THE FALLACY ANALYSIS OF THE PROGRAM
"WAKTU INDONESIA BERCANDA"

Martina Mulyani
STKIP Pasundan, Indonesia
Email: martinamulyani@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Recently, one of popular programs on TV is Waktu Indonesia Bercanda (WIB). It is a Quiz Show program that offers problems to solve and the host makes use fallacies as the core of its game. WIB offers the sense of achievement among its participants, but competitive atmosphere is hardly to find among them. This research tries to analyze the fallacies being used in WIB and figure out how such fallacies can encourage people to think critically. The research employs descriptive research design as it simply attempts to determine, describe or identify phenomena. 6 WIB from September through December were randomly selected as the subject of the research. The result shows that WIB demonstrates the use of fallacies of relevance but it avoids using argumentum ad hominem that contains personal attack. WIB may encourage the audiences and participants to think critically as fallacious arguments offered make the audiences work hard to think any possible implicatures. Eventually, WIB is the program that invites the participants and the viewers to think, evaluate and decide the answer or solution to the problem provided. In conclusion, WIB is a worth watching ShowQuiz as it is entertaining and encouraging its audience to think critically.

Keywords: *Fallacy, critical thinking, fallacious arguments*

INTRODUCTION

Recently, one private TV station has launched a new Quiz Show named "Waktu Indonesia Bercanda – WIB" (Indonesian Joking Time) hosted by Cak Lontong, a famous Comedian from East Java. It is a Quiz Show program which offers entertainment and enjoyment. In WIB or in any other Quiz Show the entertainment and enjoyment can be found anytime the host offers the questions or statement. However, in WIB, the host utilizes fallacy in his questions or statements within which the participants will feel the sense of achievement when they are able to answer or complete the statements. The fallacies uttered are often absurd so the contestants often feel upset, and they will state some spontaneous but comical comments which create laughter in the air.

Related to fallacy in entertainment program, this study is interested in finding out types of fallacies available in WIB and how the fallacies in WIB can encourage the contestant to be critical.

Entertainment and enjoyment seem to be the most popular program on TV. They are able to attract audiences and at the same time advertisement. Based on the result of some researchers, Norris and Colman (1994, p. 366) assert that either entertainment or enjoyment is an effective media for advertisement. It means entertainment and enjoyment are a kind of TV programs that enable the TV station to earn advertising revenue.

Entertainment and enjoyment may emerge in the form of shows including Quiz Show. Meriam and Webster dictionary defines Quiz show as an entertainment program (as on radio or television) in which contestants answer questions. On the other hand, Quiz Show according to Mason (2002) is a major television genre that is believed to be popular

and able to attract many viewers. Further, Quiz Show in Mason's opinion may mirror factual statements or issues relating to social understanding and personal experience. In other words, Quiz Show can be said as a fascinating program that provides not only entertainment but also education and information.

In Indonesia, a lot of Quiz Shows air in many TV station. One of Quiz Show programs that gains its fame recently is Waktu Indonesia Bercanda (WIB). The followings are the information related to WIB.

Waktu Indonesia Bercanda (WIB)

Recently, one private TV station has launched a new Quiz Show named "Waktu Indonesia Bercanda (Indonesian Joking Time). Waktu Indonesia bercanda or WIB is a new program presented by NET TV, a private TV station. This TV program is hosted by Cak Lontong, a famous Comics from East Java accompanied by Peppy and Ihsan Nur Akbar. WIB was started to release on 23 April 2016. It is a Quiz Show program which offers entertainment and enjoyment. According to Stern, et al (2001 as cited in Sperring and Strandvall, 2008) enjoyment or entertainment can be attained over the feeling of suspense, competitiveness, and achievement. In WIB, the entertainment and enjoyment can be found by audiences in all segments of WIB especially in TTS (Teka Teki Sulit) segment. In TTS participants compete to complete the crossword in which there are grids of squares and blank crossing vertically and horizontally by answering the questions or completing the statement given. The thing that makes WIB different from other quizshows is that WIB offers the sense of achievement among its participants, but competitive athmosphere is hardly to find among them, as Arie Keriting one of the participants of WIB once says that TTS is a weird game. He felt the sense of pleasure when his opponent was able to answer the question (see Netmediatama. 2016: Waktu Indonesia Bercanda - Keren! Tim Pak Djarot Sukses Jawab Pertanyaan TTS (2/4) min. 6:11) or the presenter, Nabila, in WIB on 18 September 2016, asserts that it is only on WIB, the two teams who compete in the game support one to another (Metmediatama. 2016. Waktu Indonesia Bercanda - Peppy Berhasil Jawab TTS, Arie Untung Ikutan Heboh. Min. 1:51).

With respect to problems creation, the host of WIB makes use the statements or questions that may raise diverse answers, create confoundments among participants and appeal to emotion. Such statements may be known as fallacy that will be explained in the section to come.

Fallacy

Fallacy according to Cummings (2005, p. 165) is commonly used to describe a belief or opinion that is generally accepted even though, it lacks of accurate basis in fact. In similar vein, Kip Wheeler in his article on the handlist of fallacies defines fallacies as statement that might sound reasonable or true but are actually flawed or dishonest. Wheeler classifies fallacy as false line of reasoning that can be used as self- defense in debate. It means fallacy is a statement or argument that contains false reasoning as it lacks of accurate bases.

The types of fallacies that seem to be used generally in entertainment is Red Herring. Walton assert that red herring is tricky that is why it is often used in entertainment. Walton (2015, p. 72) points out that red herring belongs to fallacy of relevance. It is a fallacy resulted from shifting the topic of discussion to some other issues that may be entertaining, or distracting the attention of the listener or reader from the original subject. Further discussion will talk about fallacies of relevance.

Fallacies of relevance

Kip Wheller in his essay on "Logical Fallacies Handlist" formulates Fallacies of relevance as fallacies that appeal to evidence or examples irrelevant to argument at hand. The followings are references of fallacies of relevance from Kip Wheeler modified by H.O Meare are as follows:

1. Appeal to Force (*Argumentum Ad Baculum* or the "Might-Makes-Right" Fallacy: This of argument uses force, the threat force, or some other unpleasant backlash to make the audience accept a conclusion.

2. *Genetic Fallacy*: The claim that an idea, product, or person must be untrustworthy because of its racial, geographic, or ethnic origin.

3. *Personal Attack* (*Argumentum Ad Hominem*, literally, "argument toward the man.") Attacking or praising the people who make an argument, rather than discussing the argument itself.

4. *Argumentum ad Populum* (Literally "Argument to the People"): Using an appeal to popular assent, often by arousing the feelings and enthusiasm of the multitude rather than building an argument. There are three basic approaches related to this fallacy:
   a. *Bandwagon Approach*: "Everybody is doing it." This *argumentum ad populum* asserts that, since the majority of people believes an argument or chooses a particular course of action, the argument must be true.
   b. *Patriotic Approach*: "Draping oneself in the flag." This argument asserts that a certain stance is true or correct because it is somehow patriotic, and that those who disagree are unpatriotic. It overlaps with *ethos* and *argumentum ad hominem* to a certain extent.
   c. *Snob Approach*: This type of *argumentum ad populum* doesn't assert "everybody is doing it," but rather that "all the best people are doing it."

5. Appeal to Tradition (*Argumentum ad Traditionem*): This line of thought asserts that a premise must be true because people have always believed it or done it.

6. Appeal to Improper Authority (*Argumentum Ad Verecundium*, literally "argument from that which is improper"): An appeal to an improper authority, such as a famous person or a source that may not be reliable.

7. Appeal to Emotion: (*Argumentum Ad Misericordiam*, literally, "argument from pity"): An improper emotional appeal concerning what should be a logical issue during a debate. (Pathosis appropriate for inspiring justified outrage or concern, but not as a diversion from a rational argument).

8. Argument from Adverse Consequences: Asserting that an argument must be false because its being true would create negative results.

9. Argument from Personal Incredulity: Asserting that opponent's argument must be false because you personally don't understand it.

Argument and Critical Thinking

Fallacy is another form of argument (LaBossiere, 2002, 2010 p. 2). An argument basically consists of two or more premises lead to a conclusion. Wilfrid (2009) clarifies that a coherent argument requires a relevant premise and conclusion. Deciding whether the argument is coherent or incoherent encourages the audience to think critically.

Critical Thinking can be defined as thinking that explicitly aims at well-founded judgments and hence it utilizes appropriate evaluative standard in the attempt to determine the true worth, merit and value of something (Paul et al as 1995, 2015)

In similar vein, Wood, (2002) defines Critical Thinking as the process of using reasoning to discern what is true, and what is false, in the phrases and "sound bites" we hear every day.

Based on the definition provided by the scholars, the study takes into account some strategies that encourage critical thinking. They are teaching critical thinking explicitly by giving real example, explaining the example or argument as clearly as possible to enable the audiences to judge or to evaluate the argument or the example, and letting the audience to identify and determine the true worth, merit, and value of something

In relation to critical thinking and WIB, the host of WIB utilizes arguments as a core of its game, a game in WIB, and lets the audience identify the arguments, decide the answer and evaluate whether the arguments presented are coherent or incoherent.

METHOD

The study is a descriptive research. It is a research that may be characterized as simply a the attempt to determine, describe or identify phenomena (Ethridge, D.E. 2004) as cited in (Duvovsky, 2016). In this case, the study will describe and identify the red herring fallacies available in WIB by synchronizing the argument or the statement offered in the Quiz Show with types of red herring fallacies explained in the literature review part of the paper. In addition, it will be analyzed the way the "argument" encourages the audience to think critically by holding the semantic or syntactical analysis.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The result of the fallacy analysis in WIB demonstrate that WIB depicts

1. ***Argumentum Ad Populum with bandwagon approach*** which can be found in the following utterance:
   Q: Kampung rambutan, cililitan, lebak bulus adalah nama apa pak?
   A: Nama terkenal
   Reason: While diverting to audience, the host states...
   "Anda semua tahu Kampung rambutan, cililitan, lebak bulus kan?..Nah berarti itu terkenal. "

Clearly found in the conversation that the host switched the subject from " name of stations in Jakarta" to the phrase "Anda semua tahu" or "everybody knows". The host represented the phrase "the majority of people" which means he utilizes badwagon approach to prove that his argument saying that "Kampung rambutan, cililitan, lebak bulus adalah nama terkenal" is true. (WIB on 27 November 2016)

2. ***Appeal to adverse consequence***: Asserting that an argument must be false because its truth would create negative results.
   Q: Ada 3 orang, Mamat, Budi dan Wawan. Mamat itu penjual buah, Budi penjual baju, Wawan penjual parfum. Suatuhari, ada satpol PP melakukan penertiban. Siapa diantara ketiga orang tersebut yang tidak ditangkap?
   A: tidak ada yang tertangkap karena memang mereka tidak sedang jualan hari itu. Argument: the three sellers who are not selling anything on that day will not be arrested. In this argument, the host uses two differeent premises

   Premise A: There are three sellers, Mamat, Budi and Wawan
   Premise B: Public Order Agency Officer (Satpol PP) are conducting sweeping
   Using these two different premises, the host does not mean to build the argument well. This argument implies that the host does not use dictionary meaning of word: seller: someone who sells" instead he utilizes *argument from adverse*

consequences by argueing that a seller is not holding any action of selling when the sweeping takes place. (WIB on 27 November 2016)

3. **Argumentum ad Populum with patriotic approach**: (Literally "Argument to the People"): Using an appeal to popular assent, often by arousing the feelings and enthusiasm of the multitude rather than building an argument. This argument asserts that a certain stance is true or correct because it is somehow patriotic, and that those who disagree are unpatriotic.
Q: Biasa digunakan untuk menyalakan dan mematikan TV
A: kata "Tolong"
Argument: use the word "*tolong*" or "please" if one asks for helps from others no matter who he/she is whether he /she is younger or helper. (WIB on 5 December 2016).

The argument shows that the host uses *Argumentum ad Populum* with patriotic approach as he does not build argument instead referring a certain recommendation for those who need helps from others.

4. **Appeal to Tradition** (*Argumentum ad Traditionem*): This line of thought asserts that a premise must be true because people have always believed it or done it
Q: Saat Tujuh Belasan anak-anak dikompleks ikutan balap.....
A: Kalung
Argument: in our childhood when someone asked us what competition we joined in Independence Day game, we would answer "Balap kalung, Om". It occurred that way as a child still could not articulate sound "r" well consequently he/she would pronounce sound "r" into "el", instead of "er".

Looking at the argument, the study infers that the host resorts to traditional belief that children are always unable to articulate sound "r" well (WIB on 5 December 2016)

5. **Appeal to Force** (*Argumentum Ad Baculum* or the "Might-Makes-Right" Fallacy): This argument uses force, the threat of force, or some other unpleasant backlash to make the audience accept a conclusion. The host makes use this fallacy in the following statement:
Q: Dibutuhkan untuk menarik gerbong kereta api

Kuat gak lo Argument: The statement *"Dibutuhkan untuk menarik gerbong kereta api"* is similar to job vacancy stating *"Dibutuhkan untuk tenaga administrasi"*. So, the premise given to the reader is *"lo kuat gak"*. It means if you are strong you may apply for a job.

Like other fallacies catered by the host, this argument also implies fallacies of relevance. The host seems to be able to give a stance by creating an analogy of job vacancy which often use the opening "*Dibutuhkan untuk ....*" and the topic about job vacancy will raise comment whether one meets the requirement. *The fallacy appeal to force* can be found in the comment "*kuat gak Lo*". As the meaning may be „if you do not have power to push the carriage you had better not apply for the job but you may apply for a job but if you are strong enough".

6. **Argumentum Ad Populum with Snob approach** can be found in the following conversation:
Q: Yang mengatur pertandingan sepak bola?
A: Waktu

Argument: "Time" hold essential role in a match. Even, a referee is ruled by the "time" (WIB on 18 December 2016). In this fallacious argument, the host of WIB demonstrates his ability in using Argumentum Ad Populum with Snob approach. He used the word "even referee ..." to point out that it is not "all everybody" but rather that "people in position".

7. ***Argument from personal incredulity.*** The host utilizes this type of fallacy in this following statement:

"Jakarta katanya identik dengan macet, saya tidak percaya 100%. Karena saya juga sudah lebih dari 10 tahun tinggal di Jakarta, pengalamansaya jam1 jam2 malam saya gak pernah lihat Jakarta macet."

In this fallacious argument, the host claims that the premise saying that Jakarta is identical with traffic jam is false as he personally never experiences the congested traffic of Jakarta after mid night. The statement given by the host appears to follow the principle of argument from personal incredulity as he pretends not to be able to comprehend the meaning and the matter that causes road to be congested.

Encouraging Critical thinking

WIB is an entertaining program that requires its participant to think hard. One of the regular participants said that he has prepared his mind in order to be ready to face the questions provided by the host (min 7:48). It occurs that way because the host always offers challenging questions to answer, and often gives confounding but astonishing explanation. However, the good thing from WIB is the program invites the participants and audience to think about any possible answers, to evaluate the answer given, and to decide if they are able to accept the fallacious argument presented. As a Quiz Show, such actions that may boost the audiences. Critical thinking can be found in all segment of WIB. The example can be found the following script:

Q   : Saat Tujuh Belasan anak-anak dikompleks ikutan balap.....
Bedu Cs: karung (it is a wrong answer)
(Bedu CS decided to choose this answer as they thought that "karung" is proper answer to the question. Unfortunately, the answer was wrong, the other group thought other possible answers)
Arie Cs: Jangan (wrong)
(Arie Cs thought in different way. They chose "jangan" for the answer as it refers to word "balap or race")
which sounds dangerous. So, the premise may go this way:
"Saat 17 an anak-anak di kompleks jangan ikutan balap".
The answer: Kalung

When the audience ask for the reason of the answer, the host pointed out that balap karung is carried out by both adult and children. Then he directed the audience to the word "anak-anak or children" with which he used the word "anak-anak or children" without no reason. Children have difficulty in pronuncing soun"r" so instead of „karung", kids will pronunce „kalung". Although the answer reveals the fallacy that Appeal to Tradition (*Argumentum ad Traditionem*), yet the argument still sounds acceptable.

CONCLUSION

The result of the study shows that WIB is a Quiz Show that makes use fallacy for its entertainment. The strength of the program is that from 6 episodes of WIB being analyzed, the program seems to avoid using argumentum ad hominem that contains

personal attack. The amusing part comes when the fallacious arguments offered make the audiences work hard to think any possible implicatures. For short, with its red herring fallacy, the program invites the participants and the viewers to think, evaluate and decide the answer or solution to the problem provided. Eventually, WIB is a worth watching ShowQuiz as it is entertaining and encouraging its audience to think critically.

REFERENCES

Sperring, S., & Strandvall, T. (2008). Viewers" Experiences of a TV Quiz Show with Integrated Interactivity. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction, 24*(2), 214–235. http://doi.org/10.1080/10447310701821590

Norris, C. E., & Colman, A. M. (1994). Effects of Entertainment and Enjoyment of Television Programs on Perception and Memory of Advertisements. Social Behavior & Personality: *An International Journal, 22*(4), 1–15. http://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1994.22.4.365

Marriam Webster Dictionary. (2015). Web Version. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com

Mason,V. (2012). *What can we learn from Television Quizzes*. http://ltsc.ph-karlsruhe.de/Mason.pdf

Tyler, T. (2010). Why Do People Cooperate? In *JSTOR*. Princeton. Retrieved from http://press.princeton.edu/chapters/s9338.pdf

Cummings, L. (2005). *Pragmatics: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. New Jersey: Lawrence, Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Walton, D. (2004). Classification of Fallacies of Relevance. *Informal Logic, 24*(1), 183–185. Retrieved from http://ojs.uwindsor.ca/ojs/leddy/index.php/informal_logic/article/view/2133

LaBossiere, M. (2002, 2010). *42 Fallacies*. Retrieved from https://aphilosopher.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/42-fallacies.pdf

Laurier, W. (2009). *Critical Thinking Strategies*. Retrieved from https://web.wlu.ca/learning_resources/pdfs/Critical_Thinking_Strategies.pdf

Paul, R., Elder, L., & Bartell, T. (1995). *Study of 38 Public Universities and 28 Private Universities To Determine Faculty Emphasis on Critical Thinking In Instruction*

Keriting, A. Netmediatama. (2016) 10 December. *Waktu Indonesia Bercanda - Keren! Tim Pak Djarot Sukses Jawab Pertanyaan TTS (2/4)*. Indonesia. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=esbePom0kbs

Putri, N. Metmediatama. (2016). 18 September. *Waktu Indonesia Bercanda - Peppy Berhasil Jawab TTS. Arie Untung Ikutan Heboh. Retrieved from* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TRm3doHRoMk&t=19s

WIB, Netmediatama. (2016). 27 November. At https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nCWSTMmvfsc

WIB, Netmediatama. (2016). 5 December. At https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=33mib4F94oA

WIB, Netmediatama. (2016). 18 December. At https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vO94j_uvUtA

WIB, Netmediatama. (2016). 16 October. At https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aImNZgjNA70