AN ANALYSIS OF STRUCTURE OF ARGUMENTATION IN THE ARTICLES OF THE JAKARTA POST NEWSPAPER FROM 20 AUGUST UNTIL 22 SEPTEMBER 2010*

Maulida Legianti

Alvin Taufik

Universitas Bunda Mulia

Abstract

This research analyzes the structure of argumentation used in the articles of the Jakarta Post newspaper from 20 August until 22 September 2010. It also has the purpose to find out the way the journalist constructs the argumentation in his article.

This research uses a descriptive method. The researcher takes the data from the articles of the Jakarta Post newspaper dated from 20 August until 22 September 2010. The researcher collects the data using text observation. After that, the researcher analyzes the data using related theories in order to find out the structure of argumentation in the headlines of the Jakarta Post newspaper.

After the writer analyzes the data using the related theories, the writer finds each elements of argumentation that exists in the articles of the Jakarta Post newspaper.

In conclusion, the structure of argumentation used by the journalist from the Jakarta Post newspaper in the article about terrorism dated from August 20, 2010 until September 22, 2010 can be ordered into: first the journalist gives the probability claims. After that, the journalist provides the second order data and first order data. To make the data and claim related, the journalist gives the authoritative warrants. Then, to advocate the warrant the journalist gives the backing and the qualifiers for the restricted data if the data uses foundation and the claim is not clear and accurate.

Keywords:

argumentative discourse, structure of argumentation

1.   Introduction

Nowadays, many people read newspaper for their needs. A newspaper consists of news such as information about politics, entertainment, finance, etc. News is a quick report about facts or new ideas which are interesting and important to people. According to Dana, news is "anything that interests a large part of the

*Taken from the author's thesis which has been published internally in UBM

community and has never been brought to its attention before" (qtd. in *Mencher* 70). In this research, the data are taken from the website of the Jakarta Post newspaper. This is because the website of the Jakarta Post newspaper is more significant and structured than other newspaper websites.

One of the functions of newspaper is delivering message using text. The journalist presents the news through the articles he / she writes. According to Wibowo, there are four elements in a newspaper article: (1) headline, (2) dateline, (3) lead and (4) body (47). The writer analyzes the newspaper article about terrorism because it shows crucial issues.

There are a lot of articles about terrorism in the *Jakarta Post* newspaper such as bomb terror, activities of terrorism in some area, and the robberies whom the suspects are allegedly linked to the terrorist. Based on terrorism definition by Walter Reich, terrorism is "a strategy of violence designed to promote desired outcomes by instilling a fear in the public at large" (qtd in Whittaker, TERORISME Fundamentalis Kristen, Yahudi, Islam 25). The writer had chosen the article in the Jakarta Post newspaper dated from 20 August until 22 September 2010. This is because during that time there were a group of people who robbed a branch of the CIMB Niaga bank in Medan. The perpetrators were linked with terrorists. It is interesting because usually topics about terrorism are about bomb terrors and terrorist activities in some area. Therefore, the article about the terrorism which happened in Medan is interesting to bring up because the suspects are linked with terrorists.

In discourse analysis, argumentation is a type of discourse which is called argumentative discourse. Toulmin's model defines argumentative discourse "as specifying modes of arguing and indicating when they are acceptable" (3). It is interesting because sometimes even though arguments are not clear even from headlines which are long; the reader knows what the article in the newspaper discusses. An argumentation can be structured using Toulmin's model. Toulmin says that the structure of argumentation is "an analysis of the argumentation discourse which analyze not only the logical form of an argumentation but also how an argument is structured" (203). This is interesting because usually the

arguments are stated verbally. Thus, the writer wants to know how a written argumentation is structured.

There was a research which had previously analyzed the structure of argumentation in newspaper. Astuti (2007) with "*Argumentasi dalam Editorial Surat Kabar Berbahasa Indonesia: Kajian Pada Harian Kompas dan Media Indonesia*", compared the elements of structure of argumentation in two printed mass media in editorials – *Kompas* and *Media Indonesia*. That research is different from this research because this research analyzes the articles in the Jakarta Post newspaper. Furthermore, it is important to note that this article is a summary of a research previously conducted by the writer (Legianti, 2011).

2.   Elements of Argumentation

There are many models of structure of argumentation by different experts. After analyzing the four models of structure of argumentation, the importance of the structure of argumentation is that how the arguments are structured (qtd. in Renkema, 203). Renkema presents Toulmin's model of structure argumentation into six elements that can be used for analyzing argumentative discourse. Those elements are (1) data: fact that can be used for evidence as the foundation of the claim; (2) claim; a statement which is stated to be received as a truth; (3) warrant; the relationship between data and claim to show that there is a relation between data and claim; (4) backing: the evidence to support the answer of another question that is related to the claim which has been stated; (5) qualifier: words or phrases expressing the speaker's degree of force or certainty concerning the claim; (6) rebuttal: denying an argument which has been stated. Renkema states that the main analysis of an argument in Toulmins model are three elements which are data, claim, and warrant. The other elements are used based on the writers need, although the information which has been stated is clear.

Renkema says that there are three types of evidence (data) in argumentation analysis. First-order data offer the best possibilities for convincing argumentation. The receiver is convinced of the data. This data is related to the statistics or result of the report. Hoekens calls this as the statistical evidence (data). It is evidence based on the data statistics (qtd. in Renkema 213).

Second-order data is dangerous when the credibility of the source is low. The type of data (evidence) is based on the credibility of the source which comes from the individual authority, organization, and government.

Third-order data is based on one source. This type consists of opinion about the fact that is stated by other sources. Hoeken calls this as anecdotal evidence. It is evidence based on the explanation by other sources (qtd. in Renkema 213).

Renkema also mentions the types of claims which are adapted from Hoeken (213). The first is probability. Probability claims is a claim based on the probability. For example, extra streetlights on the sidewalk will result in a sharp decrease in the number of burglaries. The second is desirable claims. Desirable claim is a claim based on the desirable. For example: burglaries have very undesirable consequences for the victims.

Moreover, Toulmin's model differentiated three types of warrants: (a) Motivational Warrants, (b) Authoritative Warrants, and (c) Substantive Warrants, as can be seen below:

a. Motivational Warrant

The motivational warrant is the relationship between the data and claim by expressing the benefit of the claim for the receiver. For example:

> **Every woman should have the right to decide for herself whether she wants an abortion**. Therefore, this abortion law, which conflicts with the right, cannot be ratified, as no law should infringe on the rights of the individual (Renkema: 204).

This warrant has motivational relation which is used for the claim. The claim is shown in the sentence which is underlined and in bold, that mentions "*every woman should have the right to decide for herself....*" For this claim, the journalist represented the evidence in a form of law which should not come into conflict with someone including the right to decide an abortion. Therefore, this warrant is linked to the claim and data (evidence) by expressing the benefit of the claim for the readers or receivers.

b. Authoritative Warrant

The authoritative warrant is the relationship between the data and claim by using the credibility of an authority to make the claim stick. For example:

> **The Defense Department has announced that hostilities will soon cease.** Peace is at hand. It is safe to draw this conclusion as the Defense Department is a reliable source (Renkema: 204).

The authoritative warrant is shown in the example above because the word "*has announced*" which is stated by the Defense Department which has an authority to make a claim "*peace is at hand.*" Alwi states that "authority" also may be put forward as the right to refuse the action or the right to establish rules governing others" (qtd. in Astuti: 23).

c. Substantive Warrant

Substantive warrant is the relationship between the data and claim based on the systematic relationship between concepts in the external world. For example:

> (1) We are allowed to smoke here, because there is an ashtray on the table (Renkema: 205).
>
> (2) America's Vietnam policy has not brought world peace any closer. **So,** America must remain neutral concerning internal conflicts in the other countries. What proved true in Southeast Asia holds true for future conflicts? (Renkema: 205).

Sentence (1) is one of the examples of the warrant which is based on the external knowledge. Another example which is also considered as a substitutive warrant which is based on a generalization can be seen in sentence (2).

Backing is credentials designed to certify the statement expressed in the warrant. Backing must be introduced when the warrant itself is not convincing enough to the readers or the listeners. If the warrants are not clear, the backing will appear. This can help to show that there is an acceptance between the data and claim. For example:

> The provincial police have formed a special team and it is currently focusing their manhunt on Binjai and Deli Serdang. …. (Lines 18-19) (Source: The Jakarta Post newspaper)

The statement in lines 18-19 can support authoritative warrant in lines 16-17 which is about the perpetrator who were hiding in two places.

On the other hand, rebuttal is denial to an argument which has been stated. Rebuttals appear because there is incompatibility among the data and claim which is stated by the journalist and there is hesitation toward the data that is stated. For example:

> However, when asked to confirm these reports, North Sumatra Police Chief Insp. Gen. Oegroseno said he was not informed about the arrests. (Lines 14-15) (Source: The Jakarta Post)

In lines 14-15, it is clear that the statement is included as the rebuttal because the journalist uses the parameter such as 'however.' It means that the word is denying the claim.

As for the qualifier, they are words or phrases which express the speaker's degree of force or certainty concerning the claim. If the data serves as the foundation to the claim but is not accurate, the qualifier can appear to be restricted. This can help the data to be accurate and clearly support the claim. For example:

> People should not connect the robbery or the illicit firearms to recent terrorist activities in Aceh, he added. (Lines 6-7) (Source: The Jakarta Post)

The qualifier can be seen because the statements shows the degree of response about the rifles which came from Aceh. This degree indicates that the rifles came from Aceh.

3.   Findings

The writer found the total of each elements of argumentation used by the journalist in *The Jakarta Post* newspaper that can be identified are: 10 (ten) data of first order data, 16 (sixteen) data of second order data, and 3 (three) data of third order data. There are 22 (twenty-two) warrants that can be identified: they

are 1 (one) data of motivational warrant, 17 (seventeen) data of authoritative warrants, and 4 (four) data of substantive warrants. Furthermore, there 4 (four) claims data that can be categorized as: 3 (three) for the probability claims and 1 (one) for the desirability claim. Then, there are 12 (twelve) data for the backing that can be identified. The writer also found 13 (thirteen) data for the qualifier which can be identified. Finally, the data of rebuttals that can be identified are: 3 (three) data. This calculation of each elements of argumentation used by the journalist in *the Jakarta Post* newspaper can be seen in the table below:

TABLE 1

Elements of structure of argumentation used in article in the headlines of the Jakarta post newspaper dated 20 August till 22 September 2010.

No.	Dated of the headlines	Data			Warrants			Claims		Backing	Qualifier	Rebuttals
		1st order	2nd order	3rd order	Motivational	Authoritative	Substantive	Probability	Desirability			
1.	August 20, 2010	1	4	-	-	4	-	1	-	4	5	2
2.	August 23, 2010	2	3	2	1	5	-	-	1	3	3	-
3.	September 21, 2010	3	5	-	-	5	3	1	-	2	2	-
4.	September 22, 2010	4	4	1	-	3	1	1	-	3	3	1

4.   Conclusion

After analyzing all the data, the structure of argumentation used in the articles can be summarized. The structure of argumentation used in the articles of the Jakarta Post newspaper dated 20 August 2010 until 22 September 2010 is that claims always appear in the titles or headlines and the journalist from the Jakarta Post newspaper more often give the probability claims. Data or evidence appear in the first lines of the article especially for the second order data and first order data. Then, to create a relation between the data and claim, the journalist gives the warrant. The authoritative warrants very often appear to make the data and claim related. Moreover, to advocate the data, warrant, and claim, the journalist put the backing. After that, the journalist presents the qualifier toward the claims.

Further conclusion, the structure of argumentation which are often used by the journalist in the articles of the *Jakarta Post* newspaper about terrorism dated

20 August 2010 until 22 September 2010 are probability claims, second order data and first order data next to the authoritative warrants, backing, and qualifiers. The writer concludes that the elements of argumentation that always exist are: data or (evidence), warrants, claims, backing, and qualifier.

From the conclusion, the writer concludes that the pattern of the structure of argumentation that was used by the journalist of the Jakarta Post newspaper dated 20 August until 22 September 2010 is usually started with claim, data and warrant. However, there is an exception for data 3, after the journalist gives the claim; he started with the qualifier in the first lines.

References

Astuti. *Argumentasi dalam Editorial Surat Kabar Berbahsa Indonesia: Kajian Pada Harian Kompas dan Media Indonesia*. University of Indonesia, 2007.

Aristotle, W.D. Ross ed. *Rhetoric*. London: Oxford University Press, 1910-1931.

Eemeren, F.H Van, Grootendorst, Henkema. *Fundamental of Argumentation Theory*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlboum, 1996.

Eemeren, Frans H. Van, Grootendorst, J. Anthony Blair, Charles A. Willard (eds). *Argumentation: Across the Lines of Discipline: Proceedings of the Conference on Argumentation 1986*. The Netherland: Foris Publication Holland, 1986.

Eriyanto. *Analisis Wacana Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS Yogyakarta, 2001.

Frost, Chris. *Designing for Newspaper and Magazines*. New York: Rouledge, 2003.

Hendropriyono, A.M. *TERORISME Fundamentalis Kristen, Yahudi, Islam*. Jakarta: PT. KOMPAS Media Nusantara, 2009.

Masduqi, Harits. *Argument, Argumentation Analysis and Argumentative Devices*. Humanities-Journal of Language and Literature 2 (2006): 1.

Mencher, Melvin. *News Reporting and Writing*. 8th ed. Singapore: McGraw-Hill Book, 2000.

Parsons, Simon Nicholas Maudet, Pavlos Moraitis, Iyadrahwan. *Argumentation in Multy-Agent Systems*. Verlag Berlin Heidelberg: Springer, 2006.

Renkema, Jan. *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company, 2004.

Wibowo, Wahyu. *Manajemen Bahasa: Pengorganisasian Karangan Pragmatik dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 2001.