# Fallacies In English Department Students' Claims: A Rhetorical Analysis Of Critical Thinking

**Rohmani Nur Indah, Agung Wiranata Kusuma**
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang
Jl. Gajayana 50 Malang. Email: indah@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id

**Abstract:** This study focuses on the fallacies found in English department students' claims of fact, value and policy. It employs qualitative design as the object is the real reflection of critical thinking in the form of writing to understand the fallacies varieties. The data are in the form of the sentences in the claims written by the students of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang who took critical writing course. On claims of fact, the fallacies found include *hasty generalization, irrelevancy, slippery slope, oversimplification* and *begging the question.* Regarding pathos, the fallacy type covers *ad populum, appeal to emotion premises* and *red herring.* Meanwhile the ethos fallacy occurs in *straw man* only. On claims of value, more faulty reasoning is found compared to the discussion on the topics which are considered less familiar. In the logos fallacy for instance, the whole types of fallacy are found. The pathos found involves *appeal to emotion premises* and *red herring.* While the ethos fallacy occurs in *appeal to authority* and *ad hominem.* On claims of policy, the similar tendency of ethos is also found while the pathos existing is in the form of *appeal to emotion premises.*

**Key Words:** fallacy, claims, logos, ethos, pathos

**Abstract:** Penelitian ini mengkaji lompatan nalar dalam karangan argumentatif berjenis faktual, nilai dan kebijakan. Rancangan yang digunakan kualitatif dengan objek refleksi berpikir kritis dalam tulisan untuk memahami lompatan nalar yang ditemukan. Data penelitian berupa kalimat dalam klaim yang ditulis mahasiwa UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang pada mata kuliah menulis kritis. Pada klaim faktual, lompatan nalar meliputi generalisasi langsung, tanpa kaitan, terpelintir, penyederhanaan dan penuh pertanyaan. Dalam hal patos, lompatan nalar meliputi simbol umum, emotif dan pengalihan isu. Adapun lompatan dalam etos meliputi penyepelean opini saja. Dalam klaim nilai, terjadi lebih banyak lompatan nalar pada topik yang bersifat kurang umum. Pada logos, seluruh jenis lompatan nalar teridentifikasi. Adapun patos yang muncul yaitu pernyataan emotif dan pengalihan isu. Lompatan etos terjadi pada keberpihakan isu dan serang opini. Dalam klaim kebijakan, lompatan etos juga memiliki kecenderungan yang sama dan pada patos melibatkan penyataan emotif.

**Kata kunci:** lompatan nalar, klaim, logos, etos, patos

Today, discussing critical thinking in Indonesian context becoming buzzword especially after Reform Era in 1998 which was characterized by massive demonstration in which the freedom to express one's thoght has become a crucial start to build critical thinkers (Emilia, 2010). Referring to the international benchmark of education, the 3R basic literacy (reading, writing, arithmetic) seems to be insufficient today. It needs to be completed into 4R basic competences (reading, writing, arithmetic, and reasoning), so that learners are equipped with skills needed to support their current and future life economically, socially and culturally (Hayat & Yusuf, 2010; Depdiknas, 2004). Critical thinking skills also belong to the crucial outcome of higher education. This is in line with the Indonesian Government Regulation (*Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia/PPRI*) No. 70/2010 section 84.2 which states that one of the aims of tertiary education is to develop human beings who are critical, innovative, independent, self-confident and entrepreneurship-minded. Therefore, the teaching of language, including writing skills, should incorporate the critical pedagogy.

Measuring critical thinking skills can be done through several ways involving writing competencies

especially in producing claims in the form of argumentative essays. This study concerns the rhetorical analysis of the critical thinking skills measured through writing claims in particular. The assessment of the rhetorics includes some aspects, one of which is the logic. Assessing the logic of the argument or the claims 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 occurring in English department students claim writing.

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. 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).

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). Concerning the empirical bases supporting this study, Ramage and Bean (1999 in Stapleton 2001), include sections on fallacies using similar terminology of fallacies.

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".

As the delimination of the analysis, there are three objectives formulated to do this research. *First,* this study is to identify the types of the fallacies found in English department students' writing especially in claims of fact. The factual claims to analyze are those regarding the argument relevant to the situation happening in either in the past, present or future. *Second,* the analysis done in this study aims at identifying the types of the fallacies found in English department students' writing especially in claims of value. The value claims are those relevant with attribution on certain issues presented by the student. This type of claim is usually related to the student initiated topic concerning his or her own area of interest to be evaluated. *Third,* this study is to identify the types of the fallacies found in English department students' writing especially in claims of policy. The policy claims are analyzed on the bases of suggested solution provided by the writer regarding a certain issue.

## METHOD

In this study the types of fallacies in different type of claim become the basis to uncover what is specifically happening in the process students' reflecting critical thinking. By identifying 'how' and understanding 'to what extent' the students 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 students' critical thinking skills through the fallacies made.

The data needed for revealing the pattern of fallacies in their critical writing are in the form of the sentences written in the students' claim. Therefore the main instrument used in this study is the researchers themselves who conduct the whole process starting with collecting the data covering the documents of students' essays, doing the analysis as well as drawing the research conclusion. The source of the data is the essays written by English department students of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang who took critical writing course. By conducting this study which support the productive writing skill as well as writing publication, it is in line with the schema of the university toward the quality of World Class University. The quality is inseparable from the quality of the graduates including the quality of the writing as the academic production of the students.

## RESULTS

The fallacies in students' claims consist of logos, ethos and pathos described in separate tables below. The fallacies on logos of the three types of claims are presented in Table 1.

Based on the above table, the logos fallacy of the whole data appears mostly in *begging the question* which is followed by *hasty generalization* and *oversimplification.* While the type rarely found consists of *irrelevancy, false analogy* and *slippery slope.* Of the three types of claim, the logos fallacies mostly appear in claims of fact. The next summary, the Table 2 is on ethos.

The fallacies on ethos covers *ad hominem* as the most frequent type which is followed by *appeal to false authority* and *straw man.* The faulty reasoning of this type occurs more in claims of policy. This finding is different from the pathos. fallacy as presented in Table 3.

Table 3 shows that *ad populum* is the most frequent type of pathos fallacy which is followed by *red herring* and *appeal to emotional premises.* Similar to the finding in logos, the pathos fallacy occurs more in claims of fact. Meanwhile, the trend in the fallacious statement is as summarized in Table 4.

Based on the summary of analysis presented in Table 4, the highest percentage falls in logos (77%). Although there are more essays taken from claims of value, the findings result in different amount of fallacy. The flawed reasoning occurs more in claims of fact (44%). This approves that the faulty argument is not relied on the number of the claims made but on the topic preference covering factual issues, value deduction or policy suggested.

## DISCUSSION

### The Fallacies in Claims of Fact

Akin to the type of claims, the students' writing on claims of fact deal with those regarding the argument relevant to the situation happening in either in the past, present or future. This type of claim may refer to what the writer defines on a particular point of view. More faulty reasoning is found in the issue of illegal logging, woman emancipation and becoming career woman compared to the discussion on other topics. Although the issues the students chose are not new, the relevant arguments they made jump to the conclusion. Therefore, 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. 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 L2 learners as it is involved in their English writing. The data show that 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 occurence of the fallacious sentences in the students' writing.

In the findings, it is obvious that the errors students made 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. These are as stated by Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001). Among them the occurence of *hasty generalization* is the most obvious compared to other types of fallacy. While one type of fallacy namely *false analogy* is not found.

**Table 1. Fallacies on Logos**

| Type of claims | Irrelevancy | False analogy | Hasty generaliz. | Slippery slope | Oversimplification | Begging the question | Post Hoc | ∑ logos |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Claims of fact | 1 | - | 13 | 1 | 10 | 11 | - | 36 |
| Claims of value | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 26 |
| Claims of policy | - | - | 4 | 3 | 3 | 9 | - | 19 |
| ∑ fallacy | 2 | 1 | 24 | 6 | 19 | 28 | 1 | 80 |

**Table 2. Fallacies on Ethos**

| Type of claims | Appeal to false authority | Ad Hominem | Straw Man | ∑ ethos |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Claims of fact | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Claims of value | 1 | 1 | - | 2 |
| Claims of policy | 1 | 5 | - | 6 |
| ∑ fallacy | 2 | 6 | 2 | 11 |

**Table 3. Fallacies on Pathos**

| Type of claims | Ad Populum | Appeal to emotional premises | Red herring | ∑ pathos |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Claims of fact | 6 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| Claims of value | - | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Claims of policy | - | 1 | - | 1 |
| ∑ fallacy | 6 | 3 | 5 | 14 |

**Table 4. Fallacies in L2 Students' Claims**

| Type of claims | Logos | Ethos | Pathos | ∑ flawed reasoning (%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Claims of fact | 36 | 2 | 8 | 46 (44%) |
| Claims of value | 26 | 2 | 5 | 33 (31%) |
| Claims of policy | 19 | 6 | 1 | 26 (25%) |
| ∑ fallacy (%) | 80 (77%) | 11 (10%) | 14 (13%) | 105 |

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 claims. This faulty deduction occurs in the topic of forestation, TV effects, e-book and family planning program. The following are the examples where the writer in this type take the conclusion based on the observation result of some cases but it is then hastily generalized.

*Nowadays we always watch television to know the information about the world*

*Following family planning can prevent some cancer*

Errors in the reasoning of logos, becomes rare whenever the L2 students talk about factual things which are not familiar to them. The issue can be new one such as the Korean wave, or because of the distant from the object to discuss for instance on pornography. The students writing the claims as the source of data mostly have the background of living in Islamic boarding house. Therefore they did not get much exposure to the topics irrelevant with their religiosity. Also on the topic of online course, the students do not get sufficient experience concerning this issue so that they do not make more inferences which can cause flawed reasoning. Accordingly it is clear that discussing unfamiliar topic limits the students' expression causing faulty reasoning on logos.

Claims of fact are related to factual issues which interest more arguer. Of the three types of claim, the logos fallacies mostly appear in claims of fact. The more argument and refutation the students made re-

sults in the more fallacious sentences in terms of logos. As seen in table 4, 44% of the data covers the fallacious statement from factual claims. Therefore, for factual claims it can be inferred that the occurrence of faulty reasoning of logos goes together with the high number of fallacious sentences.

Regarding pathos which come the next after logos in claims of fact, 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). All of the three type of pathos fallacies are found namely *ad populum, appeal to emotion premises* and *red herring.* The first pathos fallacy, *ad populum* is the most frequent one as seen below where the writer overestimate the fact on the issue presented.

*This is because there are so many references on woman emancipation we can find*

Pathos is also found on the issue of Ahmadiyah, e-book and leadership. Although the issue is considered not familiar, the tendency to influence the audience becomes apparent. This is as a result of the inability to explore more on a more logical reasoning so that to complete the ideas the students include their overestimating on their own claim.

In claims of fact, the occurence of pathos fallacy is the highest compared to the other types of claims as reported in Table 3. That the way the writer overestimates his/her own claim becomes apparent as the goal is to directly influence the reader. In this type of claim, the students realize on the audience of their writing. As the claim is written on a piece of paper, they believe that the claim only reach limited audience. Accordingly they want to affect the readers through exaggerating argument which then becomes fallacious. When the writing prompt says that the writing will be published online, it can bring another consequence as it reaches larger audience. In this case, the more awareness of the larger audience will improve the students' carefulness to avoid more pathos fallacy.

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 straw person (oversimplifying an opponent's argument to make it easy to refute). In the findings on Table 2, it is clear that the ethos fallacy occurs in *straw man* only as seen below.

*Online course is more appropriate than traditional class in writing course as the author has full right to publish their writing and it can decrease the number of giving up because their writing is not published yet.*

It happens on the issue concerning online course. It seems that the spatial aspect, since the students and the character involved in the argument are not too close, causes the ethos fallacy. None of the students involve in online course based on class survey, therefore the students do not know exactly about the exact matters dealing with the issue of their argument. They oversimplify the opponent's argument so that their claim becomes stronger which actually results in fallacious statement.

The claims of fact also results in small number of ethos fallacy. 2 out of 11 ethos fallacious statements belong to this type of claim as shown in Table 2. This happens as in discussing the condition or factual event that can refer to those happening in the past, present or future, faulty reasoning occurs in the relation with the character involved. In this case the students on the issue of their prediction on online course seems to weaken their own point of view as do not certain on what would certainly happen relevant to the issue they presented.

## The Fallacies in Claims of Value

In students' writing, the argument using the attributive value becomes dominant. There are more statements related to claims of value, which are bigger number compared to the other two claims, of fact and policy. Referring to the argument made, the students' writing on claims of value deals with those regarding the issue on sport in education and on leadership in education. When talking about education field, the students feel that the topic is very familiar with their life. 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).

The fallacy in claims of value, although comes the second after factual claims in terms of number, the variability is bigger. In the logos fallacy for instance, the whole types of fallacy are found. In the findings, it is obvious that the errors students made 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. These are as stated by Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001). Among them the occurrence of *begging the question* is the most obvious compared to other types of fallacy (see Table 1).

In *begging the questions* as the most logos fallacy found, the conclusion 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 2, this type of logos fallacy occurs in the topic on TV effects, and e-learning. That is why talking about the logos fallacy is inseparable from the choice of issue to present in the argument as seen below.

*Becoming popular is also a benefit of studying overseas*

*Although the mother is really smart but her children cannot become like her*

What is unique from this claim of value is the occurence on *false analogy* and *post hoc* fallacy found. This is different from the finding on claims of fact. Talking about value justification, *false analogy* occurs in the topic on free sex effect and *post hoc* is shown in the topic of rice price. In this case, the occurence of the fallacy deals with not acquainted topic. As the information in the relevant topic is limited for the students, the faulty reasoning results in misinterpretation on the analogues fact. It also results in the tendency to think that the correlational fact proves for causation of that particular fact.

Errors in the reasoning of logos become rare whenever the L2 students talk about justified values which are not familiar to them. As seen in Table 2, the issue can be controversial such as polygamy, or because of the distant from the object to discuss for instance on cyber crime. The students writing the claims as the source of data mostly have the background of living in Islamic boarding house. Therefore they did not get much exposure to the topics irrelevant with their own value or belief. Accordingly it is clear that discussing unfamiliar topic limits the students' expression causing faulty reasoning on logos.

Claims of value are also related to the occurence of faulty reasoning of pathos. Regarding pathos which come the next after logos in claims of value, 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). Pathos in claims of value is found on the issue of cyber crime, and internet for children. The following is the example of appeal to emotional premises found.

*Don't be the victim of cyber crime on Facebook, because it'll make you regret*

Although the issue is considered not familiar, the tendency to influence the audience becomes apparent. This is as a result of the inability to explore more on a more logical reasoning so that to complete the ideas the students include some other irrelevant ideas which is also supported by emotional expression such as threatening and showing sympathy.

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 straw person (oversimplifying an opponent's argument to make it easy to refute). In the findings on Table 2, it is clear that the ethos fallacy occurs in *appeal to authority* and *ad hominem*. It happens on the issue concerning Islamic boarding school as seen below.

*Mr. Podin, one of consellor in a senior high school at Tulungagung said that the students' spiritual characteris influenced by their environment and parents' care. So we do not have to send our children to Islamic Boarding School.*

It seems that the closeness, since the students also live in the boarding school, causes the ethos fallacy. Therefore the students know exactly about the exact matters dealing with the issue of their argument. This results in overuse of attacking the arguer which actually results in fallacious statement.

Understanding the phenomenon on the types of fallacies in students' claim of value brings some pedagogical implications. Since this type of claim results in the more various types of logos fallacy, writing teachers should model how to make inference based on logical reasoning. Influencing readers to believe the same value justification should not be made merely by involving emotion and adding irrelevant details.

This is because these two types of ethos fallacy is proven to be dominant in the students' claim of value. Another implication is that the teacher needs to encourage them to read more references relevant to the characters in their topic.

## The Fallacies in Claims of Policy

In students' claims, the argument using the suggested policy occurs in 25% of the data. The students' writing on claims of policy deals with the issue on prostitution effects, assignments and on family planning program. It can be inferred the policy suggested deals with a bigger issue or nationwide concern. Discussing about the nationwide issue make the students overuse the references which may cause more faulty reasoning 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).

The fallacy in claims of policy although not much in terms of number, but the occurence of ethos fallacy is the most frequent compared to the other claim types. In discussing suggested policy, 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 straw person (oversimplifying an opponent's argument to make it easy to refute). In the findings on Table 2, it is clear that the ethos fallacy occurs in *appeal to authority* and *ad hominem*. It happens on the issue concerning assignments and street vendors. It seems that the closeness, since the students know well about their syllabus and the existence of street vendors in their surroundings, causes the ethos fallacy. Therefore the students know exactly about the exact matters dealing with the issue of their argument. This results in overuse of attacking the arguer which actually results in fallacious statement.

In the findings, it is obvious that the errors students made 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. These are as stated by Ramage and Bean (as summarized by Stapleton, 2001). Among them the occurrence of *begging the question* is the most obvious compared to other types of fallacy (see Table 1).

In *begging the questions* as the most logos fallacy found, the conclusion 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. This type of logos fallacy occurs in the topic on prostitution, advertising and palm plantation. That is why talking about the logos fallacy is inseparable from the choice of issue to present in the argument as seen in the example below.

*It is the government's job to stop the expanding of palm plantation*

Errors in the reasoning of logos become rare whenever the L2 students talk about suggested policy which is not familiar to them. The issue can be controversial such as gay marriage by stating below.

*The gays do not disturb their neighbor and society*

The students writing the claims as the source of data mostly have the background of living in Islamic boarding house. Therefore they did not get much exposure to the topics irrelevant with their own value or belief. Accordingly it is clear that discussing unfamiliar topic limits the students' expression causing faulty reasoning on logos.

Claims of policy are also related to the occurence of faulty reasoning of pathos. Regarding pathos, flawed relationships can also exist between what is argued and the audience. These flawed arguments, include, appealing to stirring symbols (such as nationalistic values), provincialism, appealing to emotional premises, and red herring (shifting the audience's attention). *Appeal to emotion premises* occurs in the data as seen below.

*If the aim of marriage is as evidence of our love with the couple to have a happy life, why don't the government give the legalization?*

Pathos in claims of policy is found on the issue of gay marriage. Although the issue is considered not familiar, the tendency to influence the audience becomes apparent. This is as a result of the inability to explore more on a more logical reasoning so that to complete the ideas the students include emotional expression such to show sympathy.

In claims of policy, the occurrence of ethos fallacy is rare as reported in Table 2 with the type similar to those of value. The writers involve more on *ad hominem* where they make an irrelevant attack on the arguer and suggests that this attack undermines the argument itself. It happens on the topic of street vendors, assignment and prostitution. The following is the example.

> *According to their opinion doing assignment is good for the future, but who knows that the students also have another things to do.*

Understanding the phenomenon on the types of fallacies in students' claim of policy brings some pedagogical implications. Since this type of claim results in the more various types of logos fallacy, writing teachers should model how to convince readers on the suggested policy without involving illogical reasoning. 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 suggested policy, students can avoid making unnecessary fallacious statements.

Based on the analysis, it is obvious that topic familiarity or students' background knowledge of the issue they write is regarded as a factor contributing to the awareness of avoiding fallacies. This is related to their development of critical thinking skills. Despite the knowledge being transferred in class, studies show that not all students may be good at critical thinking skills; nor do some teachers appear to teach students 'good thinking' skills (Pithers & Soden, 2001). Undeniably, in the context of academic writing learners need to be critical in treating the information related to the topic to be developed into an essay (Craswell, 2005). Therefore, students are expected to enlarge their knowledge to sharpen their critical thinking skills so that they can avoid making more fallacious statements in their argumentative essays.

The knowledge based on the topic familiarity which learners possess regarding texts is usually traced back to schema theory. In schema theory, the comprehension is composed of two parts–a linguistic component responsible for decoding text and sending information to the brain, and a conceptual component that connects this information to pre-existing knowledge structures (McNeil, 2010).

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusions

Based on the analysis on the students' claims, the argument relevant to the situation happening either in the past, present or future results in the largest portion of fallacies. 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. 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).

On claims of fact, the errors students made 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 which include more fallacies on *hasty generalization*. Regarding pathos fallacy which occurs on the relation to the audience, the fallacy type covers more on *ad populum*. Although the issue is considered not familiar, the tendency to influence the audience becomes apparent. This is as a result of the inability to explore more on a more logical reasoning so that to complete the ideas the students include their overestimating on their own claim. In claims of fact, the occurrence of pathos fallacy is the highest compared to the other types of claims. In this type of claim, the students realize on the audience of their writing. As the claim is written on a piece of paper, they believe that the claim only reach limited audience. Accordingly they want to affect the readers through exaggerating argument which then becomes fallacious. Meanwhile the ethos fallacy occurs in *straw man* only. It seems that the spatial aspect plays a role since the students and the character involved in the argument are not too close. The students oversimplify the opponent's argument so that their claim becomes stronger which actually results in fallacious statement.

On claims of value, more faulty reasoning is found compared to the discussion on other topics which are considered less familiar. The fallacy in claims of value, although comes the second after factual claims in terms of number, the variability is bigger. In the logos fallacy for instance, the whole types of fallacy are found. *Begging the question* is the most dominant one. In this case, the occurrence of the fallacy deals with not acquinted topic. As the information in the relevant topic is limited for the students, the faulty reasoning results in misinterpretation on the analogues fact. It also results in the tendency to think that the correlational fact proves for causation of that particular fact. Claims of value are also related to the occurrence of faulty reasoning of pathos which involve more on *appeal to emotion premises.* Although the issue is considered not familiar, the tendency to influence the audience becomes apparent. This is as a result of the inability to explore more on a more logical reasoning so that to complete the ideas the students include some other irrelevant ideas which is also supported by emotional expression such as threatening and showing sympathy. In the findings the ethos fallacy occurs more in *appeal to authority.* Since the students know exactly about the exact matters dealing with the issue of their argument, it results in overuse of attacking the arguer which is also fallacious.

On claims of policy, the topics chosen deal with a bigger issue or nationwide concern which makes the students overuse the references which may cause more faulty reasoning compared to the discussion on other topics which are considered less familiar. The logos fallacies found cover more on *begging the question*. The fallacy in claims of policy although not much in terms of number, but the occurrence of ethos fallacy is apparent particularly in *appeal to authority*. Since the students know well about the contexts of the issue in their argument, they tend to overuse references and details with goal to attack the arguer which actually results in fallacious sentences. Claims of policy are also related to the occurrence of faulty reasoning of pathos existing between what is argued and the audience in the form of *appeal to emotion premises.* Since the topic chosen is controversial and not observable in their surroundings, the argument the students made involve emotional expression to show sympathy. This becomes fallacious as it is used to strengthen their claim.

## SUGGESTIONS

Exploring the phenomenon on the types of fallacies in students' claim of fact, value and policy brings some pedagogical implications. Knowing that the claim of fact results in the biggest number of fallacy, writing teachers should warn the students that making justification on the factual condition happening in the past, present or future must be based on logical reasoning.

As the study found that the students are more interested in writing claims of value, the writing students need the model on how to make inference based on logical reasoning. Influencing readers to believe the same value justification should not be made merely by involving emotion and adding irrelevant details. This is because these two types of ethos fallacy is proven to be dominant in the students' claim of value.

The findings show that the students' claim of policy needs more elaboration to convince readers on the suggested policy without involving illogical reasoning. Influencing readers to believe the same value justification should not be made merely by involving emotion and attack the opponents. It needs more emphasis through teacher's guidance and modeling so that in presenting the suggested policy, students can avoid making unnecessary fallacious statements. Therefore, it is recommended for syllabus developer to enrich the students' knowledge with the type of fallacies to avoid in argumentative writing.

As this study concerns with the claims created by the English department students of UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, it is suggested that other researchers conduct more elaborative study. More empirical bases on different contexts are needed to strengthen the finding of this study concerning the various fallacies occurring in terms of logos, ethos and pathos in the claims of fact, value and policy.

## REFERENCES

Craswell, G. 2005. *Writing for Academic Success: A Postgraduate Guide.* London: SAGE Publication Ltd.

Depdiknas. 2004. *Peningkatan Kualitas Pembelajaran.* Jakarta: DIKTI.

Dowden, B. 2010. *Fallacies.* Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, (Online), (http://www.iep.utm.edu/fallacy/, diakses 21 September 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. 2013. *Topic Familiarity, Writing Proficiency and Critical Thinking Skills.* Disertasi tidak diterbitkan. Malang: Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Malang.

McNeil, L. 2010. Investigating The Contributions of Background Knowledge and Reading Comprehension Strategies to L2 Reading Comprehension: An Exploratory Study. *Reading Writing,* 24: 883–902.

Peraturan Pemerintah Indonesia No. 17 Th. 2010(84.2) tentang Pendidikan Tinggi, (Online), (http://dikti.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2010/pp17-th2010.pdf, diakses 8 Februari 2014).

Pithers, R. T. & Soden, R. 2001. Critical Thinking in Education: A Review. *Educational Research*, 42 (3): 237–249.

Stapleton, P. 2001. Assessing Critical Thinking in the Japanese University students. *Written Communication,* 18 (4): 506–548.