ABSTRACT

Analysis Construction of Argumentation in Presidential Debate at Forty-Fourth American Election (Barack Obama and John Mccain).


An argumentation is considered as practical of a discourse. Thus, it is the product of the hierarchical, situated sequence of utterance, indexical, propositional and illocutionary acts carried out in pursuit of some communicative goal. As the objective, an argumentation engages with language use and function. It works in how language applies in certain circumstance and pattern of language use raised in certain purpose. Since argumentation may be practised as written and spoken discourse, researcher focus on spoken argumentation construction which occurred in American Presidential Debate Forty-Fourth on this research. Therefore, the purpose of the research to describe about construction of argumentation, which functions of argument are applied and structures of the argument function created during the debate. The result of the research shows that those argument functions - raised in Stephan Toulmin’s Argumentation model - are not always occurred in an argumentation. Hence, the structure of an argumentation in the debate may be constructed by claim function and warrant function at least. Furthermore, warrant function occurred mostly in the argumentation. As spoken argumentation (debate) which is created spontaneously, warrant function become important because it is "common ground" of speaker and hearer.