

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This is the last chapter of the study. This chapter presents the conclusions based on findings and discussions in the previous chapter. This chapter also offers the suggestions for further studies.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

This paper examines the strength of arguments of the 2012 U.S presidential candidates, Barack Obama and Mitt Romney. It has been revealed that arguments' strength can be measured by applying an appropriate linguistic approach. By using Toulmin's Argumentation Models (1958), this study aims to determine theoretically about who has stronger arguments between the 2012 American presidential candidates in their latest presidential debate.

According to the results of analysis, most of the weak arguments in the debate are in a form of inductive argument. It happens because the grounds of inductive arguments only present an analysis and reasons for the claim, but they do not guarantee the factuality of the grounds and the certainty of the claim.

Moreover, inductive arguments in this study are mostly uncogent. The 'truth' of the information that is given by the grounds is a necessary requirement for a cogent argument. One of this phenomenon is shown in the transcription no.12 from Mitt Romney. In this transcription, Romney's grounds are based on analysis and reasons. He mentioned some reasons why America must not withdraw the foreign policy of the U.S missile defense. However, his reasons are not accompanied by factual data either statistical, numerical or 'accepted premises'. In other words, these types of grounds is not strong enough to support the claim. As the impact of this action, the grounds only provide a 'probability' of its conclusion or the claim.

Thus, the overall strong arguments in this study are constructed in the form of deductive argument. This is in line with the result of the study, which has determined Barack Obama whose argumentation is stronger than Romney in the latest U.S presidential debate. Most of Obama's arguments are in the form of deductive arguments. Even in a weak form, Obama's arguments in the debate are mostly accompanied by factual grounds to support his claim. The example of this phenomenon is shown in the transcription No.13. In the transcription, Obama's claim concerning the reality that America is now stronger than the first time Obama came into the office is supported by several facts which contain the U.S. advances under the Obama administration. Even though the argument is a cogent argument, however, in Toulmin's Model (1958), this argument cannot be mentioned as 'a strong argument'. This argument only contains of the primary elements without the addition of backing, rebuttal and qualifiers. In other words, in Toulmin's Method 'a strong argument' is not only *cogent*, but also *need to be sound and valid*.

Therefore, not every argument in a form of deductive argument is 'a strong argument' according to the Toulmin's Argumentation Model (1958). In conclusion, the type of argument does not indicate the strengths of arguments in Toulmin's Model of Argumentation.

## 5.2 Suggestion

This study presents the answers regarding the research problems. The study, however, can raise numerous questions requiring further research. Future research can enrich the data by using any other data sources. The observation proved two different levels of arguments strength among the two American presidential candidates 2012, Barack Obama and Mitt Romney, with the results of studies that proves Obama's argumentation is stronger than Romney. However, the studies using different data will also yield different outcomes. By limitations that have been determined, this study is not a benchmark in assessing the credibility and personality of someone or anything personal. The study only provides steps in measuring argument strength in a specified time and context. To

conduct research related to the credibility, in-depth study is required along with the large amount of data.