

Types of Speech Acts in Indonesian Debate Argumentative Discourse

Resa Nurul Fahmi^{1✉} & Rustono²

¹ Public Senior High School 1 Tuntang, Jawa Tengah, Indonesia

² Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesi

Article Info

History Articles

Received:
February 2018
Accepted:
March 2018
Published:
April 2018

Keywords:

*argumentation discourse,
debate,
speech acts*

DOI

<https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i1.22941>

Abstract

Debate is a practice of oral argumentation discourse. Various moving arguments used to solve different arguments as a form of verbal communication form in debating and seen as speech acts contributing to solve different arguments. The aim of this study to describe the type of speech acts marked by the argumentative indicator used in the discourse of argumentation of Indonesian debate. The research approach used in this research is theoretical approach and methodological approach. Theoretical approach is pragmatic approach and dialectica, while methodological approach is descriptive qualitative approach. The data were collected observing methods consisting free conversational (simak bebas libat cakap/SLB) and observing methods, record and note methods. The method of data analysis used is referential reference method followed by Determinant Elements technique (PUP). The analysis result of this research (1) the commonly used argumentative indicators by pros and cons sides is in argument phase, (2) the commonly used act of speech by pros and cons sides is assertive, and (3) the act of speech function is to state opinion.

© 2018 Universitas Negeri Semarang

✉ Correspondence address:

Raya Tuntang-Beringin KM 1, Delik, Tuntang, Semarang,
Jawa Tengah, 50773
E-mail: resafahmi31@gmail.com

[p-ISSN 2301-6744](#)

[e-ISSN 2502-4493](#)

INTRODUCTION

Language plays important roles in society life as communication means. The roles are very dominant in human life because language is not only the part from human cultures but also as determinant of culture development (Mardikantoro, 2013). Language is used by human in daily life such as arguing toward certain phenomena in society. The arguments as the result of reasoning process must be supported by valid facts and evidence to form communication.

To communicate means having discourse (Hamand, 2010). It means while communicating a discourse is being developed through verbal and non-verbal languages. The discourse having relation in human life is argumentative discourse. Argument is an essential matter in our daily life (Syaifudin, 2012). Its delivery in current time is much easier by the time of information and technology development. Currently, the social media and information and technology advancement eases the society creating argumentative discourse, as for example *whatsapp* group. Through this group application, the society can deliver their argumentative discourse inside their business.

The argumentative discourse is discourse containing notion, thought, or arguments with the discussed problems to persuade the listeners or readers or the opposite party using the logic and objective arguments (Maimunah, 2007). Through the arguments supported by facts and evidence, the writers or speakers show their better point of views. Therefore, the listeners or readers can determine the direction to follow their point of views or the writers and speakers' point of views.

The proses to persuade using the arguments must be attached by facts and data. Through the arguments, someone can show statements or proposition by referring the facts and evidence based on the problems to let listeners or readers believe the arguments presented (Lida & Zulaeha 2017). The listeners or readers will believe toward an arguments when statement is completed data and facts. Those

things affect mostly in the process of convincing addressees.

The practice of argumentative discourse, one of them is such as debate. Debate is an activity between two or more people evaluating power and weakness of certain arguments about an issue (Aditomo, 2017). Therefore, debate is a meant of two direction communication. This communication involves argument exchanging to confirm action, point of view, notion, or reason. Every party involved in debate delivers, defends, and rebuts the arguments from other party. In this matter, language plays the most important part in distributing information (Supriyadi & Zulaeha 2017). The argumentative delivery must be attached by logic and strong evidence, so the arguments valid.

The arguments are directed to solve argument differences by confirming or rebutting toward certain point of view (Eemerinet *et al* 2007a). The speakers must be able to deliver arguments supported by strong data and facts to be accepted by other party. The arguments must be used to solve differences among parties based on supportive arguments or to deny the point of view.

Various moving arguments used to solve different arguments as a form of verbal communication form in debating and seen as speech acts contributing to solve different arguments. Speech acts are speech product in certain condition that determine the meaning (Safrihady & Mardikantoro, 2017). The utterances can be interpreted as doing an action, or uttering something. To utter is not limited in utterances only but also action based on the action.

Speech acts contain various meaning which can be identified by considering the speakers' context (Alviah, 2014). The meaning of speech is influenced by the context, because it is meaningless when the speech is produced without context. The process to review the speech without paying attention to the situation it is produced will cause the wrong review (Yuliarti, Rustono, & Nuryatin, 2015).

The speech acts are individual symptoms that delivered orally by language (Ariyanti &

Zulaeha, 2017). Therefore, the theory of speech acts can be used to analyze arguments or opinion based on pragma-dialect approach principles. The speech acts contribute to solve different arguments in debate. There are five forms of speech acts both directly or indirectly (Eemeraan 1987 in Eemeraan *et al* 2007a), there are assertive speech act, directive speech act, expressive speech act, commissive speech act, and declarative speech act.

In this study, pragma-dialectic is used. It is an integration of two study fields: dialectic study and pragmatics. Dialectic study is a study focusing on argument exchanges and pragmatics focusing on the use of the language in communication (Eemeraan *et al* 2007a).

According to Eemeraan *et al* (2004b), there are three reasons why this approach is assumed as the most appropriate approach to describe argumentative indicators (1) discussion of argumentation and texts are always used to solve different arguments, (2) giving specification to all speech acts having constructive roles in solving different opinion stage, and (3) clarifying various argumentative indicators in argument movements systematically in its relation to solving argument stage.

Based on the explanation above, the study reviewed is speech acts in argument discourse namely Indonesian debate. It is backgrounded by the study of speech act in Indonesian argumentative debate discourse is rarely done. Therefore, it needs to be analyzed through a study.

The problems are how the types of speech acts are labeled as argumentative indicators used in Indonesian argumentative debate discourse? Meanwhile the purpose of this study is to explain the types of speech acts labeled by argumentative indicators used in the discourse.

An argumentative discourse study has been conducted by Aji and Rokhman (2017) titled "Pandangan Harian *Suara Merdeka* dalam Konflik KPK vs Polri Jilid II: Analisis Wacana Kritis pada Tajuk Rencana" (The study aims to reveal the views of *SUARA MERDEKA* in KPK conflict with POLRI second edition. The result is that *suamerdeka* tend to take side to KPK. The

difference between this research and the Aji & Rokhman's research (2017) is that this research data used pragmatic approach research, meanwhile the data is used as a critical discourse analysis approach. The equation is to equally analyze the argumentation discourse.

The research titled "Speech Act Theory and the Study of Argumentation" is explained by Henkemans (2014). The theory of speech acts and implicatures of Grice conversation affects on those two approach in the discourse. The first approach is pragma-dialectic developed by Frans van Eemeraan and Robert Grootendorst. The theory of speech acts used to analyze the arguments with the approach because the approach is considered as the most appropriate tool in descriptive pragmatics.

The second approach is dialectic developed by Scott Jacobs and Saly Jackson. In this approach, speech acts and implicatures of conversation are used as tool to analyze argumentative discourse. The similarities of the researcher are using pragma-dialectic approach to review argumentative discourse. The differences are the use of argumentative discourse in debate, while Henkemans' study (2014) uses speech acts and argumentative theory on written argumentative discourse.

METHODS

This approaches uses in the study are pragmatic approach and descriptive qualitative approach. This pragmatic approach uses the language usages as the milestone, how the language is in the utterances and how the utterances are used in a certain context (Parker in Rustomo, 1999). The utterances are the primary thing in study using pragmatic approach.

The second approach is descriptive qualitative approach. Based on Bogdan and Taylor (in Moleong, 2006) states qualitative approach results descriptive data in the forms of written or spoken words from the observed addressees. Meanwhile, descriptive approach, Sudaryanto (2015), is an approach done only based on existing linguistic facts or phenomena,

empirically living in speakers' life. It results into a common language.

This current study focuses on three problems related to argumentative discourse of Indonesian debate: argumentative indicators. The focus of the study is reviewed in argumentative discourse of Indonesian debate from pro and contra sides in National Debate Competition 2017 held by College Activity Center of Gajah Mada University.

The data in the study is excerpts of argumentative discourse covering argumentative indicators of the debate participants. The collected data is classified based on argumentative indicators, types, and speech act functions.

In this study, the data source is oral data: utterances from the debate participants, from the first until third speaker from two sides. The debate competition, in another hand, is a national competition followed by both private and public Senior High School in Indonesia. The competition was held from 2 until 3 September, 2017 in Gajah Mada University.

The data is collected through observing methods consisting free conversational and observing methods, record and note methods. Observing methods are listening and observing methods done by not participating while observing (Sudaryanto, 2015). The researcher records the utterances from both sides in debating without interrupting them.

The triangulation technique is to validate the used data, meanwhile the data analysis is using equivalent.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The theory of speech acts are used to analyze arguments or opinion based on pragma-dialectic approach. Speech acts contribute to solve different arguments. There are five speech acts rolling in debate both directly and indirectly (Eemeren 1987 in Eemeren *et al* 2007a). However, the expressive speech act does not have clear examples and roles of constructing in solving the arguments because it does not show up relevant proposition commitments to solve.

The forms of the expressions do not become the parts of discussion. It does not mean the expressions do not affect toward the arguments but toward emotion. When some one is uneasy, emotionally and implicitly will surely affect the uttered arguments.

Types of Pro's Side Speech Acts

Pro's side is supporting side toward the given topic or problem being debated. The belief of pro's side toward the problem delivered in the forms of arguments covering various speech acts: assertive, directive, commissive, and declarative.

Assertive Speech Acts

This speech act states the truth or honesty binding the speakers with the right proposition uttered. Eemeren *et al* (2007a) states this speech act does not always show the truth but also reliable decision of the arguments. In debating, this speech act describes or expresses the point of view of the motion; it delivers additional arguments to defend or strengthen the previous arguments, and it determines the discussion results. In participants' utterances, assertive speech acts are found in confronting, arguing, and concluding stage.

Confronting Stage

In this stage, each party delivers its point of view toward the motion. Assertive speech acts consisted in this stage from pro side consist of.

(1) Contexts:

The participants of debate discuss motion about BPJS should provide more advantages than disadvantages

"*Saya sangat menyetujui dan percaya* bahwa BPJS memberikan banyak keuntungan daripada kerugian karena kita bisa membandingkan sebelum ada BPJS banyak sekali orang-orang di Indonesia yang tidak bisa mendapat pelayanan kesehatan karena masalah biaya."

This utterance covers proposition action indicators indicated by the existence of expression *Saya sangat menyetujui dan percaya*. It indicates the pro side's explanation provides explanation about their beliefs toward the debated motion. Therefore, the utterance is

included into assertive speech act. It is also stated by Eemeren (2007a) stating one of the examples of the speech act is delivering certain point of view or explanation.

Argumenting Stage

This is the core stage of debate. Every party delivers arguments. Assertive speech acts in this stage are seen on.

(2) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about BPJS should provide more advantages than disadvantages

“**Perbandingan** BPJS adalah 1:4, untuk keuntungan 4 dan kerugian 1.”

The utterance covering the indicators represents argument by comparing is indicated by expression *Perbandingan*. It includes assertive speech act because the pro side explains its arguments using comparison. According to Eemren (2007a), one of the prototypes of the speech act is explanation. The pro side in its explanation uses comparison such as comparing the advantages and disadvantages of BPJS as much as 1:4.

Concluding Stage

In this stage, each side determines its conclusion, for example, keeping supporting the motion or denying the motion. Assertive speech acts consisting in this stage both from pro or contra side are seen on data below.

(3) Contexts:

The participants of debate discuss the motion about bpjs should give provide more advantages than disadvantages

“**Kelompok kami sangat setuju** bahwa BPJS memberikan banyak keuntungan daripada kerugian.”

The utterance consisting the indicator from pro side is seen in its supporting to the basic argument expressed by **kelompok kami sangat setuju**. It is an assertive speech act to determine the debate result. The side keeps agreeing the

motion and it aligns with Eemeren (2007a) statement telling one of the prototypes of assertive speech acts is determining the debate result.

Directive Speech Act

The speech act has intention to ask someone doing the speaker's will. This speech act is not applicable in every critical discussion, such as utterances functioning to command or prohibit. The speech act can take form into action based on the speaker's will, challenges toward certain arguments to defend its own arguments, and demands of clarification or explanation (Eemeren *et al* 2007 a). In this utterance of the participant, the assertive speech acts are found in opening stage.

Opening Stage

In this opening, every party side is clear, both supporting and opposing. Assertive speech acts in this stage is from pro side as follows.

(4) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about full day school is not effective due to lack of social interaction of the students

“**Dapatkah** tim kontra menjamin adanya *full day school* ini membuat suasana KBM kondusif? **Apakah ada bukti nyata** bahwa *full day school* ini semakin membuat kondusif?”

The utterance covering the indicators opposing to defend the basic arguments are indicated by expression **dapatkah** and **apakah ada bukti nyata**. They include directive speech acts because they demand clarification from the other party. The pro side uses two different expression to ask clarification. Firstly, the utterance **dapatkah** to ask clarification about the contra team's opinion stating *full day school dapat meniptakan KBM yang kondusif*. Secondly, the utterance **apakah ada bukti nyata** to ask the supporting evidence of it. It agrees with Eemeren's statement (2007a) telling the prototypes of the directive speech acts are asking clarification.

Commissive Speech Acts

This speech act states the speaker having self-commitment to show it to other party. It is different with directive speech acts, this commissive one implicates the speaker to move on his own. Eemeran (2007a) states some examples of commissive speech acts in debate are accepting or agreeing the opposite's arguments, accepting or denying the basic arguments or opposite's point of views, agreeing to be a part of the opposite's argument, agreeing toward the rules of discussion related to accept or deny the arguments, and to decide starting new discussion. In the utterances of the participants, the commissive speech acts are seen in opening stage.

Confronting Stage

In this stage, each party delivers its point of view toward the motion. Commissive speech act in this stage is seen from this data.

(5) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about BPJS should provide more advantages than disadvantages

“Perlu ditekankan bahwa **kami tidak menyinggung** tentang fasilitas rumah sakit, itu mungkin pendapat Saudara yang ingin Saudara sampaikan tapi menyangkut pada kami, tapi Saudara tidak melihat jalannya pertandingan bahwa kami tidak menyinggung rumah sakit.”

The utterances covering the indicators of confronting signed by expression **kami tidak menyinggung** is included in commissive speech act because it has denial or rebuttal of the positive side toward the contra side dealing with BPJS' facilitation in hospital toward BPJS patients and non-BPJS patients. Feeling uncomfortable toward the arguments, the pro team rebuts the argument. It is also stated by Eemeran (2007a) that the prototype of the speech act is argument denial.

The Opening Stage

In this stage, each team has clearly positioned itself both supporting and opposing the motion. Commissive speech act consists in the opening stage of pro team as follows.

(6) Contexts:

The participants discuss about acculturation of western culture corrupts local culture

“**Mari saya jelaskan**, salah satu contohnya adalah Jepang yang bekerja secara individualisme karena mereka bekerja memikirkan waktu.”

The speech act covering the indicator of accepting burden functions as proof of one side indicated by expression **mai saya jelaskan**. It is a commissive speech act to explain or clarify. It also aligns with Eemeran (2007a) stating one of the prototypes is explaining or clarifying. According to the utterances of pro team, in which it is willing to explain the argument about Japan cooperating individually.

Declarative Speech Act

This speech act relates the content of utterances with the reality, usually in the forms of language usage consisting new statements. This speech act shows authority of the speaker to believe toward the preliminary and doubtful utterance. Eemeran (2007a) states the examples of this speech act in debate by relating the utterances with the reality and defining or creating specification of the intended arguments. In their utterances of the participants, this speech act consists in confronting stage and arguing stage.

Confronting Stage

In every confrontation, each party delivers its own point of view toward the motion. Declarative speech act in confronting stage from pro side is seen on.

(7) Contexts:

The participants discuss full day school is not effective because it lessens children's social interaction

“Pendidikan dapat dilakukan di lingkungan keluarga, masyarakat, dan lainnya. **Fakta di lapangan** menjelaskan bahwa orang-orang sukses tidak harus memiliki pengetahuan yang baru, tapi juga memiliki keterampilan yang bagus juga. Seperti halnya, Bob Sadino.”

The utterances overig emphasizing expression is signed by **fakta di** lapangan. It is a declarative speech act because the pro side relates its arguments to the facts. According to the utterances, the pro side argues based on facts that successful people are not affected by knowledge but by skills, as for example Bob Sadino. The additional argument strengthens the previous ones that education can be done in family or society environment. It aligns with Eemeren's statement (2007a) stating one of the prototypes of assertive speech act is additional explanatoin.

Argumentng Stage

It is the core of debating. Every party argues. The declarative speech act contains in argumenting stage from pro side is seen on.

(8) Contexts:

The participants discuss about gadget lowers students' reading interest

"Ketika kita lihat orang dewasa umumnya memiliki keinginan yang sudah mantap, **artinya** ketika ini sudah berjalan dari kecil hingga dewasa akan susah untuk diubah, tapi bukan tanpa kemungkinan itu tidak dapat diubah, hanya saja susah."

The utterance coverig indicator of symptomatic arguments are signed by expression **artinya**. It is a declarative speech act because the utterance indicating the positive side defining the related argument. Eemeren (2007a) states the prototype of declarative speech act in debate is defining again the intended argument.

Types of Contra Side's Speech Acts

The contra side opposes the given topic or problems debated. The point of view of the team toward the problems given in the arguments cover from assertive, directive, commissive, and declarative speech acts.

Assertive Speech Acts

The participants' assertive speech acts are seen in confronting, argumenting, and concluding stage.

Confronting Stage

Assertive speech acts in this stage occur in.

(9) Contexts

The participants discuss about western and local culture aculturation.

"**Kami katakan** bahwa akulturasi budaya barat justru mempererat persahabatan dengan negara barat. Kita ketahui dalam ilmu sosiologi, akulturasi jelas berbeda dengan asimilasi. Dimana akulturasi berarti $A+B=AB$, sedangkan asimilasi adalah $A+B=C$."

This utterance covering indicators of propositional action is signed by **kami katakan**. It is an assertive speech act because the utterance indicating the point of view of contra team. Eemeren (2007a) states one of the prototypes is an assertive speech act to deliver point of view toward the motion. The contra team delivers its point of view toward the pro team about the motion by telling them to strengthen the cultures.

Argumenting Stage

This speech act is seen in argumenting stage from the contra team on this excerpt.

(10) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about *full day school* is not effective because it lessens children's social interaction

"Lalu izinkan kami untuk menyampaikan **sejumlah argumen** dari tim kami."

The utterances (10) covering univocal argumentative indicators are signed by expression **sejumlah argumen**. This utterance is assertive speech act because it has some explanation or arguments. The contra team states directly some supportive arguments. It aligns with Eemeren's statement (2007a) stating one example of this assertive speech act is providing additional argument.

Concluding Stage

This assertive speech act is in contra team.

(11) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about bpjs should provide more advantages than disadvantages

“**Sekali lagi kami dari tim kontra tidak setuju** apabila dikatakan BPJS memiliki banyak keuntungan daripada kerugian.”

This utterance covering the indicators to state its doubtness signed by **sekali lagi dari tim kami tidak setuju**. It is assertive speech act because the utterance (11) indicating the tone of contra team toward the discussion result. According to utterance (11), it can be seen the team is still on its point of view. It aligns with Eemeren (2007a) stating an assertive speech act is determining the discussion results.

Directive Speech Acts

In the utterances of the participants, directive speech acts are found in:

Opening Stage

Directive speech acts emerging in argumenting stage from the contra team are.

(12) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about *full day school* is not effective because lessens children's social interaction

“**Tim pro tidak bisa memberikan bukti nyata**, apakah interaksi sosial dipengaruhi oleh *full day school*?”

The utterance covering opposing indicators to defend basic arguments is signed by **tim pro tidak bisa memberikan bukti nyata**. It is a directive utterance (12) since indicating clarification demand of the contra team toward the pro team. The contra team is feeling doubt the argument's of pro team. Thus, the contra team asks clarification of the real evidence that full day school affects social interaction of the students. It aligns with Eemeren (2007a) stating the prototype of directive utterance is asking clarification.

Commissive Speech Acts

In these utterances of the participants, the commissive speech acts of contra team are.

Confronting Stage

This commissive speech act is in argumenting stage of contra team.

(13) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about western and local culture aculturation

“**Sesungguhnya kami telah menghargai apa yang telah Anda sampaikan, tetapi kami tidak setuju**, seperti yang Anda sampaikan, pembicara pertama mengatakan bahwa kebudayaan barat merusak kebudayaan timur asal masih bisa memilah.”

The utterance covering opposing indicators is signed by **kami tidak setuju**. It is a commissive utterance indicating denial or rebuttal toward the opposite's arguments. The contra team disagrees so the team rebuts. It aligns with Eemeren's statement (2007a) stating the prototype of commissive speech acts is denying the arguments of the opposite's team.

Declarative Speech Acts

In this utterance, the speech acts of contra team are seen in.

Argumenting Stage

This declarative speech act occurs in argumenting stage of contra team.

(14) Contexts:

The participants discuss the motion about bpjs should provide more advantages than disadvantages

“BPJS ini bukan program jaminan kesehatan nasional, karena menerapkan sistem subsidi di dalamnya. **Artinya** pemerintah tidak mengeluarkan sepeser pun, melainkan rakyat yang mengeluarkan biaya untuk mendapatkan jaminan kesehatan nasional.”

The utterance covering symptomatic argumentative indicators is signed by the expression **artinya**. It indicates the contra team re-explaining its argument about working system of BPJS in managing its finance. Eemeren (2007a) states the example of declarative speech

act is defining. According to that statement, the utterance (14) is said to be declarative.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the types of speech acts in the discourse used by pro team are: (1) assertive, declarative, and commissive speech acts on confronting stage; (2) directive and commissive speech acts in opening stage; (3) assertive and declarative speech acts in arguing stage; (4) assertive speech acts in concluding stage. Meanwhile, the contra team's speech acts are: (5) assertive and commissive speech acts in confronting stage; (6) directive speech act in opening stage; (7) assertive and declarative speech acts in arguing stage; and (8) assertive speech acts in concluding stage.

So this article was made, hopefully it is useful. Acknowledgments to Dr. Hari Bakti Mardikantoro, M.Hum., have taken the time to guide the author, so this article materialized.

REFERENCES

- Aditomo, A. (2017). Penghargaan pada Argumentasi Bagian dari Karakter Intelektual: Studi Eksploratoris pada Calon Mahasiswa. *Humanitas* 14(1), 26-40.
<http://journal.uad.ac.id/index.php/humanitas>
<http://journal.uad.ac.id/index.php/HUMANITAS/article/view/5803>
- Aji, E. N. W. & Rokhman, F. (2018). Pandangan Harian Suara Merdeka dalam Konflik KPK vs Polri Jilid II: Analisis Wacana Kritis pada Tajuk Rencana. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(3), 256-264.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/13921>
- Alviah, I. (2014). Kesantunan Berbahasa dalam Tuturan Novel *Para Priyayi* Karya Umar Kayam. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 3(2), 128-135.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/6629>
- Ariyanti, L., & Zulaeha, I. (2017). Tindak Tutur Ekspresif Humanis dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran di SMA Negeri 1 Batang: Analisis Wacana Kelas. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(2), 111-122.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/17272>
- Eemeren, Frans. H. van, Petter Houtlosser, & A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans. (2004). *Dialectical Profiles and Indicators of Argumentative moves: Netherlands Organization for Scientific research*. NOW (Project no: 200-41-012) 1-17.
- Eemeren, Frans. H. van, Petter Houtlosser, & A. Francisca Snoeck Henkemans. (2007). *Argumentatif Indicators in Discourse (A Pragmatic-Dialectical Study)*. Neteherlands: Springer
- Hamad, I. (2010). *Komunikasi sebagai Wacana*. Jakarta: La Tofi Enterprise
- Henkemans, A. Francisca Snoeck. 2014. Speech Act Theory and The Study Argumentation. *Studies in Logic, Grammar, and Rhetoric*, 36, 41-58.
<https://content.sciendo.com/view/journals/igr/36/1/article-p41.xml>
- Lida, Ulfah & Ida Zulaeha. 2017. Pola Penalaran dalam Karangan Argumentasi pada Siswa Tahap Operasi Formal. *Indonesian Language Education and Literature*, 3(1), 45-52.
<http://www.syekhnuurjati.ac.id/jurnal/index.php/jeill/article/view/1570>
- Maimunah, S. A. (2007). *Buku Pintar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka Publiser
- Mardikantoro, H. B. (2013). Bahasa Jawa sebagai Pengungkap Kearifan Lokal Masyarakat Samin di Kabupaten Blora. *Jurnal Komunitas* 5, 197-207.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/komunitas/issue/view/333>
- Moleong, L. J. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya
- Rustono. (1999). *Pokok-pokok Pragmatik*. Semarang: CV IKIP Semarang Press
- Safrihady, S., & Mardikantoro, H. B. (2017). Jenis dan Fungsi Pragmatis Tindak Tutur Masyarakat Melayu Dialek Sambas di Kota Singkawang. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 59-67.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/14766>
- Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa (Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik)*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Duta Wacana Press
- Supriyadi, S., & Zulaeha, I. (2017). Dimensi Ekonomi, Politik, dan Ideologi pada Artikel-Artikel di Media Massa Cetak Jawa Pos dalam Perspektif Analisis Wacana Kritis. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(2), 111-122.

- Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(1), 1-14.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/14747>
- Syaifudin, A. (2012). Pengembangan Model Pembelajaran Menulis Argumentasi Siswa SMA melalui Dukungan ICT. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 1(1), 41-44.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/120>
- Yuliarti, Rustono, & Nuryatin, A. (2015). Tindak Tutur Direktif dalam Wacana Novel Trilogy Karya Agustinus Wibowo. *Seloka: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 4(2), 78-85.
<https://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/seloka/article/view/9864>