,mbah?? (datum 4.4)

Bandit Pembela Rakyat kalo di Mexico namanya : ZORRO mbah amin..kalo di DKI: AHOK...dari pada santun tapi Bandit Beneran.. Nggak UP DATE apa mbah? Masa lupa..? (datum 4.5)

Gue catat dulu..orang gila nambah satu lagi (datum 4.6)

Hallo RSJ ada orang gila disini, tolong kirim ambulan ke sini ya (datum 4.7)

Mulai sakit...kasihan ya sodara sodara...mari kita doa kan. (datum 4.8)

Ini dia sdh lama tinggal di yogya hati d pikiranya berbudaya unta gurun pasir

.buktinya anaknya gagal caleg.. (datum 4.9)

tinggal diyogya nyari makanya dijakarta (datum 4.10)

Dia pikir otaknya sama dengan orang dki bisa dibodobodohi, maunya dia tanya! Apa yg sdh dibuat di jogya? Apalagi di Negara RI, yg jelas selalu iri terhadap orang sdh berhasil membuat kemajuan (datum 4.11).

In the data above, datum 4.1 to 4.5 address to Amin Rais who is labelled by the writers as an old man as stated: “Old man nearly dies” (datum 4.1) and “Geez Granpa, are you a figure or thug” (datum 4.2). In these data, the writers show **pathos** by judging the person shown by the **appeal of emotional states**. Similarly this flaw of reasoning also exist in the next statement: “This old man instead of doing charity and kindness, he even makes people fed up” (datum 4.3)

Beside that, the next sentence also contains reasoning flaw: “Amin Rais (in) .... you said you wanted to go walking, grandpa ?? (datum 4.4). Rais(in) is from Javanese language meaning that the shame Amin forgot his promise to go walking from Yogya to Jakarta if Jokowi becomes president. As this statement shows shifting of issue, it belongs to **pathos** on the type of **red herring**.

Datum 4.5 also contains fallacy in the statement: “Bandits defending people in Mexico is ZORRO grandpa Amin..while in Jakarta: Ahok ... It’s better instead of having polite person but apparently the real bandit . You’re not UP DATE grandpa? Forgot it?” The use of capital letter stressing how Amin has been an old man who is not up date to the current news characterizes the use of **ethos** as the writer tries to attach the arguer by having **ad hominem**.

In the next sentences the flaws of reasoning are also obvious: “Let me take a note...one more crazy man “(datum 4.6) “Hello hospital, please send an ambulance over here” (datum 4.7) “He’s getting sick, let’s pray for him, brothers” (datum 4.8). These fallacies concern with **pathos** as the writers show **appeal of emotional premises** that is not relevant with the opinion but to label one as a crazy man.

The next datum also shows more fallacies: “It’s a long time he lived in Yogya with his like a desert camel, so that his son becomes a failed candidate of legislature” (datum 4.9) and “He lives in Yogya but finds money in Jakarta” (datum 4.10). In these data the writers show the use of **logos** as the idea presented is not relevant or **non-sequitur** the topic discussed. In addition datum 4.11 also shows fallacy in the statement: “He thought people in Jakarta have the same brain with him which is easily fooled. Just ask hima what has he made for Jogya? Moreover, Indonesians are obviously always jealous of others who managed to

make progress (datum 4.11).” In this datum, another **logos** appears in the form of **hasty generalization**. It is shown by labeling Indonesians as those with jealousy.

#### Data 5

Data 5 is taken from

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/442486392537299/> conversing on the controversies concerning the prayer ending the plenary session preceding the Independence day. This status is shared by 68 people.

SOAL DOA DI PARIPURNA: BUKAN SOAL PANTAS ATAU TIDAK  
TETAPI SOAL 'MERASA' ATAU TIDAK

kalo kaga merasa harusnya jangan kebakaran jenggot (*datum 5.1*)

Iblis mendengar orang adzan lari sampai terkentut2...ini ada orang berdoa malah gerah...betarti sama dgn iblis... (*datum 5.2*)

Yg merasa salah apalagi tersinggung itulah mrk yg berdosa. (*datum 5.3*)

Mereka dungu semua. Goblog gak ketulungan. Bodoh turun temurun tak berkesudahan. (*datum 5.4*)

DIKRITIK..... ngusir suruh pindah negara  
DIDOAIN..... kepanasan, marah-marah.....  
Apakah mungkin lebih cocok kalau diSHALATkan...???!... (*datum 5.5*)

In the data above, flaws of reasoning occur in the status stating that “ON PRAYER IN PLENARY: NOT ABOUT PROPER OR NOT BUT WHETHER ONE FEELS IT OR NOT” If you don’t feel it, you should not panic” (datum 5.1). This status is written with the fallacy on **pathos** as it tries provoke readers by the use of **appeals of emotional premises**.

Similarly, another statement also contains fallacy as it stated: “Satans cannot bear hearing the call to prayer...when the praying makes them sick...it means they are also devil (datum 5.2). It belongs to **logos** as it uses different comparison or **false analogy**. Satans cannot bear the sound of adzan and satans cannot hear as well as call other’s for praying. It is not similar to the way people

criticize the wording of prayer. The people can do their own prayer with the wording which they think more appropriate.

Datum 5.3 also contains another flaw of reasoning as it states: “Those who think that it’s wrong and feel offended are actually the sinners”. This argument is not telling the content of the topic of discussion, rather than attacking the arguer. Therefore this sentence falls to the category of **pathos** in the type of **appeals to emotional premises**.

The following sentence also has flaw in reasoning in datum 5.4 stating: “They are all dumb. Helpless stupidity. Their being stupid is endless through generations.” As the writer thinks that all of those having opposing argument are stupid, it means the fallacy falls in the category of **logos** namely **hasty generalization**. This sentence also contains **pathos** in the type of **appeals to emotional premises** by provoking the readers.

The next sentences in datum 5.5 have some flaws in reasoning in the statement: “When criticized, these people force others to move from the country. When prayed, they got sick and grumpy ..... What about being prayed as corpse???! This sentence provokes the readers as it contains the fallacy on **pathos** with the type of showing **appeal to emotional premises**. The writer threatens the readers through the statements.

#### Data 6

In the following data, the selected chats are taken from the facebook fanpage of FPI (Front Pembela Islam). It is available in <https://www.facebook.com/groups/frontpembela/?fref=ts>. The chats discuss the existence of Chinese workers in Indonesia lately. This chat is responding the news on the threaten of their coming which is responded by 150 people, 128 shared and commented by other 39 people.

"kami bangga dengan buatan kafir, karna islam gak bisa buat" (*datum 6.1*)

indonesia diserang scara halus...qt tdk sdar (*datum 6.2*)

Kalo gak sperti in yaaa bukan indonesia nama ny (*datum 6.3*)

Makax ISLAM harus bersatu melawan ketidak adilan jgn cuma berdebat sesama muslim itu sendiri..intix yg menyimpan itu , bukan muslim sejati harus diwaspadai ISLAM adalah AGAMA Damai (*datum 6.4*)

Mangka nya milleh presiden hati2...!!! Orang bodoh jadi pemimpin. Ini akibatnya (*datum 6.5*)

USIR CHINA DARI NKRI & IBU PERTIWI,, KLW ANAK CUCU KITA TAK MW TERGUSUR,,, MERDEKA,,,,!!!! (*datum 6.6*)

Semoga presiden yang gak adil cepet lengser. (*datum 6.7*)

harus itu tergantung kita sebagai masarakat yang berani  
Intinya kita blom merdeka mereka bisa kerja tanpa dokumen yg jls sedangkn pribumi di persulitkan, mana arti merdeka , merdeka hnya untuk klangn tertentu bukan untuk global nkri marilah kita bersatu rakyat indonesia malu lah dn sedih lah kalian pada pahlawan kita klo mnyaksikan anak cucunya seperti ini yg mnikmati kekayaan indonesia hanya segelintir orang apa artinya merdeka untuk sekarang bersatulah  
Intinya sekarang kita harus bersatu demi masa depan anak cucu kita, lama2 keturunan etnis cina yg mnguasai negeri tercinta ini bukan pribumi buat apa merdeka klo bukan untuk anak cucu kita ayoo rebutlah arti kemerdekaan itu hak paten milik pribumi (*datum 6.8*)

In datum 6.1, flaw of reasoning exists in the sentence: ““We’re proud of the products from those infidel people, because those of Islam still cannot create them”. It refers to the use of fallacy which falls in the category of **logos** as it shows irrelevant issue or **non-sequitur** from the writer. The coming of Chinese worker to Indonesia does not have anything to do with the coming of their products. Although Indonesia has imported various kinds of product from China, it does not mean that the country also need to import the workers. This issue is irrelevantly elaborated with the infidelity or Islam or not.

Datum 6.2 also concerns with another type of fallacy as it states: “Indonesia has been attacked softly...while we do not realize it”. It concerns with the flaw of reasoning on **logos** as the writer make **hasty generalization** by inferring that the coming of thousands workers from China means a soft attack from other countries.

Another type of reasoning flaw occurs in the next sentence: “This is it, otherwise you cannot call this country Indonesia.”(*datum 6.3*). It shows the use of

**logos** fallacy as it tends to judge Indonesia as a country with several problems. Again, the writer uses **hasty generalization**.

The following sentences have fallacy as it states: “Accordingly ISLAM must unite against injustice, don’t just stay arguing among Muslims.. The point is not to maintain the injustice, that’s not the true Muslim. We should watch out for ISLAM is RELIGION of peace” (datum 6.4). This data deals with the occurrence of fallacy in **logos** on the type of **non-sequitur** as the topic is on the coming of Chinese workers. It also reflect the flaw of reasoning which is categorized into **pathos** on shifting the topic or **red herring**.

The next data states: “So...be careful in choosing president ... !!! A fool has become a leader. This is the result” (datum 6.5). It also another example of **logos** fallacy which shows **non-sequitur** as it has irrelevant support to the topic discussed. It also reflects the use of **ethos** fallacy on the type of **ad hominem** as the writer attacks the arguers.

Datum 6.6 also concerns with the use of reasoning flaw as it states: “Banish the Chinese from our homeland and beloved country OTHERWISE OUR GRAND CHILDREN WILL BE BANISHED.... FREEDOM !!!!” This warning has the fallacy in the type of **pathos** as the writer provokes the readers through the use of **appeals of emotional premises**.

Another type of fallacy occurs in the statement: “Hopefully, the current unfair president is stepped down.” (datum 6.7). This sentence falls in the category of fallacy on **ethos**. It exists as the writer tries to attack the arguer by using **ad hominem**.

The last datum contains long sentences having flaw of reasoning as it states: “It is a must as it depends on us, the brave society. The point is we’re not yet independent as those without complete documents can easily get jobs while the native people face difficulties. Freedom is for some people not all people. Let’s unite, Indonesians. Don’t let the pioneers feel shame and sad looking their grandchildren like this. Only some people get the benefit of Indonesian wealth. What’s the meaning of freedom, for now get united. The point is we have to unite for our grandchilren’s future. Later on the descendants of ethnic Chinese conquer our beloved country, not the indigenous people. Why did we want our freedom if

not because of our grandchildren. Come on get the meaning of freedom, the true right of indigineous people (datum 6.8). These sentences have fallacy on **logos** on the type of **slippery slope** as the writer mentions some further consequences after the coming of Chinese workers.

## **4.2 Discussion**

In this section the findings are examined by reviewing some basic concepts of fallacies elaborated with the fact portrayed in the data. The discussion is presented based on the fallacy types found in the three facebook grup fanpage namely Jonru, TemanAhok and FPI. There were six corpus of data, from which fourty two statements chosen as the data to analyze.

### **A. The Fallacies on Logos**

Akin to the type of fallacy, the writer of the social media converse on the argument relevant to the topic. This type of opinion may refer to what the writer defines on a particular point of view. In the data there are various topic presented. They are governmental issue of Ahok (36%), the opponent of Ahok (33%) and the controversial prayer (31%). More faulty reasoning is found in the issue on how people judge the political power of Ahok that is taken from Jonru facebook fanpage (data 1 and 2) compared to those having chat in the fanpage of TemanAhok (data 3 and 4) and the FPI facebook group (data 5 and 6).

In the data chosen, the current Indonesian issues are on politics as the people on the social media or the netizen tried to make the relevant arguments which sometimes can also be irrelevant and contain several types of fallacies. In all of the data, the faulty deduction on the logos always occur. Because the political issues are considered more familiar and always dynamic for the netizen, there is tendency of leaping the premises to come to the direct conclusion which tend to raise faulty reasoning. This finding is in line with the way Japanese students made flawed reasoning in their argumentative essays as found by

Stapleton (2001). In addition, the more familiar the students with the topic, the more number of fallacies found as supported by Indah's research (2013).

A fallacy is a kind of error in reasoning which appears to be one of the difficulties faced by the netizen who write with their emotional state. Based on the findings, the vast majority of the commonly identified fallacies in claims of fact involve arguments relating to the faulty reasoning of logos, followed by pathos and ethos. Each of the faulty reasoning is elaborated below by revealing the phenomenon to figure out the justification underlying the occurrence of the fallacious sentences in the writing of the netizen.

In the findings, it is obvious that the errors netizen made in reasoning occur when the reason does not adequately support the argument in one of a number of ways. The flawed relationship can exist between the statements in an argument attempt. These are called logos fallacies and they include fallacies such as irrelevancy, false analogy, hasty generalization, slippery slope, correlation proves causation, faulty dilemma, and begging the question. These are as stated by Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001). Among them the occurrence of **hasty generalization** is the most obvious compared to other types of fallacy. The occurrence of flaw of reasoning on logos is as listed in Table 1 below.

**Table 1.** Logos types

Fallacy	Datum			Percentage
Begging the questions	1.1 2.3	1.2 2.6	1.3	5 %
Correlation proves causation	1.5			1%
Slippery slope	6.8			1%
Hasty generalization	2.1 3.1 4.11 5.4 6.2	2.6 6.3		7%
Faulty dilemma	2.3			1%
Non-sequitur	2.5 4.9 6.1	4.10 6.4	6.5	6%
False analogy	5.2			1%
Sum	22 fallacies (out of 52)			42%

As seen on Table 1, the number of logos is 42% from the whole data. On the first place, **hasty generalization** frequently appears in the data where the conclusion is jumping to generalization. In this case the writer believes that the general fact will be exactly the same as what s/he has assumed through his/her statements. This faulty deduction occurs in the topic of Ahok's governmental issues, Ahok's opponent and the controversial prayer. It means that in all of the topics this type of reasoning flaw is dominant. The writer in this type take the conclusion based on the observation result of some cases but it is then hastily generalized.

In **non-sequitur** as the second most logos fallacy found, the opinion made by the writer is irrelevant to the topic discussed. This kind of irrelevancy occurs in all of the topics in the selected chats. It is found in all topics in the data. Irrelevancy will not happen when the writer wisely select his/her expression through rethinking the logical connection between the topic and his/her own opinion. The flaw of reasoning is violated as the writer fails to make correct inference on the logical connection which become the bases for expressing logical opinion

In the third place, **begging the question** also characterize the flaw of reasoning made by the netizen. It happens when the conclusion of the writer is derived from the premises that presuppose the conclusion. The circular reasoning in this type of fallacy appears which is not clear for the readers as the ideas really jump from the earlier premises. As seen in Table 1, this type of logos fallacy occurs in the topic on Ahok's governmental issues (data 1 and 2) taken from Jonru fanpage. That is why talking about the logos fallacy is inseparable from the choice of issue to present in the argument.

The other type of flaw in logos has minimum occurrence (1%) namely, correlation proves causation, slippery slope, faulty dilemma, and false analogy. **Correlation proves causation** fallacy occurs in an argument assuming that when two events occur, one causes the other. For instance when the writer thinks that if Udar the suspect of TransJakarta was released, the culprit is still unknown, but the obvious fact is Udar's boss at that moment was Jokowi (datum 1.5). Accordingly

the writer brings on his own inference that the boss is the one who is guilty which refers to correlation proving causation. This flaw of reasoning is made as an instant thought. It is naturally appearing in netizen chats in social media like facebook fanpage of Jonru which is taken as the data in this study.

**Slippery slope** also occurs once on the topic of controversial prayer. In this case, the writer mentioned some effects from the opinion he/she made. For instance in FPI fanpage describing the coming of Chinese workers to Indonesia, the writer listed several consequences which are not directly related to the fact of the issue on their coming (datum 6.8). Instead of stating that the first effect is the lessening of opportunities for the local people to find a job as they must compete with the Chinese workers, the writer had long list of indirect consequences. The indirect consequences are the threat to Indonesian freedom and the further effects for the grandchildren.

The **false dilemma** fallacy in the finding occurs when an argument offers only two possible conclusions when many more are possible. For instance on the topic of Ahok governmental issue, the writer only gave two option namely to trust TNI or to leave TN (datum 2.3). While, in finding a solution, the writer of Jonru fanpage can actually offers some other relevant ways. This is because power of military is not the only solution to offer.

**False analogy** is also found as logos fallacy made in FPI facebook group. The writer made analogous relation between satan and man (datum 5.2). Satan cannot bear listening to adzan or call for praying and this characteristic when imitated by man makes the analogous relation. In this case, it is considered incorrect as man can pray while satan cannot therefore this comparison belongs to false analogy.

Based on the fanpage source, the analysis on the variety of fallacies made by the writers are listed in Table 2.

**Table 2.** Distribution of logos

Fanpage	BQ	CC	SS	HG	FD	NS	FA	$\Sigma$
Jonru	5	1		2	1	1		10
TemanAhok				1		2		3
FPI			1	3		3	1	8

(Notes: BG: Begging questions; CC: Correlation proves causation; SS: Slipery slope; HG: Hasty generalization; FD: Faulty dilemma; NS: Non-sequitur; FA: False analogy)

Jonru fanpage is more various in the type of fallacy as seen in Table 2. As the context this fanpage is judging the governmental issue of Ahok, the writers tend to express themselves through various ways which may result in the various occurrence of fallacy. Meanwhile in FPI, the writer has more homogeneous perspective that is to agree with the main opinion as stated in the status (see data 5). Although this facebook group is more homogeneous, their fallacy tends to be various, too. The fanpage of TemanAhok has the lowest fallacy of logos on two types only.

It is interesting to note that the Jonru is not only numerous but also various in fallacy. Even one statement can contains two types of fallacy altogether. For instance in the sentence that civil police is obviously already bought, where is TNI, are they already bought too (datum 2.3). This statement belongs to **faulty dilemma and beg the question** as it is giving the two options only as well as unclear meaning of being bought or pawned. In addition, still in Jonru fanpage, the two logos occur simultaneously. It occurs in the statement that the country is powerless because of the jerks, there is great power behind the weak man and Indonesia is being colonialized (datum 2.6). It contains **beg the question and hasty generalization**. This sentence not only begs the question on who the weak man and the great power behind him, but also hasty generalization that this issue becomes the fact that the country is simply colonialized.

Errors in the reasoning of logos, becomes rare whenever the netizen talk about factual things not by instant inference. In addition, writer can avoid faulty reasoning of logos when they agree with one another by supporting their statement using logical reasoning. Accordingly it is clear that discussing topics with logical support limits the expression of the netizen causing faulty reasoning on logos.

## **B. The Fallacies on Ethos**

The fallacies in the data also fall in the category of ethos. A flawed relationship can exist between the argument and the character of those involved in the argument. These are called fallacies of ethos and include appeals to false

authorities, attacking the character of the arguer, and strawperson (oversimplifying an opponent's argument to make it easy to refute).

In the data, this type of reasoning flaw occurs less than the fallacy on logos. Only one kind of ethos is found, namely **ad hominem** or attacking the character of the arguer. Ethos on this type occurs on the topic of Ahok's opponent (data 4) and on the controversial prayer (data 6). Ethos is not found in the fanpage of Jonru.

The fallacy on ethos appears as another characteristic of netizen's expression showing the difficulties to write based on reasonable support. Such writers rather elaborate their ideas with the statement attacking the character of the arguer, not the essence of the topic. Based on the findings, the vast majority of the commonly identified fallacies in claims of fact involve arguments relating to the faulty reasoning of logos, followed by pathos and ethos.

In the findings, it is obvious that the errors netizen made in reasoning occur when the reason does not adequately support the argument in one of a number of ways. One of the effect if the inadequacy of support is the use of ethos. These are as stated by Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001). The occurrence of flaw of reasoning on ethos is as listed in Table 3 below.

**Table 3.** Ethos fallacy

Topic (source)	Statement (datum)	Type
Ahok's opponent (TemanAhok)	Bandits defending people in Mexico is ZORRO grandpa Amin..while in Jakarta: Ahok ... It's better instead of having polite person but apparently the real bandit . You're not UP DATE grandpa? Forgot it? (4.5)	Ad hominem
Controversial prayer (FPI)	So...be careful in choosing president ... !!! A fool has become a leader. This is the result (6.5)	Ad hominem
	Hopefully, the current unfair president is stepped down (6.7)	Ad hominem

As seen on Table 2, the number of ethos is only three reflecting small percentage or 6% from the whole data. Ad hominem, based on the context occurs as the writer address the statement to the character of the arguer as seen in datum 4.5 that is on labeling Amin Rais as "a forgetful old man". Similarly, on datum 6.5, the writer addressed the caharacter of "a fool leader". The attributive character

is given which is not relevant to the topic of discussion. While in datum 6.7, the attributive is “an unfair president”. The writers do not stand for their opinion based on a more reasonable ideas, but they tend to use the negative attribution to the arguer or the characters in the argument.

Errors in the reasoning of ethos includes to rare fallacy as more netizen had flaw in reasoning on logos and pathos. They made attribution to the character in argument because they feel that they are familiar enough with the character so that they can produce instant inference. In this case, these writer can avoid faulty reasoning of ethos when they support their statement using logical reasoning. Accordingly it is clear that discussing topics with logical support limits the expression of the netizen causing faulty reasoning on ethos.

When talking about someone’s familiar with their life, ethos can appear. Therefore, more faulty reasoning is found compared to the discussion on other topics which are considered less familiar. This finding is in line with the way Japanese students made flawed reasoning in their argumentative essays as found by Stapleton (2001). In addition, the more familiar the students with the topic, the more number of fallacies found as supported by Indah’s research (2013).

Another interesting finding concerning the fallacies on pathos is on the occurrence of double fallacies in one statement. As the example is the statement in FPI fanpage conversing the controversial prayer below:

So...be careful in choosing president ... !!! A fool has become a leader.

This is the result (datum 6.5)

The above datum falls in the category of **ethos logos** as it shows not only attribution on the arguer’s character but also irrelevancy to the topic. The readers will find it irrelevant in talking about the fool leader which is related to the controversies in the prayer. Therefore this statement has **ad hominem and non-sequitur**.

### C. The Fallacies on Pathos

In the data chosen, the current Indonesian issues are on politics as the people on the social media or the netizen tried to make the relevant arguments

which sometimes can also be irrelevant and contain several types of fallacies. In all of the data, the faulty deduction on pathos always occur. Because the political issues are considered more familiar and always dynamic for the netizen, there is tendency of leaping the premises to come to emotional appeal which tends to raise faulty reasoning. This finding is in line with the way Japanese students made flawed reasoning in their argumentative essays as found by Stapleton (2001). In addition, the more familiar the students with the topic, the more number of fallacies found as supported by Indah's research (2013).

In the findings, it is obvious that the errors netizen made in reasoning of pathos occur when the reason does not adequately support the argument in one of a number of ways. Flawed relationships can also exist between what is argued and the audience. These flawed arguments, called fallacies of pathos, include, appealing to stirring symbols (such as nationalistic values), provincialism, appealing to emotional premises, and red herring (shifting the audience's attention). These are as stated by Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001). The occurrence of flaw of reasoning on pathos is as listed in Table 4 below.

Fallacy	Datum	Percentage
Appeal of emotional premises	1.3    1.7    1.8 2.1    2.4    2.5    2.7 3.1    3.3 4.1    4.2    4.3    4.6    4.7    4.8 5.1    5.3    5.4	20 %
Red herring	1.2    1.6 2.2 3.2 4.4 6.4	1%
Sum	26 fallacies (out of 52)	50%

As seen on Table 1, the number of ethos is 50% from the whole data. On the first place, **appeals to emotional premises** frequently appears in the data where the writer judge the readers or the person in the argument. In this case the writer believes that it is fine to attack the readers or the person in the argument through his/her statements. This faulty reasoning occurs in all of the topics in the data, namely the topic of Ahok's governmental issues, Ahok's opponent and the controversial prayer. It means that this pathos fallacy dominates the occurring of reasoning flaw.

There are various type of emotional state shown by the writer of pathos fallacy. One of the emotional state is **accusing or judging the person** in the argument. On topic of Ahok's governmental issues as discussed in Jonru fanpage, some judgements are made. The writer judge that Ahok is a corrupt governor (datum 1.3). The writer also accused Megawati was forced by someone to support Jokowi (datum 1.7). The writer also accused that Jokowi and Ahok cover one another (2.1). The writer also accused that at that time the government do not use their brain because stomach affair is more important (datum 2.7).

The occurrence of writer judging the person in the argument also seen in the data from TemanAhok facebook group. The topik is on Ahok's opponent. The write uploaded the news on Amin Rais. Through his statement, Amin Rais shows emotion by saying that Ahok is like a bandit (datum 3.1).

The judgement from the writer which shows appeal of emotional state is also found in the data from TemanAhok. The writer judged that Amin Rais is an old man nearly dies (datum 4.1) that Amin Rais is a thug (datum 4.2) that Amin Rais made people fed up (4.3).

In another data from FPI fanpage on controversial prayer, the writer also make judgement. The writer said that the government are all dumb (datum 5.4). The writer also accused that these governmet got sick and grumpy when being prayed (datum 5.5).

In addition, emotional appeal also appears when the writer **make fun of** the person in the argument. For instance by stating that one more crazy man comes (datum 4.6) asking for ambulance (datum 4.7) and praying for the sick

grandpa (datum 4.8). These sentences were made by the writers to mock Amin Rais.

The other emotional appeal is **provoking readers** by using some phrases that can persuade the readers to have the same opinion with the writers. It is shown in the statement from Jonru page on Ahoks' governmental issue. The writer said that those who are still blindly in love, just wait they will accuse this status as defamation (datum 1.8). The writer provoked readers to oppose Ahok as he delays his job (datum 3.3)

Provoking readers also occurs in the data from FPI on controversial prayer. The writer stated that if the readers don't feel it, they shouldn't panic (datum 5.1). The readers who feel offended are sinners (datum 5.3). In addition, the writer provokes readers to fight for freedom by banishing the chinese workers from the homeland (6.6).

Similarly, the writer showing his emotion by chaffing the readers to make them angry by stating that Javanese can only corrupt. You are Dutch slave (datum 2.4). It occurs in Jonru fanpage conversing Ahok's governmental issue.

The writer also showed his or her emotional appeal to another writer. For instance stating that he or she is probably out of pills so that he is like being tranced (datum 2.5).

Beside appeal to emotional premises, the other pathos fallacy found is **red herring**. It occurs when the writer state another issue to shift reader's attention from the main idea of the topic being discussed. This type of pathos fallacy occurs in all of the topics in the data.

To shift reader's attention on Ahok's govermental issue, the writer in the fanpage of Jonru mentioned that Jokowi got the presidential position because of Chinese investors while the topic was actually on Ahok (datum 1.2). The writer shift the opinion on Ahok by adding the support using Megawati's reason of choosing Jokowi (1.6). The writer also made long list of the mistakes directed to the president authorities which are not sufficiently proven (datum 2.2).

On the topic of Ahok's opponent taken from the fanpage of TemanAhok, the shifting of attention is also given. The writer brings the issue of corruptors as bandits (datum 3.2). While the conversation is still on Ahok not the corruptors.

The writer reminded the readers on the promise of Amin Rais to walk from Yogya to Jakarta if Jokowi wins the president election which was not directly relevant to the topic (4.4)

The shifting of ideas also occur in the fanpage of FPI conversing controversial prayer. The writer asked readers to unite and fight for Islam as it is religion of peace while the topic is still on the controversial prayer (6.4).

Based on the fanpage source, the analysis on the variety of fallacies made by the writers are listed in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Distribution of pathos

Fanpage	AP	EP	RH	$\Sigma$
Jonru		7	3	10
TemanAhok		8	2	10
FPI		5	1	6

(Notes: AP: Ad populum; EP: appeal to Emotional premises; RH: Red herring)

Both Jonru and TemanAHok fanpage are more numerous in the type of fallacy on pathos compared to FPI as seen in Table 2. As the context this fanpage is judging the governmental issue of Ahok, the writers tend to express themselves through various ways which may result in the various occurrence of fallacy. Meanwhile in FPI, the writer has more homogeneous perspective that is to agree with the main opinion as stated in the status (see data 5). Although this facebook group is more homogeneous, their fallacy tends to be various, too.

It is interesting to note that the fallacy on pathos can occur simultaneously with another fallacy such as logos. Even one statement can contains two types of fallacy altogether. In Jonru's fanpage as an example in the sentence Jokowi becomes president because of the support from Chinese investors (datum 1.2). This statement belongs to **logos pathos** fallacy with the type **begs the question and red herring**. This sentence is not clear in the evidence of the Chinese support as well as shifting the idea from the topic of Ahok's governmental issues.

Similarly, double fallacy also apparent in datum 1.3 stating that Ahok' corruption is crystal clear. This statement surely needs sufficient evidence and it shifts reader's attention therefore it belongs to **logos pathos** fallacy with the type **begs the question and red herring**. This sentence is also taken from Jonru's fanpage.

Still on double fallacies, datum 2.1 also has more than one reasoning flaw. The writer when one government does not cover for another, there will be chaos. This sentence reflects **logos pathos** fallacy with the type **hasty generalization and appeal to emotional premises**. It is because the writer infers that all of the government cover their mistakes and he/she provoked readers to have similar assumption. This sentence is selected from Jonru facebook group conversing on Ahok's governmental issues.

Another informal fallacy occurs in datum 2.5. It stated that probably the other writer is out of pills so that he/she is like being tranced. Still on Jonru's fanpage on Ahok's government issue, double fallacies occur. It concerns with **logos pathos** with the type on **non-sequitur and appeal to emotional premises**. This happens because the writer mentioned irrelevant idea that is on being tranced and make fun of another writer in that fanpage chats.

Double fallacies also occur in the fanpage of TemanAhok conversing Ahok's opponent. The writer upload the statement of Amin Rais that Ahok is a fierce leader like bandit. In this case, it reflects the hatred and inference in stating that all bandits are fierce. Therefore, it belongs to **logos pathos** with the type of **hasty generalization and appeals to emotional premises**.

Similarly, from FPI fanpage conversing on controversial prayer, double fallacies occur. The writer stated that all of the government and the arguers are dumb, their helpless stupidity is endless through generations. This opinion is surely generalizing all people are dumb which can also provoke readers to be angry. Accordingly it fell to the category of **logos pathos** with the type on **hasty generalization and appeal to emotional premises**.

The last double fallacies occur from the FPI fanpage conversing on the controversial prayer. The writer said that we have to against injustice and Islam is religion of peace. This sentence is not directly relevant to the topic on the coming of Chinese workers as there is not clear evidence on the injustice fact being discussed. In addition, the writer tries to shift reader's attention to a new topic. Accordingly it reflects the use of **logos pathos** with the type of **non-sequitur and red herring**.

From the finding on double fallacies in pathos, it can be inferred that Jonru's fanpage has used more reasoning flaws. While FPI fanpage is ranked the second. Jonru's fanpage not only got more responses but also consists of more various writers whose arguments are also heterogeneous. Meanwhile, in FPI facebook group although the writers are more homogeneous, still they made a lot of reasoning flaw. While in TemanAhok fanpage, although the writers are also homogeneous but they tend to have their arguments within more logical reasoning so that it has less number in emotional appeal.

Errors in the reasoning of pathos can actually become rare whenever the netizen talk about factual things not by instant inference which is added by emotional appeals. In addition, writer can avoid faulty reasoning of logos when they agree with one another by supporting their statement using logical reasoning. Accordingly it is clear that discussing topics with logical support limits the expression of the netizen causing faulty reasoning on pathos.

The above analysis is summarized in Table 6 below to show the pattern of the fallacies based on the topic.

Topics	L	E	P	LL	EL	LP	FF
Ahok's governmental issues	2		6	2		4	1
Ahok's opponent	4	1	9			1	
Controversial prayer	5	1	5		1	2	

(Notes: L: logos; E: ethos; P: pathos; LL: logos logos; EL: ethos logos; LP: logos pathos; FF: formal fallacy)

As seen in Table 6 above, another interesting finding from the data is the occurrence of not only informal fallacy as described above but also formal fallacy. Formal fallacy occurs because of the error in making deduction. For instance a statement from Jonru's fanpage in which the writer has dissimilar deduction to the statement. The first sentence: Ahok boasted that if he became a suspect, he would uncover the case of TransJakarta. While, the sentence in brackets with capital letters stated the writer's inference that it makes the statement wierd as Ahok is fame for anti-corrupt, yet through his threat it seems that he protects the corruptor. These sentences contain different inference in the word "uncover" which is not always analogous to "protect". Ahok wanted to help ending the case which does not mean that Ahok protected the corruption process.

Understanding the phenomenon on the types of fallacies in netizens' chats from the selected facebook group having a lot of responses brings some pedagogical implications. Since this study on fallacy tracing results in the more various types of pathos fallacy including double fallacies, it is important to trace back the rethorical skills of the netizen. This is because the rethorical skills are shaped through education. Influencing readers to believe the same value justification should not be made merely by involving emotion and attack the opponents. This is because these types of fallacy are proven to be dominant in the students' claim of policy. As described by Dowden (2010), fallacies should not be persuasive, but they often are. Fallacies may be created unintentionally, or they may be created intentionally in order to deceive other people. It needs more emphasis through teacher's guidance and modeling so that in presenting the argument, netizens can avoid making unnecessary fallacious statements.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

As the final part of this research report, some conclusions are given based on the research problem. Some suggestions are also provided to the person concerned.

#### A. Conclusion

Based on the analysis on the netizen's chats containing flaws in reasoning, some conclusions are drawn. The conclusion of this study is on the types of the fallacies found in social media especially in conversing Indonesian issues. In addition, it infers on the pattern of logical flaw occurring in the contexts of social media discourse in Indonesian issues.

On type of fallacy, more faulty reasoning is found in the type of **pathos** that is **appeal to emotional premises**. The writers from heterogeneous background conversing an issue in a fanpage through social media cannot avoid having reasoning flaw with certain emotional states. The emotional appeal found in the data are to make some judgement on the person being argued, to accused certain attributes of the person in the argument, to provoke readers and the other writer to have the same assumption and to make them angry by making fun of both the person in the argument and the readers.

Another type of fallacy mostly occur when conversing on Indonesian issues is on **logos**. It occurs as the writer has logical flaw typically on the type of **hasty generalization, non-sequitur** and **begging the question**. It is called hasty generalization when the writer make general inference which may not be the true condition. The writer also states irrelevant ideas or non sequitur and also make statement that is not clear or begging the question. Meanwhile the occurrence of

ethos or the fallacy on the character of the arguer is rarely found in the netizen's chats.

As the pattern of reasoning flaw, the result of this study shows that netizen had more fallacies when conversing issues which are considered more general to the netizen, that is on topic like Ahok's governmental issue. The variety of fallacy is less in the specific topic such as controversial issue. The variety of fallacy also concerns with the background of the writer. When the netizens are heterogeneous like in Jonru's fanpage, there is a tendency of leaping the premises to come to the direct conclusion and the appeal of emotions causing various fallacies.

## **B. Suggestion**

Exploring the phenomenon on the types of fallacies in netizen's chats on Indonesian issues as conversed in social media brings implications. Knowing that the pattern of fallacy shows that pathos on appeal of emotional premises becomes the trend, netizens should be aware not to involve emotional states which can result in chaos or online fight. Netizen should focus on the argument not by shifting to more personal issues which can harm the essence of the discussion. Considering that the faulty on logos is also dominant, it is important to remind netizen to make justification on the factual condition happening in the discourse of Indonesian issues. Influencing readers to believe the same factual justification should not be made merely by exaggerating the issue and hastily resulting generalization. Another implication is that netizens need to base their argument on some related references relevant to the topic of the discussion.

As this study concerns with the chats in Bahasa Indonesia, it is expected that more researchers elaborate the finding with another study comparing between the fallacies in different languages. They can also develop more studies on the effect of topics toward the occurrence of fallacies. With more researches on fallacies, the pattern of fallacies as found in this study can be validated. In addition, more empirical finding is also needed to see the pattern of fallacies

across different contexts. For instance, the fallacies across gender, across age and nationalities.

## REFERENCES

- Dowden, B. 2010. *Fallacies*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.  
(<http://www.iep.utm.edu/fallacy/>). Retrieved March 21, 2014.
- Emilia, E. 2010. *Teaching Writing: Developing Critical Learners*. Bandung; Rizqi Press.
- Hayat, B. & Yusuf, S. 2010. *Benchmark Internasional Mutu Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Indah, R. N. 2002. *Enhancing Content Area Reading Skills through Summary Writing*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Indah, R. N. 2007. *A Psycholinguistic Analysis on Children's Language in Reader's Digest 'As Kids See It'*. Unpublished Report. Malang: The research center of UIN Malang
- Indah, R. N. 2007. Claims of Fact on Issues in Islamic Countries in Newsweek International Magazine. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Study* vol.19 UMS
- Indah, R. N. 2009. Developing Students' Critical Thinking Awareness through Interest-based Claims Writing Publication. *The 56<sup>th</sup> of International Conference of Teaching English as Foreign Language in Indonesia*. Malang: UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Press.
- Indah, R. N. 2010. Discovering Student's Expertise to Augment Claim Quality in Writing Class at UIN Maliki Malang. *The 1st National Conference on Linguistics and Literature*. Malang: Ma Chung University.
- Indah, R. N. 2010. *Stabilized Errors in Argumentative Essay Writing: Learners' Perspective* Unpublished Linguistics research
- Indah, R. N. 2012. Communicating Critical Thinking through bilingual Reflective Writing (2012). In Cahyono, B. Y & Yannuar, N. (Eds.) *Englises for Communication and Interaction in the Classroom and Beyond*, Malang: State University of Malang Press

- Indah, R. N. 2013. *Critical Thinking Based Instruction in Australian Primary Schools*. Unpublished Report. International Collaborative Research with University of Deakin Australia.
- Indah, R. N. 2013. *Topic Familiarity, Writing Proficiency and Critical Thinking Skills*. Unpublished Dissertation. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Indah, R. N. 2015. Fallacies in English Department Students' Writing: A Rethorical Analysis of Critical Thinking. *Jurnal Pendidikan Humaniora (JPI) JPH* vol. 3 (4): 281-290. Postgraduate Program UM. p-ISSN: 2338-8110. e-ISSN: 2442-3890. (DOI: 10.17977/jph.v3i4.4847)
- Stapleton, Paul. 2001. Assessing Critical Thinking in the Japanese University students. *Written Communication*.18 (4): 506-548.