ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING CONSTRUCTION OF EFL WRITING CLASS THROUGH DECLARATIVE SPEECH ACTS APPROACH

Durotun Nasihah*, Sonny Elfiyanto

Universitas Islam Malang, Indonesia

(durotun@unisma.ac.id)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates how Indonesian undergraduate EFL students construct argumentative essays through critical discussion using Pragma-dialectic and pragmatic approaches. This study employed a qualitative research method. The data consist of argumentative essays authored by undergraduate English students at a private university in Indonesia (N=34). Students worked in pairs as protagonist and antagonist, discussed and wrote essays on a controversial topic. The analysis showed that students used four steps of argumentation: confrontation, opening, argumentation, and conclusion. Most students used confrontation and opening stages in the introduction, argumentation stage in developing a paragraph, and end with a conclusion. To understand the purpose of argumentation, the students were instructed to use four types of speech acts, which have different functions: assertive, commissive, declarative, and directive speech acts. Implementing the pragma-dialectic theory helps the students comprehend argumentative writing and trains them to think critically in resolving differences.

Key Words: pragma-dialectic approach; argumentative essay; speech acts

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana siswa EFL Indonesia menuliskan esai argumentatif melalui diskusi kritis dengan menggunakan pendekatan pragma-dialektika Van Eemeren dan Grootendorst (1970) dan pragmatis Searle (1969). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif. Data berasal dari esai argumentatif semester ketiga yang ditulis oleh mahasiswa Indonesia di jurusan bahasa Inggris. Tiga puluh empat siswa di kelas menulis mendiskusikan topik yang berbeda. Siswa bekerja berpasangan untuk mendiskusikan topik kontroversial, dipisahkan menjadi kelompok protagonis dan antagonis. Analisis mengklaim bahwa siswa menggunakan empat langkah argumentasi: konfrontasi, pembukaan, argumentasi, dan kesimpulan. Penelitian ini menemukan bahwa sebagian besar siswa menggunakan tahap konfrontasi dan pembukaan dalam pendahuluan, tahap argumentasi dalam mengembangkan paragraf, dan diakhiri dengan kesimpulan. Untuk mengetahui tujuan penggunaan argumentasi, siswa menggunakan empat tindak tutur, yang memiliki fungsi berbeda: asertif, komisif, deklaratif, dan direktif. Menerapkan teori pragma-dialektika membantu siswa memahami tulisan argumentatif dan melatih mereka untuk memiliki pemikiran kritis yang baik dalam menyelesaikan pendapat yang berbeda.

Kata Kunci: pendekatan pragma-dialektika; essai argumentative; tindak tutur

* Corresponding author

INTRODUCTION

Writing is a skill that second language (L2) learners find the most difficult (Miri, 2014). Teachers face considerable obstacles in enhancing elementary to tertiary students' writing abilities (Kementerian Pendidikan dan kebudayaan RI, 2020). This phenomenon encourages language educators and EFL professionals to look for a way to make writing less intimidating for EFL students. The highest level of writing for university students is argumentative writing, which combines writing abilities and critical thinking. Students were frequently expected to choose a position on a subject and defend it with evidence from trustworthy sources by employing argumentative writing techniques (Setyowati et al., 2017). In a democratic setting, it is expected that members of society can defend their opinions while considering those of others. Furthermore, pupils must be able to comprehend, elaborate, organize, and integrate information in the knowledge society (List & Alexander, 2019). Learning to argue will help people advance their academic and personal life (Andrews, 2000).

The argumentative discussion typically employs terminologies and major concepts to aid comprehension, particularly for a novice reader. A fundamental idea from which argumentation springs is a dispute or different points of view (explicit or implicit). Van Eemeren et al. (2002), wrote that there are always two sides involved in a quarrel or difference of opinion. When one side presents a viewpoint, the opposing side expresses questions about it or, more frequently, goes one step further and rejects the viewpoint. This argumentative discussion process uses a dialectic system (Humblin, 1970). Humbling explained that the dialectic system happens in the dialogue between two participants. The argumentative discussion has three essential components: (1) it consists of two parties, the protagonist and antagonist; (2) it has regular steps taken by both parties or participants; and (3) the dialogue has sequence steps. Moreover, the protagonist has the first opportunity to present their point of view and argumentation in this situation, followed by the responses. They then adhere to the discourse rules (Walton, 2007).

Following the above perspective, the researchers used the Pragma-dialectic approach to train the students to sharpen their critical thinking in argumentative writing because the Pragma-dialectic can be used to investigate the critical conversation

resulting in diverse viewpoints (Kaldjärv, 2011). The Pragma-dialectic paradigm is best served as a critical discourse that seeks to explain argumentative discussion and settle disagreements on the merits (van Eemeren et al., 1984). With this strategy, the protagonist and antagonist attempt to see whether the protagonist's analysis can stand the antagonist's criticism. Following the criticism from the antagonist, the protagonist presents the justification for their position. When arguing for a persuasive position, the protagonist seeks to support the statements. The protagonist attempt to disprove this assertion. The protagonist tries to justify or disprove the perspective upheld when the antagonist challenges him/her using fresh criticism, new facts that the opponent can respond to, etc. (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2003).

Besides, pragma-dialectic also concerns with the use of a pragmatic viewpoint in seeing language use, especially in speech acts, with dialectical notions from critical rationalism and dialogue logic (van Eemeren et al., 1984; van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004). Previous studies have shown that speakers' use of speech acts could show their purpose of using argumentation (Kamariah, 2021). Moreover, speech acts were used to express an opinion produced by the protagonist and antagonist sides to resolve problems (Fahmi & Rustono, 2018; van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2003). Dialogue analysis may reveal arguments where a speaker's intended meaning differs from the meaning that the speaker and the hearer mutually construct. These cases can be explained by applying the interactionist speech act theory to models like the Pragma-dialectic model. The theory of speech act is used on certain types of conditions categorized by Searle (1969): condition of propositional substance, condition of readiness, condition of honesty, and condition of necessity (Saifudin, 2019; van Eemeren et al., 2007).

The term pragma-dialectic refers to two disciplines: pragmatics and dialectics. Pragmatics is the study of the language used in communication, while dialectic is concerned with how arguments were exchanged (van Eemeren et al., 2007). Because the fundamental idea of a critical discourse aiming at resolving conflicts is founded on a speech act, this framework will appeal to pragmatics readers. Following the paradigm, a disagreement of opinion can only be resolved through each dialogue stage: confrontation, introduction, argumentation, and conclusion. Every utterance serves a purpose in critical debate; speech actions were carried out

according to the norms that must be followed in a critical argument to resolve a disagreement. Analytically, the critical conversation can be divided into four stages (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004): identifying the point of disagreement (confrontation stage), deciding where the debate will begin (opening stage), expressing the argumentative and critical responses to resolve the disagreement (argumentation stage), and establishing the discussion's outcome (conclusion stage). While this paradigm was accepted, van Rees (2009) used the extended theory as a springboard for the analysis of a conceptual technique that is frequently employed in argumentative discourse for strategic maneuvering.

Table 1. The distribution speech act and the functions

Stage of argumentation	Speech act	Function
Confrontation stage	Assertives	Show the way to express the point of view
	Commissives	Represent the agreement or the disagreement of the participants of the opinion.
	Directives	Concerned with demands to declare the viewpoint
	Declarativess	Represent definitions, clarification, and the specification of the point of view
Opening stage	Directives	Represent the challenge to defend the viewpoint of the proponent
	Commissives	View as the opponent's agreement or disagreement with the proponent's standpoint.
	Declarativess	The clarification and the specification at the opening stage
Argumentation stage	Directives	Asking the participant to advance their viewpoint.
	Assertives	The way to improve the point of view of the participants in the discussion
	Commissives	The agreement or the disagreement of the arguers of the standpoint
	Declarativess	The specification and the definition of the standpoint
Conclusion stage	Assertives	The statement of the result of the discussion
	Commissives	The agreement or the disagreement of the participants regarding the viewpoint
	Declarativess	Specify whether the difference of opinion is settled or not.

Additionally, Allani (2018) agreed that the pragma-dialectic approach could be used to explore students' use of argumentation. Svačinová (2021) believed that the pragma-dialectic approach is useful for defining crisis diary writing as an argumentative activity type. Ma and Chen (2009) said that theoretically, using pragma-dialectic in academic argumentation could develop the research framework and expand the research perspective and method of academic argument.

Practically, the pragma-dialectic approach can be used to train academic researchers in charge of public communication to use pragmatic argumentation reasonably and efficiently. More importantly, it gives readers a vital analytical tool to properly interpret academic arguments and develop their critical thinking skills. The previous studies (Ma & Chen, 2009; Svačinová, 2021) gave a wider perspective that the pragma-dialectic approach influences the writing process. Based on the knowledge of the pragma-dialectic approach related to argumentative writing, this research aimed to fill in the gap of the use of pragma-dialectics in argumentative writing pair work (protagonist and antagonist). More specifically, the study aimed to investigate how students construct argumentative writing and the actual distribution of students' speech acts in their argumentative writing using a pragma-dialectical approach.

METHODS

The study used qualitative research. The following briefly describes the participants, data collection, and analysis.

Participant

The participant in this research was students of the Islamic University of Malang. Thirty-four third-year students taking an EFL writing course whose lecturers employed pragma-dialectic theory participated in the study. The participants were around 20-21 years old at the time of data collection. All students have already studied English for two years at the university. The students (N=34) were divided into protagonist group (n=17) and antagonist group (n=17).

Data collection

The data were argumentation text from an argumentative writing class. Thirty-four students worked in pairs to discuss different topics. They chose one topic prepared by the lecturer and which side they wanted to be (protagonist or antagonist). The protagonists and antagonists attempted to systematically determine if the protagonist's viewpoint could survive the adversary's criticism. There were four steps to get the data,

Table 2. Steps in collecting data

Week	Activity
1	The theory and examples of using Pragma-dialectic
2	Choosing discussion partner
	Presenting the topic of discussion
3	Discussion verbally of the topic
4	Writing students' idea
5	Continue to write the argumentation
6	Submitting the writing
	feedback processes
7	Repair the writing
8	Submitting the revised writing

Data Analysis

The researchers analyzed the argumentative text procedure to investigate the use of the pragma-dialectic approach in critical discussion (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2003). The researchers identified each paragraph of the student's writing based on these rules: First, during the confrontation phase, discussant 1 externalized a position. This position was contested in an argumentation writing or speech that addresses a non-mixed, single difference (by discussant 2). Second, after discussant 1 accepted discussant 2's challenge to clarify the point of view and agreed on the role assignments and discussion rules, the discussants began a debate in the initial stage. Third, the protagonist-assumed discussant would defend the initial stance in the argumentation stage against the antagonist-assumed discussant. Lastly, the discussant who served as the main character in the argumentation stage either retracted or did not retract the initial stance in the conclusion stage. In contrast, the discussant who served as the opposition in the argumentation stage either upheld or rejected the initial position in the dispute. The researchers divided the data into two categories based on the analysis of the procedure: students' writing on the protagonist and the antagonist with Pragma-dialectic rules.

The researchers analyzed the reason for using language by identifying the sentences' words, sentences, and purposes to investigate the distribution of speech acts. According to the dialectical method of a critical discussion, each speech act in the text had a particular function in examining the acceptability of assertions. Every statement had a purpose in the early stages of a critical debate. The speech acts were performed following the conventions that must be followed in a critical discussion intended to settle a dispute (Kaldjarv, 2011).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Construction of Argumentative Writing Based on A Pragma-dialectic Approach

Students were divided into protagonists and antagonists and instructed to write an argumentative essay. Students were asked to compose an essay containing an introduction, a developing paragraph, and a conclusion. Each composition contained several phases for creating the argument, including the confrontation, opening, argumentation, and conclusion. The following table

presents students' construction of argumentation.

Table 3. The composition of the argumentation paragraph

The composition paragraph	Confrontation stage		Opening stage		Argumentation stage		Conclusion stage	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Introduction	27	45,9	17	28,9	14	23,8	0	0
Developing topics	13	22,1	15	25,5	34	57,8	11	18,7
Conclusion	3	5,1	2	3,4	7	11,9	27	45,9
Total	43		34		55		38	
Total	170							

The table 3 shows that the students frequently used the confrontation stage (28,9%) and opening stage (45,9 %) in their paragraph introduction. In addition, the students used the argumentation stage in the developing topics (57,8%) and a summary in the conclusion section (45,9%). The students gave a systematic writing process in the introduction stage. They showed their standpoint about the case, showing the reason why they agreed or disagreed with the motion of the case. In the opening stage, the students tried to see the opponent's standpoint on the case. Both sides started to decide to do a critical discussion about the case. In the argumentation stage, the students tried to elaborate the evidence and fact to strengthen their opinion. In the conclusion stage, students tried to give the decision of the discussion whether they followed the other side's opinion or still believed in their standpoint. It is different from Kaldjärv (2011), who found that most Estonian students use the first group writing style in exploring the state exam composition. This case happened because the work of Estonian uses a monologue manuscript that lacks a dialectical approach.

Argumentative writing is the textual process of defending and discussing arguments (Ferretti et al., 2009). argumentation model has been the most prominent theoretical framework to date regarding the essential elements of an argument (Toulmin, 2003). Through independent research into a subject to produce a collection, generation, and evaluation of evidence to support their position, students were motivated to construct arguments in their argumentative writing. Students were often asked to adopt a viewpoint on a topic through the practice of argumentative writing and to support that position with evidence from trustworthy and authoritative sources (Setyowati et al., 2017). A group of statements was referred to as an argument, and critical thinking was strongly related to this concept. Some arguments were used to justify claims and judgments (Indrilla & Ciptaningrum, 2018). A writer must provide the information in an orderly,

structured, and logical way to reach a persuasive conclusion (Fisher, 2013).

Using a communicative writing process brought the dialogue between the protagonist and antagonist. Argumentation demanded conversation. The levels of critical discussion effectively showed the argumentative writing's dialogue-level disagreements. Moreover, according to van Eemeren & Grootendorst's (2003) critical discussion, protagonist and antagonist speech acts interact in the dialectical process to resolve different opinions. In this opportunity, the students delivered the standpoint and took position and discussion rules in the confrontation and opening stage; the students might present data, evidence, opinion, and argumentation, and both discussants had the opportunity to dispute, maintain the standpoint, attacked the other side, and answered the questions. The students tried to elaborate the standpoint and argumentation into the conclusion. In this stage, the students needed to decide whether to keep the standpoint or recognize the other viewpoint.

Analytical Speech Acts in Argumentative Text Based on A Pragma-dialectics Approach

The argumentative text comprised four key discussion stages: confrontation, opening, argumentative,

and conclusion. Each step of the stages consisted of complex speech acts which had different purposes. The analytical speech effectively explained argumentation as a communicative practice in which both the speaker and hearer played a fundamental role (Marchal, 2021).

Table 4. Students' speech Act Distribution in the argumentative writing class

Stages	Assertives		Commissives		Declaratives		Directives	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Confrontation (Protagonist side)	15	5,6%	7	2,6%	2	0,7%	1	0,3%
Confrontation (antagonist side)	17	6,3%	11	4,07%	1	0,3%	-	-
Opening (protagonist side)	-	-	13	4,8%	1	0,3%	7	2,6%
Opening (antagonist side)	-	-	9	3,3%	-	-	11	4,07%
Argumentative (protagonist side)	62	22,9%	6	2,2%	2	0,7%	7	2,6%
Argu	4	17,	-	-	1	0,	3	1,1

Stages	Assertives		Commissives		Declaratives		Directives	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
mentative (antagonist side)	7	4%				3%		%
Conclusion (protagonist side)	23	8,5%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Conclusion (antagonist side)	24	8,9%	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	270							

Confrontation stage

Speech acts indicated the purpose of the statements or sentences in creating an argumentative paragraph. Assertives, commissives, and pragma-dialectic are used during the confrontation stage. Assertiveness was the most frequently used in the confrontation stage by the protagonist (5,6%) and antagonist (7%). Data (1) is from the protagonist, and data (2) is from the antagonist to present the case-related viewpoint at the confrontation stage. Kamariah (2021) found that using assertive speech acts in the confrontation stage was shown by expressing a point of view. She selected the speech act depending on the speaker's or writer's willingness to accept a specific propositional ability to

a certain degree (van Eemeren et al., 2007).

1) The death penalty is an effective way to deter criminals because death penalty can be both a deterrent and influence the behavior of those who commit serious crimes (100a)

2) On the other side I disagree with the argument that money brings happines to us (105a)

Data (1) is an assertive speech act used by the protagonist which shows how students express their standpoint by explaining the death penalty implicitly. It is different with data (2) from the antagonist which expresses his/her standpoint explicitly by saying "I disagree".

In addition, the study discovered that other writers employed sympathy to support the viewpoint (data 3) and (data 4). According to van Eemeren & Grootendorst (2004), commissives were employed to support a standpoint or not by reiterating a viewpoint that has been rejected as well as to support a challenge to a standpoint. Here, the students attempt to further their viewpoint by disparaging that of the opposing side.

3) Life is hard without money. But that doesn't mean money is everything. Because having a lot

of money does not guarantee leads happiness. people have jobs that give them meaning or purpose, they are happier and regardless of how much money they make (105)

4) People must be familiar with the phrase "money can't buy happiness." The term is not entirely correct.

Both data (3) and (4) represent disagreement of the opposite teams. The protagonist expressed disagreement by comparing the antagonist's point of view and the protagonist's argumentation, and vice versa.

Furthermore, the researchers also found declarative speech act in the confrontation stage (data 5 and 6) used to define.

5) Money is an acceptable currency in exchange for economic activities (106a)

6) Standardized Test (UN) is an exam held to control student competence at the primary and secondary education levels as a result of the learning process in accordance with the Graduate Competency Standards (SKL) (133).

Both data (5 and 6) show how the parties define money and national examination. These actions did not directly impact resolving different opinions between parties because, in critical discussion, declaratives did not play a significant part in resolving problems. Nevertheless, in the confrontation stage, declaratives could uncover pseudo-disputes (Kamariah, 2021). Another speech act, directives, was also found in the confrontation stage by the protagonist's side. Directives expressed the demand to declare the standpoint about the case shown in data (7) below.

7) Yep, I totally agree. If money brings happiness to people, of course, because why do we live without money, we can't live? (104)

In this confrontation, the protagonist uses two speech acts in one stage: assertiveness and directives. Here, the writer focused on the use of directives which represented how the protagonist asked other parties to declare the point of view of the case. There were some purposes for using directives (Saifudin, 2019), such as to refute points of view that were raised, to defend points of view, to ask the opposing party for points of support for his position, or to demand a definition or an explanation of an opponent's statement.

Opening stage

After Student 1 (protagonist) accepted student 2's challenge (antagonist) to convey their respective points of view, the division of labor and the rules for the debate are accepted. The data (commissive, declarative, and directive speech acts) had been identified. Directive speech act 2,6% (protagonist) and 4,07% (antagonist) challenges the opposing argument to defend the standpoint. Here, the writer asked the opposite side to get clarification about the other student's standpoint and statement. Fahmi and Rustono (2018) found that directives were used in the opening stage to demand the opposite party's clarification and asked for evidence of the argumentation. For example:

8) But people should also pay attention to child abuse cases – how do we send someone who commits such a heinous crime, and it happens again and again, to society? (100b)

9) Many reasons were found, like what if they escaped from prison? What if ex-criminals who got out of prison were all around us? And other things. Is that a reason to take human life (101)

The data (8) show that the student from the protagonist wants to clarify how the student from the antagonist handles severe crime if the second student disagrees with implementing the death penalty for severe cases. The antagonist had a chance to explain the reason or offered new ideas for eradicating criminal acts. Data (9) also showed how the protagonist team asked the clarification of the antagonist's argumentation.

Another speech act in the opening stage was the commissive speech acts, which account for 4,8 % (protagonist) and 3,3% (antagonist). It showed how the student supported the standpoint or not by repeating rejecting the standpoint. This commissive was in line with van Eemeren et al. (2007) accepting or disagreeing with the opposing argument, consenting to be a part of the opposing argument, agreeing with the norms of discussion connected to accepting or denying the arguments, and deciding to start a new discussion are a few instances of compliant speech acts in debate. Data (10) and (11) represent the use of the commissive speech act in the text. The students defended the standpoint by showing the opposition's weakness. The students compared arguments to determine which were more logical and credible. In line with Kamariah's (2021) research, using commissives in the opening stage showed the disagreement that can create to support

the case and express his opinion. For example

10) Even, some people find every way to get more money to create happiness like they buckle down to fill up their needs and lifestyle and if we look any further, we can see some people do bad things just to get money (106b)

11) Students must study many subjects for three years, but the subjects tested are only three subjects. And logically, with the Standardized Tests (UN), many do not realize that they are studying to pass the exam. It's not about getting better, having better qualities, or having good manners; it's just about passing the test. (133)

Data (10) show how people try hard to get money and achieve happiness. They will do everything to fulfill their life's needs, but the students emphasized that some people used the wrong way to achieve that purpose. The students could not say that this was the definition that money is everything in human life. The students tried to compare the argumentation everyone needed money and the reality that some people used the wrong ways to get that money. This was how the students defended their standpoints and stood on their position. Data (11) indicated

how the party assigned its beliefs about the case. The party tried to show that they were on the antagonist's side.

In the opening stage, the use of declarative speech act is 0,3% (protagonist) which means only one student uses declarative to represent explanations, definitions, and the expression of the viewpoint.

12) Standardized Test (UN) is an exam held to control student competence at the primary and secondary education levels as a result of the learning process in accordance with the Graduate Competency Standards (SKL) (133)

The student uses declaratives in the opening stage used to define the National examination.

Argumentative Stage

In the argumentative stage, the protagonist role is to defend the initial viewpoint (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2003) and to counter the antagonist's argument. The researchers found four types of speech acts: assertive 22,9% (protagonist) and 14,4% (antagonist), commissives 2,2 % (protagonist), directives (2,6% (protagonist) and 1,1% (antagonist), and declarative 0,7% (protagonist) and 0,3% (antagonist)., Assertiveness in the argumentative stage refers to how the

speaker or writer presents the case and increases the discussion participants' points of view (van Eemeren & Grootendorst, 2004). Speakers or writers use assertive speech acts to extract data and show the truth to convince others. Opponents will respond to a question using a variety of arguments. The objective also includes getting the other individual to come clean and admit the truth. The statement may convey the viewpoint under discussion, support a viewpoint with an argument, or explain the result of a discussion. Fahmi and Rustono (2018) also found that assertives were used to indicate explanation and argumentation. Excerpt (13) shows how the protagonist student defends the standpoint by exploring data and the truth of the effectiveness of National Examination, while another writer showed the opposite argumentation (Data 14). It is in line with van Eemeren et al. (2007), who gave a specific illustration of this assertive speech act adds to the argument.

13) The standardized test (UN) is also an exercise to face the challenges that will occur after graduating from school to form a superior generation. As a quote says, "If it is like a standardized test (UN) is only a rung of the ladder that you must pass before piling up thousands of other stairs that wait

in the future." Standardized tests train student's mentality and train student's responsibilities which will be very useful for students in the future. Cheating during standardized tests (UN) reflects students with weak mentality because they are not confident, lack of effort, rely only on friends, and easily give up on challenges. Mental learners must be built very well (132)

14) Several reasons make this Standardized Test (UN) an unhealthy competency. First, some students cannot get good grades because they cannot master the material due to educational gaps between regions. Second, they will justify any means to get good grades because the Standardized Test (UN) purpose grades, including cheating to get good grades. Last, educators who work closely with students (133)

The protagonists also used commissive speech acts in the argumentation stage (2,2%) to indicate that they agreed or disagreed with the opponents' argumentation. For example:

15) Do You still think that when you got a lot of money leads to happiness? okay-okay, so how

about this when you buy something that you like, you felt happy right when buying those items, such as your favorite supercar, a mansion, etc. With the money, you can afford a lot of things that you want to own, so I think the more money you spend on your favorite things, the happier you are (108)

Excerpt (15) shows the illustration that buying things, fulfilling their needs, and spending more money on a hobby will create happiness in real life. It describes the reality of people with much money who can do whatever they want. Kamariah (2021) also found that using commissives were used to show that the students can do something better than others.

The speech acts used in the argumentation stage were directives, respectively 2.6% for protagonist and 1,1% for the antagonist), in the form of asking other students to give a definition, specification, and further explanation. Using directives also indicates that the students want to advance argumentation in explaining the case. Saifudin (2019) suggested that an effectively-directed speech act might be used to criticize arguments that support or defend a point of view, solicit an opponent's opinion to support a speaker's point of view, or ask an

opponent to clarify or explain a remark. For example:

16) In simple word money is everything but everything is not about money. What do you mean by that? If someone dies, we can't buy a soul for them and we can't also make their life (119)

17) Well, still not believing that money leads to happiness? , well if that is the case, let's take a look at this, well-known research from 2010 had shown that people tend to feel happier the more money they make only up until a point of about $75,000 a year. More people felt happiest when they can make more money than they think of right

Directive speech acts, exemplified by data (16) for the protagonist and (17) for the antagonist, are explicitly used to ask explanation about the opposite student's statement. The students were able to weaken the opposite arguments by asking for clarification. As van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004) said, the directive speech act in the argumentation stage is used to ask the opponent to define, specify, and explain the argumentation in order to support the standpoint.

The researchers also found declaratives in the Argumentation stage whose function is for giving definition,

specification, and additional argumentation to support the standpoint. Pragma-dialectic are 0,7% (for the protagonists) and 0,3 % used by the antagonist shown in the data (18) and (19). Both excerpts indicate how students try to define terms to strengthen their standpoint.

18) The Standardized Test (UN) is an examination carried out as a national evaluation system for elementary to high school

19) The death penalty is a sentence or verdict handed down by the court as the heaviest form of punishment imposed on a person due to his actions

Conclusion stage

In the last stages, the conclusion stage, it was reported that most protagonist (8,9%) and antagonist (8,5%) students used assertive. The findings were in line with van Eemeren and Grootendorst (2004) who believed that assertiveness is used to defend one's standpoint and assign the result of the discussion. Data (20) and (21) show how protagonist and antagonist students firmly believed their standpoint in their argumentation. Kaldjärv (2011) also found in his research that students tended to use assertive speech acts to preserve their standpoint

20) The conclusion is money can bring a person happiness. Money can increase the satisfaction of life depending on how people spend it. If everyone spends money on experiences or items that match his values, it will increase each person's happiness. And the last quote is, "money can't buy happiness, but it has happier money."(112)

21) In conclusion, many strong reasons say that money is not a source of happiness, money is only a tool for needs, and don't be excessive in spending. Money cannot buy happiness because true happiness comes from our hearts when we can be grateful for what we have (113)

Discussion

This research viewed how the students construct argumentative writing and how the distribution of speech act in every stage of argumentative writing. The finding above shows how the discussant uses confrontation, opening, argumentation, and conclusion to construct argumentative text. Based on the stages in critical discussion, the researchers found three groups of discussants in using critical discussion stages related to van Eemeren et al. (1984) such as confrontation, opening, argumentation,

and conclusion. This research shows that the students apply every stage in critical discussion in different ways. No specific rules in applying stages in critical discussion, so some students use confrontation and opening stage in the introduction and use four stages in every next developing paragraph, and a conclusion ends all. Some students use argumentation in developing paragraphs, and all argumentation ends at the conclusion stage. And, also some students use stages disheveled.

On another point, the students' result discussion shows the pragmatic insight which focuses on speech acts introduced by Searle (1969). Four speech acts were used in students' argumentative writing, such as commissives, assertive, directives, and declarative, but the variations are only shown in the topic development stage. It is because the students do not have enough knowledge of pragmatics. The current research implied that the pragma-dialectic approach can be used to help students write argumentative writing systematically using critical discussion stages. In addition, speech acts are very important for students, so they can know the purposes of writing the argumentation. It helps them build brief, reasonable, logical argumentation to prove to the reader.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTION

The stages in constructing argumentation help the students write the argumentative text systemically. They can place the stages based on argumentation purposes. Implementing the Pragma-dialectical theory enhances the comprehension of argumentation texts from a pragmatic and dialectical perspective. Besides, this approach helps students to have good critical thinking in resolving different opinions. Through this approach, the students are trained to discuss and explore their opinion by showing ideas, evidence, and data. Also, the students must give a rebuttal, defend the standpoint of the case and refuse the opposite argumentation. Sometimes, they can show that other arguments are weak and unconvincing to prove others with students' arguments. The finding shows that not all students follow the stages of critical discussion in sequence, so this is very important to introduce the use of the stages in critical discussion very well.

Besides that, understanding pragmatics is very needed here because it explains the purposes of argumentation. In this research, the use of speech acts does not vary in some stages because the students lack understanding of the use of language. For the next research, the teacher

should understand how to use speech acts in argumentative writing and why the students use them. This way will help the students to have clear arguments when they do critical discussions with others.

Acknowledgments

REFERENCES

Allani, S. (2018). Academic writing for Spanish scholars: Exploring the challenges with argumentation analysis. *LSP in Multi-Disciplinary Contexts of Teaching and Research*, 59–64.

Andrews, R. (2000). Introduction: Learning to Argue in Higher Education. In R. Andrews & S. Mitchell (Eds.), *Heinemann* (pp. 1–14). Boynton/Cook.

Fahmi, R. N., & Rustono, R. (2018). Types of Speech Acts in Indonesian Debate Argumentative Discourse. *Seloka Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesian*, 7(1), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.15294/seloka.v7i1.22941

Ferretti, R. P., Lewis, W. E., & Andrews-Weckerly, S. (2009). Do goals affect the structure of students' argumentative writing strategies? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(3), 577–589.

Fisher, A. (2013). *Critical Thinking: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Humblin, C. L. (1970). *Fallacies*. Methuen.

Indrilla, N., & Ciptaningrum, D. S. (2018). An approach in teaching writing skills: Does it offer a new insight in enhancing students' writing ability. *A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 21(2), 124–133.

Kaldjärv, M. (2011). Pragma-dialectics on the basis of state examination composition. *Problems of Education in The 21st Century*, 38, 37–49.

Kamariah. (2021). Argumentative Indicators in Mata Najwa Talk Show Pragma-dialectical Study. *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Arts and Humanities 2021*. https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.211223.033

Kementerian Pendidikan dan kebudayaan RI. (2020). *Rencana Strategis Kementerian Pendidikan dan kebudayaan 2020-2024*. https://dikti.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/RENSTRA-KEMENDIKBUD-full-version.pdf

List, A., & Alexander, P. A. (2019). Toward an integrated framework of multiple text use. *Educational Psychologist*, *54*(1), 20–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1505514

Ma, J., & Chen, H. (2009). A Pragma-dialectical study of pragmatic argumentation in academic argument. *Advances in Educational Technology and Psychology*, *2*, 209–219.

Marchal, A. H. (2021). The interactionist approach to speech acts and its role in the analysis of argumentation. *Proceedings of the X Conference of the Spanish Society of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, 10–13.

Miri, T. (2014). Toward finding an approach for improving the rhetorical organization of EFL learners' argumentative writing. *The International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature (IJALEL)*, *3*(3), 164–170. https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.3n.3p.164

Saifudin, A. (2019). Teori tindak tutur dalam studi linguistik pragmatic. *Lite Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, *15*(1), 1–16.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in The Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Setyowati, L., Sukmawan, S., & Latief, M. A. (2017). Solving the students' problems in writing argumentative essay through the provision of planning. *CELT: A Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching & Literature*, *17*(1), 86–102. https://doi.org/10.24167/celt.v17i1.1140

Svačinová, I. (2021). Pragma-dialectical Reconstruction of Crisis Diary-Writing as a Communicative Activity Type. *Argumentation*, *35*, 237–264. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-020-09524-0

Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge University Press.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, & Meuffels. (1984). Het identificeren van enkelvoudige argumentatie [Identifying single argumentation. *Tijdschrift voor Taalbeheersing*, *6*(4), 297–310.

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2003). A Pragma-dialectical Procedure for a Critical Discussion. *Argumentation*, *17*, 365–386. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026334218681

van Eemeren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (2004). *A systematic theory of argumentation: The Pragma-dialectical approach*. Cambridge University Press.

van Eemeren, F. H., Grootendorst, R., & Henkemans, A. F. (2002). *Argumentation: Analysis, Evaluation, Presentation*. Routledge.

van Eemeren, Houtlosser, & Henkemans. (2007). *Argumentative Indicators: A Pragma-dialectical Study.* Springer.

van Rees, M. A. (2009). *Dissociation in argumentative discussions. A Pragma-dialectical perspective.* Springer.

Walton, D. (2007). *Dialogue Theory For Critical Argumentation.* John Benjamins Publishing Company.