



Tendencies of Argumentative Claim Types of Indonesian Academic Writers

Yuliana Setyaningsih*, R. Kunjana Rahardi

Sanata Dharma University

*Corresponding author. Email: yuliapbsi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The structure of the argument is never separated from the identity of the claim of the argument used by the author. The type of claim is truly determined by the understanding of the nature of the argumentative construction claim and the author's awareness to use the argumentative claim in academic writing. This study aims to describe the tendency of using types of claims by Indonesian academic writers. To achieve the research objectives, two problem formulations were formulated, namely: (1) How is the tendency to use types of claims by Indonesian writers in academic writing? (2) What are the determinants of the tendency to use types of claims by Indonesian writers in academic writing? This study uses a mixed approach. Argumentative claims in research papers written by Indonesian researchers and published in journals were collected. A questionnaire was also administered to describe the tendency of using claims. The data were analyzed by applying the content analysis method and the descriptive statistic technique. Findings revealed five types of claims made by Indonesian writers, including argumentative claims based on expert opinions, analogy, precedent, hypotheses, and cause-and-effect. The pattern of the author's claim tendencies was also supported by quantitative findings.

Keywords: *Academic writing, Argumentative claims, Arguments.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Argumentation is an integral part of one's life. Whether we realize it or not, everyone must present an argument in their daily life with each other in social life. It may be that the argument is conveyed orally, or it may be that the argument is expressed in writing through the vehicle of scientific writing in various manifestations. Arguments cannot be separated from the language, culture, and community entities that accommodate the language and culture. The relationship between language and language and culture is like a two-sided coin. Likewise, the relationship between language and society is just like the coin-coin metaphor presented above.

Chaika (1982) asserts that language is a mirror of the society in which it is built. As a mirror of society, the dimensions contained in the language are manifested in the people who have that language. In Halliday's (1978) perspective, language is actually the symbols of social semiotics. There are various manifestations of symbols, whether they are in nature as icons or indexes that reflect the society, and all of them can be seen in the language entities used by the

community members (Gualberto & Kress, 2019). If language is understood as a mirror of society and its culture, in fact language cannot be separated from the individuals contained in that society and culture. It is the collection of individuals that forms a social community, and which has now shifted into a virtual community.

In the perspective of Sapir and Whorf, language, culture, and society influence each other (Kay & Kempto, 1984). There are influences that are seen as a weak version, and some are seen as a strong version. Then the Sapir and Whorf hypothesis recognizes two types of dimensions, namely that one relationship is only influential, and the other type of relationship is decisive. In this regard, as has been stated in the previous section, the actual argument cannot be separated from the culture and society in which it is built.

Lately, the number of languages that exist in the archipelago is becoming less and less. Among the languages that still survive, there is a diversity of arguments in them. The dimensions of argumentation are varied, but in this study, arguments within the

framework of specific cultures will only describe the tendency towards the use of the types of position statements or claims of these arguments.

This research will focus on the tendency to use different types of arguments based on various cultural backgrounds of argumentative writers. The assumption used in the implementation of this research is the Sapir and Whorf hypothesis which asserts that language is influenced or even determined by the society and culture that is the container of that language.

Therefore, it is also assumed in this study that the types of arguments used by writers with different social and cultural backgrounds will also be manifested in the types of arguments used when they make scientific arguments. The focus of the study is only on written arguments, especially in scientific essays.

Taking into account the theoretical perspective and assumptions presented in the foregoing section, the study aims to answer two research questions: (1) What is the trend towards the use of types of position statements by writers of scientific articles in Indonesia? (2) What are the determinants of the use of types of position statements by writers of scientific articles in Indonesia? Thus, the objectives of this study are to describe the trend towards the use of the types of position statements of the writers of scientific essays in Indonesia and to describe the determinants of the use of types of position statements by writers of scientific articles in Indonesia.

2. METHOD

This study uses a mixed approach using scientific texts in various journal which contain the argumentative claims and quantitative analysis to describe the tendency to use types of claims in argumentative writing. To obtain the first type of data, scientific texts from Indonesian writers are needed, while for the second type, a Likert scale questionnaire instrument is needed to describe the tendency of using claims. Data were analyzed by applying content analysis method and descriptive statistics.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *Argumentative Claims Based on Expert Opinions*

The statement of position or claim is the most important part of argumentative writing. Claims are a determinant of whether an article can be called argumentative writing or not. From the research that has been done, it is found that argumentative claims are based on the opinion of experts. So different from the expert opinion as a warrant which is used to support the author's subjective claim, the expert opinion as a claim

is not intended to support the author's claim but instead is used as the formulation of the claim itself.

Expert opinion arguments are also called authority arguments (Keraf, 2007; Rybacki & Rybacki, 1996). The findings from the current study have found that the use of this type of claim is quite dominant. This is in line with the findings of Setyaningsih (2016) and Ambon (2018). In CAPP1, the claim formulated by the author is an expert opinion type claim. This author places the views of Mbetse (2009) as a claim placed at the beginning of the paragraph. By basing on these claims, then the construction of the argument continues with the following sections of the argument. In order to take a closer look at this type of claim, Data 1: CAPP1 below needs further scrutiny.

Data 1: CAPP1

Ecolinguistics is a discipline that studies language and its environment and juxtaposes ecology with linguistics (Mbetse, 2009). In 1970, the term ecology of language was first introduced by Haugen. Haugen in Suktiningsih said, "Ecology of language may be defined as the study of interactions between any given language and its environment" (Suktiningsih, 2016). The ecology of language in Haugen's expression can be interpreted as the interaction or relationship of a particular language and its environment, both the social environment and the natural environment. In this study, linguistic ecology is referred to as environmental linguistics which is defined by Louis and Calvet as a science related to language and its environment.

Claims based on expert opinion can also be seen in Data2: CAPP2 snippet. In the argumentative construction, the expert view that is used as the basis for the claim reads, "Qualitative research according to Sudaryanto (2015, p.15) is research that is solely based on existing facts or phenomena that empirically live in the speakers so that the resulting or recorded data are Just the way you are."

Furthermore, there are a number of expert views quoted by the author, namely the views of Spradley (2007) and so on. The difference between the expert's view and the expert's view stated at the beginning of the paragraph is in its function, namely as a warrant, not as a claim in the argumentative writing. To examine this further, readers are welcome to carefully read the following snippet of Data2: CAPP2.

Data 2: CAPP2

Qualitative research according to Sudaryanto (2015:15) is research that is solely based on existing facts or phenomena that empirically live on in the speakers so that what is produced or recorded is in the form of data as it is. Meanwhile, qualitative research using ethnographic methods according to Spradley (2007: 3)

is research that aims to understand a view of life from the point of view of the natives. The essence of ethnography is an effort to pay attention to the meanings of actions from events that are expressed directly in language and among the meanings received, many of which are conveyed not directly through words, but also actions (Spradley, 2007: 5). Based on the view of James P. Spradley, the data in this study were obtained through words and actions. The research data in the form of actions are obtained from body movements when playing the game of *cublak-cublak suweng*, while the research data is in the form of words, namely song lyrics in the game that show the value of local wisdom. Data were collected by interviewing data collection methods regarding the values of local wisdom contained in the game and through observation to find out how to play and body movements that appear during the game.

In CAPP2 data, the opinion of James P. Spradley became the basis for researchers to obtain data. This is because Spradley is an expert in the field of ethnography. Initially, the researcher wanted to obtain data in the form of movement. In order to make the claim of the data acquisition argument stronger, the researcher uses Spradley's opinion and this opinion can be seen at the end of the paragraph which reads, "The essence of ethnography is an attempt to pay attention to the meanings of actions from events that are expressed directly in language and among the meanings received, many conveyed not directly through words, but also actions." Therefore, the expert opinion becomes a strong basis for the author to obtain data in the form of body movements.

3.2. Analogy-Based Argumentative Claims

Argumentative claims based on analogy or analogy-based place the association of certain things to make an analogy with something that is to be explained in the claim. By utilizing this analogy, it is hoped that the reader's understanding will become easier because something that is used to make an analogy must be easy for the reader to understand. An example is the analogy of the Covid-19 virus with illustrations of jagged circles that are ready to injure any organs of the body they are subjected to.

In making analogy-based arguments, a similar method is also used to make it easier for readers to grasp the claims to be argued. In Data 3: CADA1, this analogy is conveyed by short story writers in writing stories that are related to environmental damage in a green literature perspective. This is intended to explain concrete facts about natural damage in Indonesia which is manifested in many facts such as mining exploitation, tree cutting, water pollution, air pollution, coral reef destruction, hunting for endangered animals, and waste that causes flooding.

Analogy-based arguments such as those presented above are very useful for conveying arguments about something that is not easily understood. By utilizing the analogy with the particular object, the reader will be greatly helped to understand it. Data Snippet 3: CADA1 below makes this clear.

Data 3: CADA1

The short story writers who pass by in Indonesian newspapers still pay attention to environmental issues in writing their short stories. This can be seen from the results of research that succeeded in finding short stories with descriptions of natural damage and green behavior. The types of natural damage described in the short story include issues of mining exploitation, tree cutting, water pollution, air pollution, coral reef destruction, hunting for endangered animals, and waste that causes flooding. The description of the environmental damage is given as an effort to build the reader's awareness of Indonesia's current natural conditions.

3.3. Precedent-Based Argumentative Claims

Precedent-based argumentative claims are part of a group of arguments based on the testimony of a witness. In assessing the truth or untruth of a witness's opinion, an investigator must have the belief that he has built beforehand. That is what is meant by precedent, both good and bad, both convincing and doubting. Argumentative claims based on these precedents will guide the writer to be critical in finding the facts that will be obtained to support his claims so that these claims will eventually be elaborated and detailed carefully.

In Data 4: CAPT1, the author's claim is contained in a statement that reads, "In other words, the development of critical thinking ability test instruments is minimally carried out within the scope of Indonesian language subjects." The author's claim is based on previous studies which then become precedents that are built in the author, and then become a reference for research conducted by researchers. Further Data4: The following CAPT1 needs to be read carefully to understand this type of claim better.

Data 4: CAPT1

There are several studies that have developed instruments to measure critical thinking skills. Sabekti and Khoirunnisa (2018) have developed an instrument to measure the critical thinking ability of high school students in chemistry subjects. Pradana et al. (2017) in his research has developed a critical thinking ability test instrument for students majoring in Physics. In addition, Amalia and Susilaningsih (2014) developed a critical thinking ability test in the form of a description on acid-base material and Jazuli and Wardani (2015)

developed an instrument in the form of a description test on science subjects at the junior high school level. These previous studies have something in common, namely the development of critical thinking ability test instruments carried out within the scope of science subjects, be it Biology, Physics, or Chemistry. In other words, the development of critical thinking ability test instruments is minimally carried out within the scope of Indonesian language subjects. On the other hand, the development of the critical thinking ability test instrument was carried out with high school students as subjects, while it was minimal for elementary students. The lack of an instrument for measuring critical thinking skills with Indonesian language substance for elementary school students causes the availability of literature on the level of students' critical thinking skills is also getting less and less.

3.4. Claims Arguments from Hypotheses

Precedent-based argumentative claims are part of a group of arguments based on the testimony of a witness. In assessing the truth or untruth of a witness's opinion, an investigator must have the belief that he has built beforehand. That is what is meant by precedent, both good and bad, both convincing and doubting. A hypothesis is an initial conclusion that must be compiled and formulated based on facts. Thus, in relation to argumentative writing, it can be said that the real hypothesis is the initial assumptions held by the author.

Departing from these initial assumptions, further details of the argument follow the claims that have been submitted. Another thing to note is that the hypothesis is also used to test the validity of a statement so that the statement can later be scientific and valid (Nesi & Iku, 2021, p.45). The hypothesis is tested with certain statistical formulas so that the results are rejected or accepted.

In Data 5: CADH1, the argumentative claims based on the hypothesis are claims that have been tested through the results of statistical calculations that have been carried out by the author. The author states that student learning outcomes given the circuit learning model are higher than students given the concept learning model and have a positive influence on the ability to write explanatory texts. This claim is also seen in the calculation results presented by the author. In order to better understand the types of hypothesis-based argumentative claims, the following Data5: CADH1 needs to be examined further.

Data 5: CADH1

Then tested the hypothesis for learning outcomes by using the t test. After testing the learning outcomes data, it turns out that the test results for the level of $\alpha = 0.05$

obtained $t_{count} > t_{table}$ which is $23.79 > 1.998$, then H_0 is rejected, and H_a is accepted. Thus, it can be concluded that the learning outcomes of students who are taught using the circuit learning learning model are higher than the learning outcomes of students who are taught using the concept sentence learning model, meaning that the circuit learning learning model has a positive effect on the ability to write explanatory texts by students of class XI MAS Project. Univa Medan compared to the concept sentence learning model.

3.5. Claims Arguments from Cause-effect

Causality relationships color human life. Almost all the time, one is in contact with the dimension which is the manifestation of cause and effect. Almost all things that result are caused by certain conditions that happened before. In the discussion of the flow of thought, this causality relation also occurs very often and almost certainly the two have a logical relationship.

In argumentative writing, claims can also be formulated based on causality relations as stated above. By displaying claims that have a causal dimension, the truth of the inner flow of thought, the argumentative writing can be guaranteed. The claim of causal argument is a relationship that has causality between statements and has a relationship (Nesi & Iku, 2021:43).

In the following Data 6: CASA1, the first event that becomes the causal aspect is learning using game media, then the second event that becomes the effect aspect is an increase in learning outcomes. The author claims that learning with game media makes the atmosphere more fun and has the impact of increasing learning outcomes. The following data needs to be examined further to understand this.

Data 6: CASA1

There is a difference in the results of the pretest and posttest because the Vocabulary Quiz game media has been developed in class V. Learning using the Vocabulary Quiz game media creates a fun learning atmosphere so that it can generate student interest in participating in learning and lead to increased English learning outcomes.

Furthermore, this research has also produced quantitative findings based on searches that have been carried out by applying the instruments that have been prepared. The quantitative research results are presented in detail as follows. Half of the respondents already have experience in writing scientific journals and 85% of the respondents are very aware that arguments have an important meaning in scientific journal writing.

In addition, 55% of the respondents used a lot of arguments in writing scientific journal articles.

Argument claims commonly used by respondents are claims of expert opinion. As many as 45% of respondents wrote using expert opinion. This is done because most of the respondents have long understood the claims of arguments based on expert views.

In addition to the type of claim argumentation expert view, the claim that is often used by respondents is a claim analogy to the phenomenon. As many as 45% of respondents often use this type of claim. This is done because according to respondents, this claim will make it easier for readers to understand journal articles. Many respondents use claims based on respondents' initial assumptions about a phenomenon, evidence-based hypotheses about a phenomenon.

Around 45% of respondents agree that they often use this claim. This is because respondents want to test the truth of a phenomenon. 45% of respondents also often use claims whose formulation is based on respondents' perceptions of certain phenomena, because respondents want their perceptions to be supported by truth by many parties. 45% of respondents answered strongly agree when writing journal articles using claims whose formulation is based on abductive reasoning about certain phenomena.

This is obtained because for respondents this type of claim makes the argument detailed and in-depth. Meanwhile, 35% of respondents answered agree to use a claim whose formulation is based on public opinion. Furthermore, 10 out of 20 or equivalent to 50% of respondents answered that respondents often write arguments using causal correlation claims about certain phenomena because the arguments developed are logical.

From the explanation above, it can be said that the argument claims that are often used by respondents are claims whose formulation is based on expert views, analogies of certain phenomena, initial assumptions on a certain phenomenon, evidence-based hypotheses, perceptions of a phenomenon, abductive reasoning, public opinion, and correlations. cause and effect of a particular phenomenon.

4. CONCLUSION

This research has resulted in conclusions in the form of the types of claims used by the authors of journal articles. There are five types of claims that are dominantly made by Indonesian writers, namely, argumentative claims based on: (1) Expert Opinions, (2) Analogy, (3) Precedent, (4) Hypotheses, and (5) Cause-and-effect Argumentative Claims.

Furthermore, this study has also found quantitatively the pattern of the author's claim tendencies. These quantitative findings confirm the findings of the analysis of the texts on the types of

claims presented above. However, this research still has a number of limitations. One of the limitations faced by the author is the limited scope of research and the limited number of texts and sources with certain cultural backgrounds.

In the next larger research, these limitations will be met so that the research findings will be better. Other researchers who have similar concerns are also welcome to carry out similar research, so that the results of this research will be more useful for the development of a better argumentation in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Ambon, Y. E. (2018). *Pengembangan Buku Ajar Menulis Argumentasi Tentang Model-model Argumentasi dalam Penulisan Artikel Jurnal* (Universitas Sanata Dharma). Retrieved from https://repository.usd.ac.id/31204/2/161232014_full.pdf
- Chaika, E. (1982). *Language, The Social Mirror*. English: Newbury House Publishers.
- Gualberto, C., & Kress, G. (2019). *Social Semiotics*.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London, United Kingdom: Edward Arnold.
- Kay, P., & Kempto, W. (1984). What Is the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis? *American Anthropologist*. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1984.86.1.02a00050>
- Keraf, G. (2007). *Argumentasi dan Narasi*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Mbete, A. M. (2009). Refleksi Ringan Tentang Problematika Keetnik dan Kebahasaan dalam Perspektif Ekolinguistik. *Makalah Seminar Nasional Budaya Etnik III*.
- Nesi, A., & Iku, P. F. (2021). Model Argumen Paragraf Argumentatif Dalam Artikel Jurnal Terindeks Sinta Rumpun Pendidikan Eksakta: Perspektif Douglas Walton. *JIPD (Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Dasar)*, 5(1), 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.36928/jipd.v5i1.678>
- Rahardi, R. (n.d.). Cultural Contexts as Determinants of Speaker's Meaning in Culture-Specific Pragmatics. 2020. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.12-10-2019.2292181>
- Rybacki, K. C., & Rybacki, D. J. (1996). *Advocacy and opposition: An introduction to argumentation*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Setyaningsih, Y. (2016). Pola Argumen Paragraf Argumentatif pada Artikel Jurnal Terakreditasi

Bidang Ekonomi (Perspektif Stephen Toulmin).
Adabiyāt: Jurnal Bahasa Dan Sastra, 15(2),
136–156.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/ajbs.2016.15202>.

Spradley, J. P. (2007). *Metode Etnografi*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.

Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan secara Linguistik* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

