

# An Analysis on The Forms of Argument in Open Grand Final of National University Debate Championship (NUDC) 2020 and Open Grand Final of World University Debate Championship (WUDC) 2021

Sefri Tania Salsabilah <sup>a,1,\*</sup>, Ririn Putri Ananda <sup>b,2</sup>, Ria Angraini <sup>b,3</sup>, Agung Suhadi <sup>b,4</sup>

<sup>a,b</sup> Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu

<sup>1</sup> [Salsanoonaa@gmail.com](mailto:Salsanoonaa@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup> [rananda@umb.ac.id](mailto:rananda@umb.ac.id), <sup>3</sup> [ria@umb.ac.id](mailto:ria@umb.ac.id), <sup>4</sup> [agunglecturer@gmail.com](mailto:agunglecturer@gmail.com)

\* Corresponding Author



Received 11 November 2021; accepted 17 December 2021; published 30 December 2021

## ABSTRACT

This research aimed to find out and describe forms of arguments mostly used by debaters in open grand final both NUDC 2020 and WUDC 2021. This research used descriptive qualitative method. The subjects were 8 debaters selected by a purposive sampling. The instrument of this study was observation checklist adapted from Steven Johnson's theory. It was supported by a video recording downloaded from YouTube and transcript making from the video has been downloaded. The researchers used descriptive method to analyze the data. The result of this study showed that there were eight models of argument forms from eight debaters in video open grand final NUDC 2021, namely one simple model argument, two chain model arguments, four cluster model arguments, and one complex model argument. Meanwhile, in video open grand final WUDC 2021, there were twelve arguments from eight debaters namely three simple model arguments, one chain model argument, six cluster model arguments, and two complex model arguments. Also, the cluster argument model was the dominant model used in open grand final both NUDC 2020 and WUDC 2021.

## KEYWORDS

Argument Form  
Debate  
NUDC  
WUDC

This is an open-access article under the CC-BY-SA license



## 1. Introduction

Arguments are important parts of expressing an opinion. In daily life, people often use arguments to express their opinions. However, sometimes they consider to give an argument when they want to give a statement. An argumentation is a collection of statements organized in a way that highlights connections between those ideas. It is to demonstrate that some statements in the collection are believed to be true and other statements in the collection should be accepted as true (Vucetich et al., 2019)

According to Mühlen et al (2019), each argument consists of three main elements: claims, data, and warrants. It should be noted that not all of these three elements are explicit, and sometimes warrants may not need to be stated in real-life arguments. A claim is a statement that the person making the argument wants the person hearing the argument to accept. However, a claim is not an argument. In an argument, support is an idea or set of ideas that the audience accepts as true and that provides the basis for acceptance of the claim. The person making the argument hopes to shift the audience from what they believe (support) to what they don't believe (claim). The real magic of the argument happens when the audience discovers the connection between claims and support. The discovery of this relationship is known as warrant.

Arguments are sometimes wrongly defined as statements even though as explained above an argument can be said to be an argument when it has 3 main elements, namely claim, data and warrant. Statements that are considered claims must be supported by data so it becomes a strong argument and also can be trusted by the audience. Thus, NUDC and WUDC are the right objects for this research. The debate aims to make the audience believe in the claims made. So, in NUDC and WUDC the debaters' statement can be confirmed as an argument because there are data and warrants to support the claim stated by the debaters.

Besides of having 3 elements, arguments are also divided into several models. Johnson (2010) states that arguments are divided into a variety of form that is simple model, chain model, cluster model and complex model. In simple model, the support is below the claim. It indicates that the support acts as the foundation for the argument. The arrow indicates the inference, or the movement of the audience's belief from the support (in which they believe) to the claim (in which they don't yet believe).

In the chain model of argument, an arguer is seldom certain what his audience believes. Therefore, they cannot be sure which ideas will function as support. In other cases, the arguer may offer a variety of bases of support as foundation for his claim. Providing a variety of support for the claim increases the chances that an audience will find compelling at least one and perhaps multiple areas of support. This form of argument is represented in the cluster model. The complex model of argument represents the combination of the chain and cluster models. This form occurs when the arguer offers a variety of bases of support for the claim, some or all of which may themselves become claims that need supporting.

There have been a large number of studies on argument section of debating competition such as NUDC and WUDC. This study concentrated mainly on argumentative but it more focused on writing. Study with title Argumentative features of International English Language Testing System (IELTS) essays: a Rhetorical Analysis on Successful Exam Essays (Ananda et al., 2018). The results of the research showed that the common parts found in the essay are lead in, thesis statement and deduction. Common elements in essay argument were claim, data, warrant. The common types of argument structures were simple argument structures and strong argument structures. This showed that in the essay section, argument elements and argument structure could be used to describe the organizational quality features of IELTS essays. To be able to write good essays in English, test takers were advised to have good mastery of essay sections, argument elements and types of essay argument structures.

Another study entitled Argument Structure & Persuasive Techniques Used In World University Debate Championship & National University Debate Championship 2017 (Vincent et al., 2018). The findings of this study showed two things. First, all debates used all kinds of persuasive techniques and types of argument structures with certain types as the most frequently used. Second, all debates have strong reasons to support their claims, while appearing in structured arguments.

National University Debate Competition (NUDC) and World University Debate Championship (WUDC) are debate competition which held every year. This annual activity has become a positive event for students throughout university student to show their best skills in critical thinking and communication in English, increase self-confidence, develop networks between universities, and foster a sense of unity and pride in the diversity of the nation and culture.

The researchers took NUDC and WUDC as objects in this study based on several things. First, NUDC and WUDC are annual competitions that are participated by various university students both nationally and internationally. In addition, the focus of the researchers who wants to research the forms of argument in the open grand final video will be easier because the debaters are selected people who have been able to reach the open grand final stage. The debaters have beaten other debaters in the previous round.

There are several differences in this study with similar studies that have been carried out by previous researchers. Previous studies have focused a lot on the main point of the argument itself. While the argument itself has many parts such as elements and the form of the argument model. An element is a certain part that forms the basis of a whole process (Pardo and Téllez, 2018). In the debate competition such as NUDC and WUDC argument is a very important element because it is the basic foundation when we argue. Johnson (2010) stated that the debate requires participants to persuade the audience about the truth or falsity of the motion it is a contest of the arguments used to prove or disprove that motion. The goal of both teams engaged in the debate is to offer an interpretation of certain events that leads an adjudicator to accept or reject the motion under consideration. According to Bhatti et al (2021), the argument case must be relevant, logical and consistent. It is the standard based on adjudicators' assessment of the arguments. This further

statement strengthens the researcher statement that argument is the most important basic in the debate.

From the background above, it is very important to conduct research on the form of argument used by debaters in competition. The researchers tries to find out the forms of argument used by the debaters in open grand final NUDC 2020 and open grand final WUDC 2021. Then, the dominant model used in open grand final NUDC 2020 and open grand final WUDC 2021 is also important to be found. This research will give beneficial information how to build a strong arguments. The researchers will conduct a study entitled “Analysis form of Arguments in Open Grand Final National University Debate Championship (NUDC) 2020 and Open Grand Final World University Debate Championship (WUDC) 2021”.

## 2. Method

This research used descriptive qualitative method. Descriptive method is a method that intended to describe everything related to the topic research (Atmowardoyo, 2018). The collected data are not in the form of number. A qualitative study is a study which describes the result of observations. In a descriptive research, the researchers do not test the theory or use hypothesis, but it described or interpreted the subjects of research. This research purposed to find out the description of form of arguments that used by debaters in open grand final NUDC 2020 and open grand final WUDC 2021.

The subjects of this research were debaters in open grand final NUDC 2020 and open grand final WUDC 2021. The researchers used a purposive sampling to select the subject, The researcher searched and watched the video of debate competition on [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). Then, the researcher chose the type of video debate competition in youtube. Finally, the chosen video of open grand final NUDC 2020 and open grand final WUDC 2021 were downloaded and saved.

There were 8 debaters divided into 4 team in each competition. For this open grand final NUDC 2020, the opening government was from University of Tadulako, opening opposition was from University of Parahyangan, closing government was from University of Tanjung Pura and closing opposition was from University of Gadjah Mada. For open grand final WUDC 2021, opening goverment was from Ateneo OV. Opening opposition was from PDP1. Closing goverment was from Oxford1 and closing opposition was from Edinburgh A.

This study used observation method. Observation in a study is defined as focusing attention on object by involving all senses to get the data. The instrument used in this study was observation checklist. Checklist is a list of data variable that collected. Observation checklist used in this study adapted from Steven Johnson’s theory.

Table 1. Observation Checklist

No	Debaters	Sentence /paragraph	Form of argument				Note
			SML	CHN	CLS	CMX	
1.	PM						
2.	LO						
3.	DPM						
4.	DLO						
5.	MG						
6.	MO						
7.	GW						
8.	OW						

### Information:

PM	: Prime minister	SML	: simple model
LO	: leader of opposition	CHN	: chain model
DPM	: deputy prime minister	CLS	: cluster model
DLO	: deputy leader of opposition	CMX	: complex model
MG	: member of goverment		

MO : member of opposition  
 GW : government whip  
 OW : opposition whip

To support this observation activity, the researchers used a video recording downloaded from youtube and transcript made from the downloaded video.

### The Data Collection Technique

The data in this research were collected by some steps. First, the researchers searched and watched the video of debate competition in [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com). Second, the researchers chose the type of video debate competition in youtube. Then, the researchers downloaded and saved the video of open grand final NUDC 2020 and open grand final WUDC 2021. Finally, the researchers made a transcript from those video has been downloaded.

### The Data Analysis Technique

The researchers used descriptive method to analyze the data. First, the researchers identified the video debate competition in youtube. Second, the researchers grouped the video debate competition that has been downloaded from youtube. Next, the researchers made coding transcript based on Steven Johnson's theory. From the transcript, the researchers tabulated the result of form of arguments using observation checklist sheet. The researchers analyzed the tabulated data. The researchers elaborated the finding of the research with theory and relevance research. Finally, the researchers concluded the study.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### Results

#### Form of Argument in Open Grand Final NUDC 2020 Script

Researchers found that in the Open Grand Final NUDC 2020 there were a total of eight arguments. Of the eight arguments there were one simple model (SML), two chain model arguments (CHN), four cluster model arguments (CLS), and one complex model argument (CMX). The cluster argument model was more widely used in the Open Grand Final NUDC 2020 debate than any other argument models. The table shows the result of the eight arguments found in the speech of Open Grand Final NUDC 2020.

Table 2. Form of Argument in Open Grand Final NUDC 2020

Debaters	Form of argument			
	SML	CHN	CLS	CMX
PM	✓			
LO		✓		
DPM			✓	
DLO			✓	
MG			✓	
MO		✓		
GW			✓	
OW				✓
TOTAL	1	2	4	1

In the speech of Open Grand Final NUDC 2020 there were several argument models used based on Johnson (2010) such as: simple model of argument, chain model, cluster model and complex model.

### **a. Simple Model**

The simple model of argument's form was used by the Prime Minister. This could be seen in her speech, the Prime Minister conveyed her claim which was then accompanied by her support repeatedly. On the first she claimed that the condition in Indonesia would look like society had fully healed, they had already understood the protocols, they already had done these protocols that lead to society. Then, she made supports of her claim that how agriculture was resilience and real sectors in the only status that strategic for us to handle in the post covid and how if it's going to be preventive mechanism if crisis would happen again.

### **b. Chain Model**

The chain model of argument recognizes that an arguer is seldom certain what his audience believes and, therefore, cannot be sure which ideas will function as support (Johnson, 2009). The leader of opposition on that debate was using chain model of argumentation's form. She claimed most things, the first was about the mechanism decreased the interest rate in order for circulation of money and bonds could bounce back. Secondly, the restoration of supply chain which was the production and the consumption in the urban cities could be restored. Thirdly, the restore of demand because now the customers could really experience a price cut.

On the other hand, she made audiences believed of her argue by giving example and opened question to the audiences. That's her support of her argue or her claim, as cite in her speech she supported her claim by talk.

She also gave another support which carried as her claim, in a sentence support sounded as if he was doubt the belief of the audience. Therefore, he repeated back giving sentence support in the form of sentences questions to the audience to emphasize the belief of the audience. Up to the end of his speech, she was still given his support to convince the audience. From there, it could be concluded that she was using the model chain.

In addition, member of opposite gave a statement claiming that in fact office people were really the most vulnerable actors in this matter for some reason. The first reason was that in the covid 19 pandemic the rate of transmission of coronavirus to more urban people because of the close demographic composition even though social distancing measures have been implemented but this virus can be recognized through individuals because the lid they live and masks are not enough and I think it makes them unable to work because they are sick. Stop them from working and they will be laid off and the company will most likely not provide health insurance. That's enough to give you a supportive statement in his claim.

He also gave a supporting sentence that people in rural areas have a looser demographic composition that keeps them unaffected by covid-19 and can still work in their harvesting activities in agriculture.

However, his opinion began to falter and switched with the discussion of rural people who claimed to also be vulnerable because they had deferred local demands on agricultural resilience and agricultural stability.

Until the conclusion, he gave some supporting sentences that were still in the form of thresholds as a claim of the opponent's opinion. He still claimed about poor governance in handling covid-19, with his explanations that allude to UMKM also the absence of the adoption of jobs from the countryside.

### **c. Cluster Model**

The cluster model of argument's form was used by the Deputy Prime Minister. This could be seen in her speech, the Deputy Prime Minister conveying her claim which was then accompanied by her support strongly. The disputing party could offer various grounds of support as a basis for his claim. Providing multiple endorsements for a claim increases the chance that the audience would find at least one and possibly several areas of support of interest.

The cluster model of argument's form was also used by the Deputy Leader Opposition. He put the claim first on the opening of the speech. The claim were starting about contextualize what kind of condition that were facing after the covid 19, how protect people in rural area better and about pandemic transmission.

Moreover, the claims were carried by a lot of support sentences later. He gave a lot of sentences supporting very strong. Not only that, he also gave sentence supporting on each



sentence of the claim was given. Therefore, this argument is this opinion is included in the cluster model, this is due to the presence of sentence supporting a very strong winning streak.

The next speech argument which used cluster model's form is from the closing of government's member. At first, she gave the claim about hows Indonesia economic reliance in status quo is harmful and why CO case is going to be more sustainable. Second, why vulnareble actors were the best strategy for government to take an action. She also claimed the opposition's argument about a lot of things like supply chain and so on and so forth.

At the end of her speech, she gave many things of supporting sentences. She refuted the opinion of the opposite about those urbanization mechanism didn't exist but they didn't really give any implication whatever by giving the sentence a strong support. Furthermore, she also gave another supporting argument, she thought that people goingg back to rural areas is existing and therefore this stimulus coming from the government is the most important we were helping people, we were giving the people the chances to actually get lifted from that poverty at the very least giving them assurance that they could still have money, they could still had food at the very least. That's the only way to help the most vulnerable actors and put them in a position to power themselves as well as the rest of the society in indonesia after post covid.

At the whip session, the government gave its claim in a row with the sentence of its supporters. Here he explained his claims about the concept of rural and urban people whose relationships were questioned. Through these claims, he stated the sentences of his supporters in a row and calm. That's why it said it's exposing the opposition. Potential in rural areas was needed when they had the power to price this from the first place by really prioritizing this from the vehicle.

So opening up the opposition was also trying to tell that somehow by prioritizing in this digital and so on and so on it would help urban areas to become digital markets. But the opposition was said to have never tried to explain to how the analysis was step by step because we saw that urban would still be urban countryside.

In another supporting sentence, he also stated that the home opposition side only told him that they would actually incentivize like the company and so on and so forth. But they never really describe how this company was really going to go and help rural areas from the first place because the logic did not exist because they'd just say that the company was so good and they wouldn't have or pay more to rural areas so rural areas wouldn't be so impactful.

In the sentence of the almost closing section, he even gave a strong supporting sentence. He explained that what the opening government said was that they actually wanted to make rural areas into labor farmers. Based on this explanation, it is clear that the model of the argument is a cluster model. Where the government gave its claim supported by the sentences of its supporters constantly and strongly in the inclusion of each of its supporting sentences.

#### **d. Complex Model**

Johnson (2010) stated that complex argument models represented a combination of chain and cluster models. This form occured when the disputing party offers various grounds of support for the claim, some or all of which could be a claim requiring support. Most arguments resembled complex models.

At Opposite Whip first, his opinions expressed on the opposite whip look flat and stick to his claims. He conveyed the claim followed by a supporting sentence that had not perfectly provided evidence as reinforcement. This made the supporting sentence given as if it was still a claimed thing. His supporters who initially claimed that agriculture should be a focus on resilience because these people were people who had friends and a higher risk of transmission and others. He only gave the reason for his claim and did not provide concrete evidence to corroborate the sentence of his supporters. But at the end of his speech, he gave a supportive sentence that perfected his opinion. He gave some conclusions that corroborated the supporting sentence on what had been claimed.

He claimed that rural areas that were vulnerable to these issues, as well as the benefits of rural investment and expansion were something that might not be possible to help. He also gave a strong supporting sentence that was because of the way companies invested in the country the market of religious resilience because they knew that this was something dangerous if it couldn't survive during a pandemic that made the possibility of investment come in. He also provided a

strong supporting sentence by explaining there is local expansion there was product knowledge as an incentive for companies to reach out and enter this rural area. He also emphasized claims by opposing parties about the vulnerability of these people to be protected, claims about realistic approaches to the issue, and corporate protection.

From his opinion it could be seen that in the sentence of his whip, the opposite party looked still doubtful at the beginning of the sentence of his supporters. But at the end, he gave a strong supporting sentence. It can be concluded that opposite whip uses complex model arguments. where the complex model is a combination of chain model and cluster model.

**Form of Argument in Open Grand Final WUDC 2021 Script**

Whereas in speech of Open Grand Final WUDC 2021, there were a total of twelve arguments from eight debaters. Based on the twelve arguments, there were three simple model arguments (SML), one chain model argument (CHN), six cluster model arguments (CLS), and two complex model arguments (CMX). The table shows the result of the twelve arguments found in the speech of Open Grand Final WUDC 2021.

Table 3. Form of Argument in Open Grand Final WUDC 2021

Debaters	Form of argument			
	SML	CHN	CLS	CMX
PM	✓			
PMAWR			✓	
LO			✓	
LOAWR		✓		
DPM1			✓	
DPM2			✓	
DLO	✓			
MG1				✓
MG2	✓			
MO1				✓
GW			✓	
OW			✓	
TOTAL	3	1	6	2

**a. Simple Model**

At the opening the Prime Minister gave his statement on what the theory of communism looked like. He claimed that the belief in private property was immoral, and we must abolish it, it was believed also that we should give all the money to the state and the state should redistribute it to anyone. The second was, the transition from capitalist to communist economy required a vanguard party that controled redistribution that we thought was immoral as well.

Next he gave his supporting sentence until the end of his argument sentence. One example of his supporting sentence was his explanation of the reason why the theory of communism is immoral, because the human body is used to produce labor without compensation equivalent to that which should be given to them. Therefore, this argument was using simple model.

Besides, in the submission of his opinion, the deputy leader opposite gave his supporters very firm and strong sentences. Here are some excerpts of his supporter's sentence in claiming from the opponnent's argument. The first supporting sentence was a sentence that refuted the claims of OG who tried to come up with the idea of sending people to prison is considered moral. He further denied that he didn't think it was very moral, but the reason for sending people to prison was to help them get better and become better people.

The next supporting sentence was to explain the reason why they thought agency is important, this was because only accessing it was much better and to maximize people's kindness and allowed them to access their agency. In this supporting sentence, he concluded that the theory of communism might be based on views about people we disagreed with but that it was no more

immoral. He also concluded that the theory of communism could mean that if there was some transition, it was more like an objective view of what would happen, unlike what would be necessary to happen.

In the final sentence in the closing of his argument, he gave an example of a particular expert theory as a reinforcement of his supporting sentence. The point of the closing was based on Marx's own theory which observed capitalism's tendency to moderate. He conveyed the things that happened to the workers who moderated all of them well, and as Mark said he didn't think that was realistic because he thought it could change the theory of communism. Almost all the supporting sentences given there seem to corroborate his argument. Therefore, the authors concluded that the argument model used is a type of cluster model argument.

Member of Government 2 also claimed and supported sentences simply. He stated that the right to shelter or the right to use anything depends on the fact that owning objects then having space to do private property is meaningful.

#### **b. Chain Model**

Leader of opposition still tended to make the audience doubted the opinions expressed. In her argument, it was still put forward because her claims about communism still allowed people to be unequal.

In her submission it appeared that the presenter was still the same on the previous idea. The idea seemed to be a supporting sentence for her, but here it could be seen that the sentence was still impressed in the form of a claim sentence that was indicated. This could be seen at the point when he gave a supporting sentence in his claim. He gave his reasons for claiming because he thought it's generally bad to want humans to suffer because things were beyond their control like this idea of punishment actually damaging society prevents people from coming forward in the long run, it also had a trickle-down effect on their families. It could be concluded that the argument of the prime minister was a model of the argument with a chain model.

#### **c. Cluster Model**

In giving his response, the prime minister was very straightforward to give his opinion answer. He gave his claim that the intrinsic quality of communism was a direct clash as well as why it did not lead to comparisons of things. From the beginning of his statement of claim he then gave his supporting sentence strongly.

In his supporting sentence, he explained that if communism didn't give them this incentive because it's only given the same monetary salary, the same resources regardless of how many jobs were included, whatever it was invested, because there weren't enough technological solutions like climate change, didn't have enough resources for the kind of hunger, hunger, and poverty that existed today. From this it could be concluded that, the type of argument model used in the speech was using a cluster model. Because there as a strong supporting sentence to support what had been claimed.

The leader opposition asserted that what had been claimed by the opposing party was wrong. This was evidenced by giving a very strong supporting response in every opinion. Here is one example of a strong supporting sentence in giving reasons for what had been claimed.

The opposite party gave a strong supporting sentence that the theory of communism demanded that people got their basic needs provided regardless of any effort they could make. Communism often emphasized the theory of the value of labor, which meant the value of goods and material things in society depended on the work of the person who puts them into it. From the sentence it could be concluded that the leader opposition used a type of argument sentence model in the form of a cluster model.

Meanwhile, the opinions expressed by the deputy prime minister lead to the cluster argument model. This was because he gave a strong supporting sentence to what was claimed. In delivering his supporting sentence, he also gave an example as a booster. Seen in the snippet of the sentence, he gave an example of communist society committing this crime because it determined the material conditions given important also derived from the leader's proposition. They could see that their site would also have some level of inequality with respect to the intelligence that people had.



Even at the end of the submission of his opinion, he explained why this principle was important because even if some poor people at their house dance were less important because it was only why material conditions were the most important.

The opinion options of the deputy prime minister claimed that his case did not depend on practical effects, if the theory dictated that it should take the ability. For people to choose what was produced, and the state must determine that regardless of how it was applied in practice, it was considered immoral. Regardless, he successively gave his supporters strong sentences.

From his opinion, it was clear that his supporters' sentences set an example if taking the ability of people to choose what they did that it was half of their life so as to essentially subject half their lives to slavery. This was seen as immoral.

Another example in the sentence above described the supporting sentence of his claim. From this sentence he wanted to show that even if there was a burden to prove counter-model theories such as socialism, theories such as the welfare state were enough to take into account the basic needs of many. This was because it was necessary to note that all the principles of work and consider people who were competent enough to potentially take into account the different needs and interests of different people.

In the closing option, the member of the government whip provided a strong statement or supporting sentence. Supporting sentences in the argument given were quite long and repeated, but it was based on giving reinforcement to the supporting sentence. Here the author gives a brief example of the strengthening argument he gave, considering how long he gave his argument.

But the most important point here was when he emphasized the right of communism, which told people to deny the existence of their own preferences and instead advocates some Marxists like utopia, where workers did not know what they wanted and therefore, we needed to force them to do what they wanted. This proved enough why capitalism could moderate and other moral criticisms of capitalism existed, so for example the rules of criticizing these things along the same lines.

Closing arguments given by the opposition also tended to corroborate his opinion. Here the researchers also gave a glimpse of the strengthening of his opinion. While delivering his argument, he concluded that the opponent gave a lazy response from the shutdown government to say that there was no such thing as objective morality.

He also explained that the fact that the theory of communism had also done many things, therefore if we tried to assess morality and its theoretical effects, we must consider what the world existed and did not exist to evaluate this. From this the author concluded that the strong supporting sentence, directing the argument model used was a cluster model.

#### **d. Complex Model**

In his argument this time the government member gave a fairly strong opinion on the sentences of his supporters. Although at the beginning there was little doubt given to the audience but slowly he was able to strengthen the sentence of his supporters. Here are some excerpts of arguments given by the members of the government.

But before heading to the supporting sentence, let's talk about what is claimed. The first thing that made the debate about the final state when it could reach a communist utopia without practical problems and must debate whether this final state was better and whether this theory was justified or whether it was immoral. He also concluded that there were three points: another critique and improvement of the worst excesses of capitalism, denying the fundamental part of human nature to the theory of communism, and why in the case of communism property was considered a good thing. He concluded the claims there.

In his first argument he actually confirmed that his opinion was naturally criticized. This certainly made the audience feel a little unsure of the opinions held from the beginning. He even corroborated it by example that even Adam Smith had many criticisms of capitalism. But then he gave an additional supporting sentence that strengthened in principle. He argued that the opportunity cost of communism and the risk of a failure transition meant a much higher and immoral trade-off to spread the theory of communism.

It expressly denied communism because it showed that people should be equal and should not be able to rise up through society's opening-up analysis of the inherent dangers of inequality.

From the sentence of his supporters gradually began to strengthen the sentence of his statement at the beginning of the debate.

His argument also provided a strong supporting line that inequality and the ability to compare oneself with others were considered bad. From some of the sentences of these quotations, the author concluded that the argument used by the government member was a type or model of complex arguments. This was because at the beginning he gave arguments that tended to still be doubtful for the audience included in the chain model, but in the middle of his argument he provided arguments with strong supporting sentences that were included in the cluster argument model. Please note that the complex argument model is a combination of the chain model and the cluster model.

At the beginning of his argument he weakened, he argued that the capitalist structure was detrimental to the proletariat, but also proposed that capitalism must be unsustainable and would eventually turn to communism. Inevitably, from time to time through some kind of revolution, I thought what this meant that this theory primarily acted to criticize capitalist structures and was not always prescriptive. But along with the opinion given, he expressed some supporting sentences as a reinforcement of his argument.

He explained that an evolved communist society would absolutely never have, useful for this theoretical framework to circulate because it helped gain other benefits. From this the author concludes that the argument used was a combination of the chain model argument and the cluster model, so the type of argument used was a complex model.

## Discussion

The first objective of this research is to find out the dominant used of form arguments by debaters. This research is conducted because of the sensitivity of the researchers to the weakness of the arguments presented during the debate by students in speaking for debating class. This is in line with the results of research by Astuti (2018), who have found problems faced by the students in debate practicing in academic speaking class are difficulty to express an argument and to find the data to support an argument. Building successful arguments requires first that the debater discover the potential arguments for or against the proposition. Arguments consist of three components: claims, support, and inferences (Van Eemeren et al., 2019). A claim is a statement that the person making the argument wants the person hearing the argument to accept. A claim is an idea that has not been accepted by the audience as true and the person making the argument tries to get the audience to accept it. Support is an idea or set of ideas that the audience accepts as true and that provides the basis for acceptance of the claim. Inference is the relationship between claims and support.

The results of this study indicated that debaters used various forms of argument and did not focus on one model. In Open Grand Final NUDC 2020, researchers found simple model on the Prime Minister's speech. Meanwhile, in open grand final WUDC 2021, simple model was used by Prime Minister, Deputy Leader Opposite and Member of Government 2. The example can be seen in the Prime Minister's speech in open grand final NUDC 2020 as follow.

“so we think the condition will look like society has fully healed, they already understood the protocols, they already have done these protocols that leads to society. The case for this covid has decrease and even goes to the zero. Secondly, we think that the post covid will look like in indonesia is that economic is restarting is on the way to bunch back to the normal way throughly we also think in a post covid they're all sectors like education, work force is reopening again.”

On the first she claimed that the condition in Indonesia would look like society had fully healed, they already understood the protocols, they already had done these protocols that lead to society. Then, she made supports of her claim that how agriculture was resilience and real sectors in the only status that strategic for us to handle in the post covid and how if it was going to be preventive mechanism if crisis would happen again.

Next, the leader of opposition and member of opposite in open grand final NUDC 2020 used chain model of argumentation's form. Meanwhile, in open grand final WUDC 2021, chain model was used by Leader of Opposite Answer 2.

For example, the leader of opposition claimed most things and made audiences believed of her argue by giving example and opened question to the audiences. She stated;

“that's why you get the restoration of supply and demand it is something that's beneficial right? So I think that's secondly you have to analyze that post covid Indonesia its' something that we have already done that we are the most.

“So let's talk about why what happened in the context of indonesian economy i think that the first thing you have to realize that economic gap between rural and urban areas is very right in indonesia right? Its mean that this tells you that on how sixteen percent of our money circulation centralized award around in urban areas in itself this tells that there needs to be an urgency to restore the consumption because this is where the consumption that can lead to demans and thats why you can balance out the supply and demand chain under outside of the house right? But secondly i think that the characteristic between rural and urban areas that the gap that exist within that the needs of urban areas people are more diverse right this leads to that there needs to be a characters of this kind of diverse needs.”

In open grand final NUDC 2020, cluster model was used by Deputy Prime Minister, Deputy Leader Opposition, Member of Government and Government Whip. Meanwhile, in open grand final WUDC 2021, cluster model was used by Prime Minister Answer, Leader Opposition, Deputy Prime Minister 1, Deputy Prime Minister 2, Government Whip and Opposition Whip. For the example, the Deputy Prime Minister explained the claim as bellow:

“We didnt want to say that office employment is not important but what you need to understand that we need to reintergrate to our economy, we need to intergrate to our strong economic basis because what you need to understand is that agriculture is the sector that impact the majority.”

On the second claim, the Deputy Prime Minister explained the claim as bellow:

“We want to clarify is that the most important for indonesia the goverment is to think or take the consideration which industries are more resilient in future that can move people to a better economic and to a better social later.”

After giving the claim, the Deputy Prime Minister gave the strong support of the claim. Moreover, the conclusion also had been given to support the claim.

In open grand final NUDC 2020, complex Model was used by Opposite Whip. Meanwhile, in open grand final WUDC 2021, complex model was used by Member of Government 1 and Member of Opposite 1. The example could be seen on complex model by Opposite Whip as follow.

At first, Opposite Whip conveyed the claim followed by a supporting sentence that had not perfectly provided evidence as reinforcement. This made the supporting sentence given as if it was still a claimed thing as follow.

“So, its more likely on our side house to create a maximum benefit hence rebounding back from the economy its likely to happen our side house but lastly sustainability what they say is that agricultural should be the focus on resilience because these people are the people who have friends and higher risk of getting transmission and what not.....”

But at the end of his speech, he gave a supporting sentence that made his opinion perfect. He gave some conclusions that corroborate the supporting sentence on what had been claimed.

“Say the most vulnerable trying to protect doesnt have this particular money because they the only one who can afford this only those people exactly on our side house. The benefit of invesment and rural expansion are something that is likely unlikely to help these people because of two reasons. Firstly, its becaus eafter covid the way that company invest to the

country its market religiously resilience because they know that this is something that is harmful if you like cannot survive during pandemic. But second of all the trend of digitalization because of the pandemic itself. This is why it is likely for an investment to come in.

Moreover, there are the first mover advantages. There are local expansion there are product knowledge as the incentive for the company to reach into and tap into this rural area. This is important because one it answer OG claim about vulnerability of these people to be protected. Second, answer just claim about realistic approaches to this problem. And lastly, machanized OO's like corporate protection.were very proud to opposed.”

The strong argument should be supported by evidence (von der Mühlen et al., 2019). It indicates that the debaters try to make a strong argument by including support to strengthens their claim. This explanation is also reinforced by the statement from Johnson (2010) argued that a strong argumentation that shows a good relationship between premise and claim that is demonstrated to strengthen the argumentation. It means that the claim and the premises should be in the same line. The standards of relevance which are unique to the type of reasoning employed by particular argumentations. In conclusion, an argumentation can be considered relevance if a main idea and the supporting idea stand in the same context. Another relevance study that related with this research and strengthen the statement is study by Vincent et al (2018) that focused on structured and persuasive arguments used in NUDC and WUDC found that first, all debates used all types of persuasive techniques and types of structures. arguments of a certain type as the most frequently used. Second, all debates have strong reasons that are support their claims, while appearing in structured arguments.

In the end, the researchers conclude that a strong argument is a very influential element, especially in winning debates. The results of this study will help to present information related to the argument form that can be used to build strong arguments in the debate. for future researchers, it is recommended to carry out a deepest investigation on debate, especially by paying a careful attention to the factors that the minimum of using argument's model in debate. This study will show the reason why students are still facing a problem when they build their debate arguments.

#### 4. Conclusion

Based on the result of argument's forms in open grand final NUDC 2021 video downloaded from YouTube platform based on Steven Johnson theory, there are some argument's forms. The total of argument's forms are eight models from eight debaters. Which the model of argument consist of one simple model argument, two chain model arguments, four cluster model arguments, and one complex model argument. Meanwhile, in video open grand final WUDC 2021, there are a total of twelve arguments from eight debaters which consist of three simple model arguments, one chain model argument, six cluster model arguments, and two complex model arguments. Based on the two events, the argument model that is more widely used is the cluster argument model.

#### References

- Ananda, R. P., Arsyad, S., & Dharmayana, I. W. (2018). Argumentative features of international English language testing system (IELTS) essays: A rhetorical analysis on successful exam essays. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2(1), 1–13.
- Atmowardoyo, H. (2018). Research methods in TEFL studies: Descriptive research, case study, error analysis, and R & D. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 9(1), 197–204.
- Austin J. Freeley and David L. Steinberg. (1996). *Argumentation and debate : critical thinking for reasoned decision making* (Twelfth). Wadsworth.
- Bhatti, M. M. A., Ahmad, A. S., & Park, J. (2021). Argument Mining on Twitter: A Case Study on

- the Planned Parenthood Debate. *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Argument Mining*, 1–11.
- Johnson, S. L. (2010). *Winning debates: A guide to debating in the style of the World Universities Debating Championships*. IDEA.
- Núñez Pardo, A., & Téllez Téllez, M. F. (2018). The Argumentative Competence through In-Class Debates on Social Issues. *Teacher-Developed Materials for Language Teaching and Learning*.
- PUJI ASTUTI, A. Y. U. (2018). *STUDENTS' PROBLEMS IN DEBATE PRACTICING IN ACADEMIC SPEAKING CLASS (A case study at fourth semester of English Education Department of Universitas Muria Kudus in Academic Year 2017/2018)*. Universitas Muria Kudus.
- Van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Kruiger, T. (2019). *Handbook of argumentation theory*. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Vincent, A., Kurniawan, Y., & Trihastutie, N. (2018). Argument Structure & Persuasive Techniques used in World University Debate Championship & National University Debate Championship 2017. *Seminar Nasional Ilmu Terapan (SNITER)*, 1(1), D07-1.
- von der Mühlen, S., Richter, T., Schmid, S., & Berthold, K. (2019). How to improve argumentation comprehension in university students: experimental test of a training approach. *Instructional Science*, 47(2), 215–237.
- Vucetich, J. A., Burnham, D., Johnson, P. J., Loveridge, A. J., Nelson, M. P., Bruskotter, J. T., & Macdonald, D. W. (2019). The value of argument analysis for understanding ethical considerations pertaining to trophy hunting and lion conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 235, 260–272.