



Implementing Toulmin's Argument Patterns from Shark Tank Global YouTube into the Creation of Data-Driven Negotiation Templates

Fitri Handayani¹, Silvia Djonnaidi², Novi Fitria³

Politeknik Negeri Padang^{1,2,3}

Email: fitrihandayani151203@gmail.com¹, silviadjonnaidi83@gmail.com², novipeto@pnp.ac.id³

ABSTRACT

This study aims to identify the components of Toulmin's Argument Pattern (TAP) that appear in successful negotiations on the American edition of Shark Tank on YouTube and to translate the findings into a Data-Driven Negotiation Template (DDNT) for Indonesian entrepreneurs. Using a descriptive qualitative design, sixteen negotiation transcripts from Season 16 that ended in an agreement were coded into six Toulmin components: claim, data, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal. The results show that Data was the most dominant component (47.9%), followed by Claim (18.7%) and Warrant (13.2%), while Backing (8.2%), Qualifier (6.3%), and Rebuttal (5.4%) appeared more selectively depending on context. These frequencies became the basis for arranging the DDNT, a six-template product that provides ready-to-use sentence patterns for each component, ordered from the most to the least dominant. The findings suggest that persuading international investors depends less on English fluency than on the ability to present quantitative evidence and connect it logically to claims, offering a practical communication tool for Indonesian entrepreneurs seeking foreign funding.

Keywords: *toulmin's argument pattern; negotiation; shark tank; data-driven negotiation template; business communication*

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship requires the ability to convert resources into new and creative business opportunities (Ratten, 2023), and among its stages, opportunity exploitation is the most crucial because it depends on securing funding (Dlamini & Botha, 2023). Obtaining funding from domestic or foreign investors increasingly requires strong communication skills, particularly in English (Azad et al., 2025). However, English fluency alone is not sufficient; international investors expect arguments that are logically structured and supported by data (Kalvapalle & Phillips, 2024). Indonesian entrepreneurs in particular often struggle to convince international investors, not because their business ideas are weak, but because their communication lacks clear, data-based argumentation (Akfan, 2025).

Toulmin's Argument Pattern (TAP), which analyzes arguments through six components—claim, data, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal—offers a framework for understanding how persuasive arguments are constructed. Although TAP has been widely applied in academic and political discourse (Turós, 2025; Supardi & Sayogie, 2022), it has rarely been examined in real, high-stakes business negotiations, and its findings have not

been translated into a practical, ready-to-use format for entrepreneurs. This gap motivated the present study to analyze successful negotiations on the American edition of Shark Tank on YouTube and to design a Data-Driven Negotiation Template (DDNT) that Indonesian entrepreneurs can use directly.

This study addresses two research questions: (1) what components of Toulmin's Argument Pattern appear in negotiations that resulted in an agreement between entrepreneurs and investors on the American edition of Shark Tank; and (2) how can a Data-Driven Negotiation Template be designed and produced based on those components. Accordingly, this study aims to identify the TAP components found in successful Shark Tank negotiations and to design and produce a DDNT for Indonesian entrepreneurs based on those findings.

METHOD

This study used a descriptive qualitative design, which requires the researcher to stay close to the data and group information into themes rather than applying heavy interpretation (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). This design was chosen because the study aims to identify and categorize the Toulmin components found in negotiation transcripts and to translate the categorization directly into a Data-Driven Negotiation Template.

The primary data consisted of transcripts of negotiations taken from the official Shark Tank Global YouTube channel, while secondary data included literature on business communication and document design, particularly Bovée and Thill (2021). Videos were drawn from Season 16 and selected using the following criteria: uploaded on the official channel, part of the American edition, ending with a confirmed deal, containing the full negotiation segment (Presentation, Q&A, and Negotiation phases), featuring a single entrepreneur, and conducted entirely in English. This process yielded sixteen transcripts.

Data analysis followed three stages. First, in data collection, each video was watched repeatedly and transcribed into Microsoft Word. Second, in data classification, each sentence was coded using Toulmin's six categories (C for claim, D for data, W for warrant, B for backing, Q for qualifier, and R for rebuttal). Third, in data analysis, the coded data were examined to identify patterns in the English phrases and sentence structures used by successful entrepreneurs. The resulting patterns then informed the four stages of DDNT development: concept, content development, and visual design and layout, which applied an 11-point Calibri font and a user-friendly instructional format based on Bovée and Thill's (2021) business communication principles.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Of 63 videos available on the American edition of Shark Tank on YouTube, sixteen met the selection criteria and covered a range of products in food, clothing, health, and technology. Analysis of these transcripts identified 219 coded utterances distributed across the six Toulmin components, as summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Toulmin Components Across 16 Transcripts**

Toulmin Component	Code	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)	Dominant Phase	Template
Data	D	105	47.9%	Q&A	Template 1
Claim	C	41	18.7%	Presentation	Template 2
Warrant	W	29	13.2%	Presentation	Template 3
Backing	B	18	8.2%	Q&A	Template 4
Qualifier	Q	14	6.3%	Q&A	Template 5
Rebuttal	R	12	5.4%	Negotiation	Template 6
Total	-	219	100%	-	-

Data was the most frequent component (105 occurrences, 47.9%), typically appearing as figures, percentages, and metrics such as revenue, user numbers, and production costs, mostly in the Question and Answer (Q&A) and Presentation phases. Claim followed with 41 occurrences (18.7%), commonly expressed through statements such as positioning the product as the best or the solution to a problem, appearing mainly in the Presentation and Q&A phases. Warrant appeared 29 times (13.2%), typically linking data to claims through explanations of how the business model works, while the three optional components—Backing (18 occurrences, 8.2%), Qualifier (14 occurrences, 6.3%), and Rebuttal (12 occurrences, 5.4%)—appeared more selectively, generally to build credibility, hedge projections, or respond to counteroffers.

Together, Data, Claim, and Warrant accounted for 79.2% of all coded utterances, confirming their status as the core components of an argument according to Toulmin (2003), while Backing, Qualifier, and Rebuttal functioned as optional components that appeared only when the negotiation context required them. This pattern indicates that in high-stakes business negotiations, investors are persuaded more by quantitative evidence connected logically to claims than by claims alone.

These frequencies directly shaped the design of the Data-Driven Negotiation Template (DDNT). Because Data was the most dominant component, Template 1 was developed as the most detailed section, offering a range of sentence structures for presenting quantitative evidence such as sales figures, unit economics, and growth metrics. Template 2 (Claim) accommodates the dynamic role of claims, which appear not only at the start of a presentation but also throughout the negotiation as counteroffers and deal-closing statements. Template 3 (Warrant) guides entrepreneurs to connect their data to their claims through concise personal narratives rather than formal logical statements, while Templates 4 to 6 provide supporting sentence patterns for Backing, Qualifier, and Rebuttal, arranged by their frequency of occurrence. Each template presents an original sentence pattern alongside an

editable version marked with brackets so that entrepreneurs can insert their own business information without altering the underlying language structure.

These findings extend the application of Toulmin's Argument Pattern beyond academic and political discourse (Turós, 2025; Supardi & Sayogie, 2022) into real, high-stakes oral business negotiations, enriching the theoretical understanding of how genre and context shape the use of Toulmin's components. Practically, the findings indicate that the most critical skill for Indonesian entrepreneurs seeking foreign funding is not English fluency itself but the ability to present data clearly, formulate precise claims, and connect them through logical warrants—skills that the DDNT is designed to train directly.

CONCLUSION

This study identified the components of Toulmin's Argument Pattern in sixteen successful negotiation transcripts from Shark Tank Season 16 and translated the findings into a Data-Driven Negotiation Template for Indonesian entrepreneurs. Data (47.9%), Claim (18.7%), and Warrant (13.2%) emerged as the three dominant components, while Backing (8.2%), Qualifier (6.3%), and Rebuttal (5.4%) appeared more selectively depending on the negotiation context. These findings indicate that in high-stakes business negotiations, investors are persuaded more by clear quantitative evidence connected logically to claims than by claims presented without data support.

The frequency of each component directly informed the structure of the DDNT, with templates arranged from the most to the least dominant component, providing entrepreneurs with a concrete, ready-to-use sentence framework. Overall, this study contributes theoretically by extending Toulmin's Argument Pattern to the domain of oral business negotiation, and practically by offering Indonesian entrepreneurs, particularly at Politeknik Negeri Padang, a structured tool to prepare more persuasive presentations for international investors. Future research is recommended to expand the data to other seasons or versions of Shark Tank, to compare successful and unsuccessful negotiations, and to test the effectiveness of the DDNT directly with local entrepreneurs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the advisors and the Department of English, Politeknik Negeri Padang, for their guidance and support throughout the completion of this research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akfan, S. S. (2025). English communication challenges among Indonesian entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Communication Studies*, 4(1), 39–51.
- Azad, D. M. A. K., Nidhya, G. S., Upadhyay, D. M., Dwivedi, D. P. K., Sharma, D. N., & Sazzad, D. M. (2025). Impact of English language communication on attracting global investors in financial sectors. *International Journal of Finance Communication*, 35(2), 2603–2609.



- Băiaș, C.-C. (2025). Analysis and evaluation of Toulmin's model of practical argumentation. *Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timișoara, Transactions on Modern Languages*.
- Boulton, T. J., Shohfi, T. D., & Zhu, P. (2018). Angels or sharks? The role of personal characteristics in angel investment decisions. *Journal of Small Business Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jsbm.12409>
- Bovée, C. L., & Thill, J. V. (2021). *Business communication today* (15th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dlamini, M., & Botha, M. (2023). Entrepreneurial intention and the three stages of entrepreneurial action: A process approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1184390>
- Ermawati, Y. (2024). Entrepreneurial finance strategies for startup success. *Advances in Economics & Financial Studies*, 2, 67–75. <https://doi.org/10.60079/aefts.v2i2.283>
- Haltiwanger, J. (2022). Entrepreneurship in the twenty-first century. *Small Business Economics*, 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-021-00542-0>
- Jetter, M., & Stockley, K. (2023). Gender match and negotiation: Evidence from angel investment on Shark Tank. *Empirical Economics*, 64(4), 1947–1977. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00181-022-02305-6>
- Kalvapalle, S. A. I. G., & Phillips, N. (2024). Entrepreneurial pitching: A critical review and integrative framework. *Academy of Management Annals*, 18(2), 550–599.
- Keren, H. (2016). Women in the shark tank: Entrepreneurship and feminism in a neoliberal age. *Feminist Media Studies*, 75–123.
- Lewiński, M., & Mohammed, D. (2013). Argumentation in political deliberation. *Journal of Argumentation in Context*, 1, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jaic.2.1.00int>
- Novaes, C. D. (2022). Argument and argumentation. In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/argument/>
- Ratten, V. (2023). Entrepreneurship: Definitions, opportunities, challenges, and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Change*, 79–90. <https://doi.org/10.1002/joe.22217>
- Sundari, H., & Febriyanti, R. H. (2021). The analysis of Indonesian EFL argumentative writing using Toulmin's model: The structure and struggles from the learners. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 2, 67–78.

- Supardi, M., & Sayogie, F. (2022). The logical pattern of argument: A case study of national university debating championship. *Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 4(1), 65–76.
- Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The uses of argument* (Updated ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Turós, M., Kenyeres, A. Z., Balla, G., Gazdag, E., & Szabó, E. (2025). A Toulmin model analysis of student argumentation on artificial intelligence. *Journal of Educational Discourse*, 1–21.
- Yang, R. (2022). An empirical study of claims and qualifiers in ESL students' argumentative writing based on Toulmin model. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00133-w>