

STRUCTURAL ARGUMENT AND PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS ON DUA SISI TALK SHOW

ALMA ALQARANA LUBIS

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara

Email: almaalqaranalubis@gmail.com

Abstract

This study deals with the structural argument and pragmatic analysis on Dua Sisi Talk Show. The objectives of the study were to analyze the argument structures of the speakers on Dua Sisi Talk Show, to investigate the speakers' ways in delivering arguments and to find out the dominant types of speech act used by the speakers on Dua Sisi Talk Show. This study applied a descriptive qualitative method to analyze the data. The data were the utterances presented by the speakers on Dua Sisi Talk Show. The technique of data analyzing was from the data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The research finding showed that there were 32 arguments found in this research which consist of 13 standard arguments and 19 non-standard arguments. Furthermore, there were 22 arguments categorized as locutionary acts, 4 arguments categorized as illocutionary acts, and 6 arguments categorized as perlocutionary acts based on Austin's theory. Locutionary act was the dominant type of speech acts found on Dua Sisi Talk Show.

Keywords: Structural argument, pragmatic, Dua Sisi Talkshow

 This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

1. INTRODUCTION

According to Govier (2018), an argument is "a set of claims in which one or more of them the premises are put forward to offer reasons for another claim, the conclusion". An argument may have several premises, or it may have only one. there are two premises. When we present arguments in speaking or writing, we try to persuade others by giving reasons or citing evidence to back up our claims.

Arguments are found everywhere in the lives of human beings include in mass media such as newspapers, radio, television, and the internet. One of the programs on television that portray arguments as their bases is the Dua Sisi talk show. Dua Sisi is one of the talk show programs that aired on TvOne. It discussed issues of politics, law, crime, and various hot topics in the community for 60 minutes. This program has attracted more than 71 thousand viewers all over Indonesia since it provides an exciting debate between elements of the public who expressed their aspirations directly with members of the council in the DPR / MPR courtroom.

When someone speaks and gives an argument, then the listener will prepare to understand what does the speaker means. The listener used pragmatic as a tool to understand the meaning of the speaker's argumentation. The factor that made researcher interested to do this research because there is no thesis or research that study about structural argument and pragmatic analysis using the speech act theory and none of the researchers had researched on Dua Sisi Talk Show. The researcher aims to analyze the meaning contained in the argument, to find the types of speech acts are used by the

speakers, and to find the dominant types of speech act that used by the speakers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Argumentation is giving opinions or the reasons to reinforce or reject an opinion, Solahudin (2009). According to Toulmin cited in Renkema (2017), a claim can be admitted to support an argument only if its statement achieves the standard of argument. Argumentation plays as a communicative process to present and test the acceptability of the arguer's standpoint. It means argumentation emerges when two or more individuals express different points of view and then construct a reason to test their standpoint. According to Kuhn and Udell cited in Birol Bulut (2019), the argument is the result of the discussion in support of a claim. Furthermore, Hasibuan, S. H., & Manurung, I. D. (2020) stated that the standard argument (coordinative argument) which consists of a combination of a premise, explanations, and proofs to form a conclusion.

There are many argument models according to some experts, such as internal structure consist of a set of assumptions or premises, a method of reasoning or deduction, and a conclusion or poin. Pragmatic is a subsection of linguistics that studies how people comprehend and produce a communicative act or speech act in a concrete speech situation which is usually in the form of utterance. In the philosophy of language, a natural language or sometimes called ordinary language that is a language which is spoken, written, or signed by human beings for the general purpose of communication. Besides, Green (1989) cited in (I Ketut Seken, 2015), pragmatic as "the study of speaker meaning" means that the main focus of pragmatic is "meaning" that is produced by the speaker when using language to communicate.

Based on the definitions of pragmatics discussed above, we can conclude that pragmatics is the study that deals with meaning that is precise, meaning in interaction which necessarily involves context. Seken (2015) Pragmatic is concerned with concerning to the study of language in use, there certainly are various levels of meaning that should first of all be made clear concerning a pragmatic analysis proper. These in general can be categorized into three levels, namely, 'abstract meaning', contextual meaning', and 'speaker meaning'.

Context is the part of a description or sentence that can support or add clarity to the meaning of a situation that has to do with an event.context is the main foothold in the pragmatic analysis. Context is crucial in the interpretation of the meaning of specific speech act, the underlying intentions of a specific utterance, assumed relationships between utterance, and how acts are organized within events and events within situations.

A speech act is the branch of pragmatics that concerns the meaning of actions performed by speaker's utterance. This definition is in line with the Austin (1962), that speech act is an action performed in saying something. Pragmatics learn the purpose of utterance, which is what it is used for; asking what someone means by a speech act; and associating meaning with who speaks to whom, where, and how. The speech act is a central entity in pragmatics and is also the basis for the analysis of other topics in this field such as presupposition, participation, conversational implicature, cooperation principle, and politeness principle. Textual, pragmatic rhetoric requires the principle of cooperation. Speech acts that have a specific purpose cannot be separated from the concept of the speech situation. The concept clarifies the meaning of speech acts as an act that produces speech as speech acts.

Dua Sisi is one of the talk show programs that aired on TvOne since 11 August 2017. Discusses issues of politics, law, crime and various hot topics in the community for 60 minutes. This is a talk show that contains several guest stars present as speakers, and each speaker is on two different sides, which are the pros and cons. Many speakers give their arguments on this talk show.

Dua Sisi talk show is different from other talk shows like Indonesia Lawyers Club Tvone. Dua Sisi talk show is a talk show that is more suited to the concept of exchanging arguments or debate concepts because it is clear that there are speakers on both sides, namely the pros and cons following the name of the talk show. Dua Sisi talk show is one of the talk shows that raise the hottest issues.

2. METHODOLOGY

This study were conducted by the descriptive qualitative method. The data of the study were utterances presented by the speaker on Dua Sisi Talk Show with the theme "Ketika Rakyat Bicara di Parlemen" on TvOne. Dua Sisi is one of the talk show programs that aired on TvOne since 11 August 2017. Discuss issue of politics, law, crime, and various hot topics in the community for 60 minutes. The source of the data taken from youtube <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FzPyt1vlvDk>. This talk show was discussed on 12 February 2020 with a duration of time 1:08:54 and consists of nine speakers.

Researcher used a method of documentation based on transcripts and also videos taken from the internet. The technique to be used to collecting of data in this study are based in a few steps, they are: (1) The researcher watched and listened the video Dua Sisi Talk Show until done. (2) Understanding the arguments presented by the speakers. (3) The researcher inditified the data and also report the finding. (4) The researcher created the transcription of the video. (5) The last step in collecting data was diplaying.the researcher displayed the data.

3. RESULT

After analyzing the data, the researcher found 32 arguments which consist of 13 standard arguments and 19 non-standard arguments. Based on the collected data, it can be seen that there were 13 standard arguments with percentage 40,625%, and there were 19 non-standard arguments with percentage 59,375%.

There are 6 parts to make a standard argument namely claim, data, warrant, backing rebuttal, and qualifier. The first elements "Claim", "Data", "Warrant", belong to the essential components of the practical argument. While the second triad, "Backing", "Rebuttal", "Qualifier", are the complement and might not be equipped in particular circumstances. This structure argument used to analyzed the arguments presented by the speakers on Dua Sisi Talk Show. The researcher found there were 13 standard arguments.

Based on the collected data, it can be seen that there were only 13 standard arguments consist of 5 claim, data, and warrant (15,625%), 1 claim, data, warrant, backing, and qualifier (3,125%), 3 claim, data, warrant, and qualifier (9,375%), 1 claim, data, warrant, claim, warrant, and qualifier (3,125%), 1 claim, data, warrant, and rebuttal (3,125%), 2 claim, data, warrant, and backing (6,25%).

4. DISCUSSION

Data 6 (Sultan Rivandi)

"UU KPK mungkin masih seumur jagung tapi seharusnya gak punya umur sama sekali. Seharusnya KPK tidak seperti sekarang[Qualifier]. Bapak-bapak yang ada didepan itu begitu optimis memandang bahwa KPK ini akan berhasil tetapi kalau ada wajah sebaliknya, kita justru melihat penetrasi undang undang yang baru sama sekali tidak ada penguatannya[Claim]. Contohnya OTT. Dramatisasi OTT PT ikan seperti negara yang tak bisa ditembus oleh para penyidik. selanjutnya, kasus komisar Rosa yang kemudian dikembalikan ke institusinya[Data]. Dimana penetrasi penguatannya. Hal ini dikarenakan adanya cacat prosedur pada saat pembuatan RUU KPK dimana RUU tersebut dibuat pada saat kondisi yang sangat genting dan gentingnya darimana, akibat pada saat pilpres[Warrant].

The argument above can be translated in English, **"The Corruption Eradication Commission Law probably still young, but it shouldn't have any age. The KPK should not be like this[Qualifier].** The gentlemen at the front were so optimistic that KPK would be successful, but if there is a face to the contrary, **we see that the penetration of the new law has no strengthening[Claim].** For example, OTT. The dramatization of PT Fish's OTT is like a country that cannot be penetrated by investigators. Furthermore, the commissioner Rosa's case was later returned to her institution[Data]. Where is the penetration of his strengthening. This is due to a procedural defect at the time of drafting RUU KPK where the revision was made when conditions were very precarious and precarious from where, because of the

presidential election[Warrant].

In the analysis, the first component of argument structure found was qualifier.

In the previous study of structural argument analysis conducted by Andini Khoirunisa and Rohmani Nur Indah (2017), qualifier is shows certainty and possibility such as **the Corruption Eradication Commission Law probably still young but it shouldn't have any age. The KPK should not be like this.** The speaker successfully created a qualifier. The speaker mention the word "Probably". The second component of argument structure found was claim. Claim is an assertion in response to a contentious topic or problem. In sorts of opinion, attitude, or controversial statement that needs further evidence or needs to be defended, such as **we see that the penetration of the new law has no strengthening.** In that regard, the speaker was able to present a claim. The speaker make an assertion that **the new law has no strengthening.** The speaker successfully make a claim to response a contentious topic or problem. The third component of argument structure found was data. Data is the facts or evidence used to prove the argument, such as **for example OTT. The dramatization of PT Fish's OTT is like a country that cannot be penetrated by investigators. Furthermore, the commissioner Rosa's case was later. returned to her institution.** That was the data. The speaker was able to provide the data to support his claim. The fourth component of argument structure found was warrant. Warrant is the general, hypothetical (and often implicit) logical statements that serve as bridges between the claim and the data, such as **this is due to a procedural defect at the time of drafting RUU KPK where the revision was made when conditions were very precarious and precarious from where, because of the presidential election.** The speaker successfully make a warrant to be the connector between the claim and the data.

Data 8 (Asfinawati)

"Ya, sudah cukup lama proses penegakan hukum tidak berkerja[Claim]. Ada banyak data data yang cukup mencengangkan yang kami kumpulkan dari 16 provinsi. Misalnya data yang tidak fair paling banyak adalah kasus kriminalisasi. Ada orang yang sebetulnya tidak salah, dia menyampaikan pendapat yaitu mengkritik pemerintah kemudian dijadikan tersangka. Kasus ini ada 47 kasus dan tersangkanya sebanyak 1.019 orang[Data]. Saya tidak bisa berkata-kata lagi karena untuk negara-negara yang sangat meghormati HAM maka satu nyawa manusia sangat berharga[Warrant].

The argument above can be translated in English, **"Yes, the law enforcement process has not worked for quite a while[Claim]. There is a lot of data that is quite surprising that we collect from 16 provinces. For example, the most unfair data are criminalization cases. There is people who are not really wrong, they express their opinion, namely to criticize the government and then become a suspect. There were 47 cases in this case and 1,019 suspects[Data]. I am speechless because for countries that really respect human rights, one human life is very valuable [Warrant].**

In the analysis, the first component of argument structure found was claim, such as **Yes, the law enforcement process has not worked for quite a while.** The speaker successfully make a claim and an assertion to response a contentious topic or problem. According to the theory of Toulmin (2003) cited in Andini Khoirunisa and Rohmani Nur Indah (2017), Claim is an assertion in response to a contentious topic or problem. In sorts of opinion, attitude, or controversial statement that needs further evidence or needs to be defended. The second component of argument structure found was data. Data is the facts or evidence used to prove the argument, such as **there is a lot of data that is quite surprising that we collect from 16 provinces. For example, the most unfair data are criminalization cases. There is people who are not really wrong, they express their opinion, namely to criticize the government and then become a suspect. There were 47 cases in this case and 1,019 suspects.** In that regard, the speaker was able to provide the data or the evidence to prove the claim that there were 47 criminalization cases from 16 provinces. The third component of argument structure found was warrant. Warrant is the general, hypothetical (and often implicit) logical statements that serve as bridges between the claim and the data, such as **i am speechless because for countries that**

really respect human rights, one human life is very valuable. In that regard, the speaker was able to present the warrant. The speaker said that **a country that really respect human rights, one human life is very valuable.** That was a logical statement that serve as bridges between the claim and data.

The researcher found there were 19 non-standard arguments on Dua Sisi Talk Show. Based on the collected data, it can be seen that that there were 19 non-standard arguments (59,375%) consist of 10 claims (31,25%), 1 data (3,125%), 1 claim and data (3,125%), 1 claim and warrant (3,125%), 3 rebuttals (9,375%), 2 claim, data, warrant (6,25%), and 1 claim, warrant, rebuttal (3,125%).

Based on the data above, the researcher the researcher has made 2 examples of non-standard arguments from 19 non-standard arguments that have been found on Dua Sisi Talk Show. Two examples of non-standard argument were described as follow:

Data 19 (Sultan Rivandi)

"Dosis narasi kebaikan begitu bagus tapi saat implemementasi kekhawatirannya terjadi dan sperti itulah suara kaum buruh. Ada persoalan dan presentasi yang tidak terwakili[Claim].

The argument above can be translated in English, **"The narrative dose of kindness is great but when it is implemented the worry occurs and that is the voice of the workers. There are problems and presentations that are not represented[Claim].**

In the analysis, the component of argument structure found was a claim, such as **the narrative dose of kindness is great but when it is implemented the worry occurs and that is the voice of the workers. There are problems and presentations that are not represented.** The speaker was able to provide the claim but he was unable to provide futher component of argument structure to explain his claim. therefore, his argument was non-standard argument because he failed to provide three or six components of argument structure.

Data 25 (Fadli Zon)

"Sebenarnya begini, sering kali dalam data-data itu perlu dikoreksi[Rebuttal]. Legislatif itu dicampur[Claim]. DPR, DPRD, DPRD kabupaten kota. DPR RI itu berbeda statusnya dengan DPR di provonsi dengan DPRD yang masuk di dalam pemerintah daerah[Data].

The argument above can be translated in English, **"Actually like this, often in the data it needs to be corrected [Rebuttal]. The legislature was mixed [Claim]. DPR, DPRD, DPRD city regency. The DPR RI has a different status from the DPR in the province from the DPRD which is included in the regional government [Data]"**

In the analysis, the first component of argument structure found was rebuttal. Rebuttal is Counter-arguments or statements indicating circumstances when the general argument does not hold. It can be conditions which strengthen or weaken a claim, such as **actually like this, often in the data it needs to be corrected.** The speaker was able to provide a rebuttal first to rebute a claim from the previous speaker. The second componend of argument structure found was claim. In sorts of opinion, attitude, or controversial statement that needs further evidence or needs to be defended, such as **the legislature was mixed.** The speaker was able to provide a claim in response to a contentious topic or problem. The speaker make a simple claim that the legislature was mixed. The third component of argument structure found was data. The data is the facts or evidence used to prove the argument, such as **DPR, DPRD, DPRD city regency. The DPR RI has a different status from the DPR in the province from the DPRD which is included in the regional government.** The speaker was able to provide the data to explain a claim but he failed to provide warrant and other components of argument structure. In the previous study of structural argument analysis conducted by Andini Khoirunisa and Rohmani Nur Indah (2017), warrant is the general principle or the logical statements that serve as bridges between the claim and the data. Warrant was used to support the data but he failed to provide the warrant. Therefore, the argument was non-standard argument.

In this case, the data were identified to know the reasons of using the argument structure on Dua Sisi Talk Show by using Austin's theory (1962). According to Austin, the

meaning of argument can be viewed from 3 types of speech acts (locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary). The researcher found 22 arguments as locutionary act, 4 arguments as illocutionary act, and 6 arguments as perlocutionary act.

Based on the collected data, it can be seen that there were 22 arguments (68,75%) categorized as locutionary act, 4 arguments (12,5%) categorized as illocutionary act and, 6 arguments (18,75%) categorized as perlocutionary act. Then locutionary act was found as the most dominant speech acts on Dua Sisi Talk Show.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the research of the study, there were several important information taken from the research finding as conclusion of the study. There were 6 elements of structural argument namely claim, data, warrant, backing, rebuttal, and qualifier. The researcher found 32 arguments of 9 speakers consist of 19 non-standard arguments (59,375%) and 13 standard arguments (40,625%).

The researcher found there were 13 standard arguments (40,625%) consist of 5 claim, data, and warrant (15,625%), 1 claim, data, warrant, backing, and qualifier (3,125%), 3 claim, data, warrant, and qualifier (9,375%), 1 claim, data, warrant, claim, warrant, and qualifier (3,125%), 1 claim, data, warrant, and rebuttal (3,125%), 2 claim, data, warrant, and backing (6,25%). Furthermore, the researcher found 19 non-standard arguments (59,375%) consist of 10 claims (31,25%), 1 data (3,125%), 1 claim and data (3,125%), 1 claim and warrant (3,125%), 3 rebuttals (9,375%), 2 claim, data, warrant (6,25%), and 1 claim, warrant, rebuttal (3,125%).

Based on the data for pragmatic analysis, the researcher found there were 22 arguments (68,75%) categorized as locutionary act, 4 arguments (12,5%) categorized as illocutionary act and, 6 arguments (18,75%) categorized as perlocutionary act. Then locutionary act was found as the most dominant speech acts on Dua Sisi Talk Show.

6. REFERENCES

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Clarendon: Oxford.
- Bulut, B. (2019). Argumentation-Based Learning in Social Studies. *Teaching Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(3), 89-94.
- Hasibuan, S. H., & Manurung, I. D. (2020). Examining Argument Elements and Logical Fallacies of English Education Students in Oral Discussion. *Tell: Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal*, 8(2), 57.
- Khoirunisa, A., & Indah, R. N.Z(2017). Argumentative statements in the 2016 Presidential Debates of the US: a critical discourse analysis. *Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies*, 4(2), 155-173.
- Renkema, J. (2006). *Introduction to discourse studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Pub Co.
- Seken, I. K. (2015). *Introduction to Pragmatics: A Course Book for Beginners*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Solahudin, Muhammad, (2009). *Kiat-Kiat Cepat Belajar Writing*, Jogjakarta: Diva Press.