

## **CHAPTER II**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter present brief discussion about related literature which are used in the study. All relevant issues of this study will be discussed based on those theories.

#### **2.1 Previous Related Research Findings**

##### **2.1.1 Studies on Argumentative Strategy**

Previous research serves as a vital foundation for this study, as it enriches the theoretical framework and helps the researcher understand the broader context of related investigations. While no existing research was found that exactly matches the title of this study, several relevant studies have been selected to provide comparative insight and support the development of the research focus. These studies are outlined below.

First, the study by (Zikrillah & Ririn Putri, 2024), entitled *An Analysis of Argument Structure in Language Teaching Research Article on Discussion Part Published in IJAL Journal Based on Toulmin Argument Pattern (TAP)*, is closely related to the current research. The study examines the argument structure of discussion sections in articles published in the *International Journal of Applied Linguistics (IJAL)*. Using the Toulmin Argument Pattern (claim, data, warrant, rebuttal, and backing), the authors analyzed how arguments are constructed within these articles. The findings show that while most articles include the basic elements of claim and data, the presence of warrants and rebuttals is minimal. This suggests a partial application of the Toulmin model and indicates a need for better

understanding and implementation of comprehensive argumentative structures in academic writing.

Second, (Arsyad et al., 2021), in their study titled *Argument Strategies and Linguistic Realizations of the Discussion Sections in Local, National, and International Journal Articles in English Education by Indonesian Authors: How do they differ and/or resemble?* analyze 60 discussion sections from articles published in local (unaccredited), national (accredited), and international journals. The study aims to identify the differences in argumentative strategies and linguistic choices among these three categories. The results reveal clear differences: international journal articles tend to use longer and more elaborated discussions, with more references and complete argumentative strategies, including well-developed warrants and rebuttals. In contrast, national journals often employ partial strategies, and local journals mostly exhibit incomplete argument structures. Additionally, international articles mostly use non-integral (indirect) citations, whereas national and local journals frequently rely on integral (direct) citations.

Third, (Bermani et al., 2017) conducted a study titled *An Analysis of Argument Strategies of Research Article of English Postgraduate Program of Bengkulu University Published in Journal*, which also applies the Toulmin Argument Model to analyze both the introduction and discussion sections of research articles written by English postgraduate students. This research, focusing on articles published in the *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Literature (JOALL)*, found that most of the argument structures were only semi-complete. Claims and data were usually present, but warrants and rebuttals were often missing. The findings highlight the

need for postgraduate students to improve their argumentative skills and apply more comprehensive strategies in academic writing.

Based on these studies, argumentative strategies in journal writing, especially in the discussion section, are important aspects that contribute directly to improving the quality of reasoning and strength of argument. Therefore, understanding of argumentative strategies such as the Toulmin Argument Model and intensive training in composing complete and relevant arguments needs to be improved. This is in line with the findings of (Direkci et al., 2022; Gupta et al., 2022) which state that academic writers, both students and lecturers, still face challenges in building a complete argument, thus requiring a more systematic learning approach.

## **2.2 Some Pertinent Ideas**

### **2.2.1 Discourse Analysis**

Discourse is a broad term with various meanings, encompassing a range of meanings derived from many disciplines, such as linguistics, sociology, philosophy, and others (Adeoye et al., 2024). According to (Handayani et al., 2025) discourse can be understood as the entire process of social interaction, in which text is only one part of that process. Etymologically, the word “discourse” comes from the Latin *discursus*, which means speech or conversation. (Solehudin et al., 2024) explains that discourse is a sequence of language that is longer than a single sentence and often forms a coherent whole, such as a speech, argument, joke, or narrative. Meanwhile, (Ningrum & Ahmad, 2024) emphasizes that the main element in defining discourse is the presence of a unified communication purpose. Therefore, discourse can be understood as any form of language use by humans in

real-life situations, whether spoken or written. Discourse can consist of a single word or short sentence, or a series of complex utterances.

Meanwhile, discourse analysis refers to the study of language as it is used in real life and goes beyond the boundaries of sentences (Gunawan, 2024). Furthermore, (Zainur Rofiq & Dhea S., 2024) explains that discourse analysis also examines how language used in social contexts shapes and is influenced by ways of thinking, ways of acquiring knowledge, and how social and cultural interactions influence language structure.

### **2.2.2 Discourse Markers**

Study of (Mawj khalil Ibrahim, 2024) states that discourse marker analysis is a rapidly developing field in linguistic studies. Discourse markers have been the subject of research in various languages and contexts, and have been analyzed in a variety of genres and interactive situations. (Fuentes Rodríguez, 2023) uses the term “discourse operator” to refer to these elements, which he defines as words or phrases such as conjunctions, adverbs, comment clauses, or interjections that have the primary function of directing the listener's attention to a specific type of utterance that will appear in the context of the ongoing discourse.

Meanwhile, (Asik & Cephe, 2013) offers an operational definition of discourse markers by placing them in a functional category, namely verbal and nonverbal devices that serve to provide contextual coordinates for the ongoing conversation. Discourse markers are elements that depend sequentially on the structure of utterances and act as boundaries between units of speech (A., 2024). Some discourse markers are summarized as follows:

1. Additive

Markers used to add additional information or ideas, such as and, also, in addition, moreover, besides that, in addition, likewise, at the same time, and others.

2. Adversative

Used to indicate differences, rejection, or contrast, including words such as although, however, but, nevertheless, on the contrary, on the other hand, in contrast to, contrary to, and so on.

3. Causal

Indicates a cause-and-effect relationship, such as therefore, so, because, as a result, as a consequence, thus, and so on.

4. Continuatives

Used to maintain the flow of conversation, such as now, of course, well, anyway, after all this.

5. Sequencing

Indicates the sequence or stages of events or ideas, such as first, second, next, then, after that, finally, in conclusion, in summary.

6. Repetition or Reaffirmation

Used to emphasize or simplify a statement, for example, in short, in general, in other words, once again, as mentioned, to clarify, to summarize.

7. Illustration or Example

Markers that introduce examples, such as for example, in this case, as an illustration, as shown by, to explain, specifically, for example.

8. Acceptance or Acknowledgment (To Concede)

Used to acknowledge or accept a statement, even if there are objections, including indeed, of course, I admit, it could be, nevertheless, I agree, I accept.

9. Conclusion or Summary (To Conclude/Summarize)

Used to conclude a discussion, such as a conclusion, to conclude, finally, thus, therefore, to summarize, therefore.

10. Comparison (To Compare)

Shows similarities or resemblances between two things, such as like, the same as, similar to, identically, also, in comparison with, in relation to.

11. Attitude or Opinion (To Express Attitude)

Shows the opinion or attitude of the speaker/writer, including to be honest, in my opinion, actually, frankly, unfortunately, I believe, in my view.

12. Emphasis (To Emphasize)

Used to emphasize important points, such as most importantly, especially, indeed, without a doubt, significantly, very necessary, more than that, clearly, certainly, definitely.

### 2.2.3 Definition of Argumentative Strategy

The term argumentative strategy consists of two words, namely *strategy* and *argumentative*. Etymologically, the word *strategy* comes from the Greek *strategos* which means the art or science of planning and directing military operations, but in the context of communication and learning, *strategy* is defined as a systematic plan or method used to achieve certain goals (Shamsiddin Xusniddin, 2024).

Meanwhile, (Rodríguez, S. M, 2024) argumentative comes from the Latin *argumentum* which means reason or evidence used to support an opinion or claim. Simply put, an argumentation strategy can be interpreted as a systematic method or way to organize and deliver arguments in order to convince listeners or readers.

In the context of rhetoric and communication, argumentation strategy is an approach used to build arguments effectively, with the aim of convincing the audience through the use of evidence, reasons, and persuasion techniques (F. van Eemeren & Garssen, 2023). According to (Toulmin, 2003), an argumentation strategy involves six essential components: claim, data, warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal. These components help the arguer to logically connect claims with evidence and anticipate objections from other parties. In addition, Aristotle (4 BC) emphasized three powers of persuasion in argumentation strategies, namely *ethos* (credibility of the speaker), *pathos* (emotional connection with the audience), and *logos* (logical reasoning) (Nur et al., 2025). These three elements play an important role in building a strong and convincing argument. Furthermore, (Neumann et al., 2023) in *New Rhetoric* highlight the importance of adapting arguments to the audience's shared values and beliefs, so argumentation strategies must consider the social and cultural context to increase the effectiveness of persuasion.

Based on these various opinions, it can be concluded that argumentation strategy is a systematic method or approach used to build and deliver arguments logically, convincingly, and relevant to the audience. This strategy not only relies on the strength of evidence and reasoning, but also pays attention to the credibility

of the speaker, the emotional engagement of the audience, as well as the social context that affects the acceptance of the argument.

#### **2.2.4 Components of Toulmin's Argumentative Strategy**

The Toulmin argumentative model provides a detailed framework for analyzing and constructing arguments effectively. This model consists of six main components that are interrelated as follows:

##### **1. Claim**

A claim is the main statement or conclusion that the writer wants to convey and believes to be true. Claims serve as the core of an argument, which is the basis or ultimate goal of the argumentative process. Strong claims are generally specific, relevant, and logically and empirically accountable.

##### **2. Grounds**

Grounds refer to the data, evidence, or reasons that support the claim. This component serves as the foundation of the argument and must be factual, valid, and relevant. Grounds can take the form of statistics, research results, expert quotes, or empirical observations. Without strong grounds, the claim will appear weak and unconvincing.

##### **3. Warrant**

Warrant is the reasoning or logical principle that explains the relationship between grounds and claims. Warrant answers the question: "Why does the evidence support the claim?" This component can be explicit or implicit, but the existence of warrant is very important so that the argument can be clearly understood by the audience.

#### 4. Backing

Backing is additional support that strengthens the warrant, especially if the warrant is considered questionable or not immediately acceptable. Backing can take the form of theories, previous research findings, or proven scientific principles. With backing, the argument becomes more robust and has a more convincing foundation.

#### 5. Qualifier

A qualifier is an indicator that shows the level of certainty or strength of the claim being made. Words such as “*most likely*,” “*often*,” or “*in many cases*” are examples of qualifiers. This component reflects the writer's caution toward their claim and shows awareness of variations in certain contexts or situations.

#### 6. Rebuttal

A rebuttal is an acknowledgment of the possibility of opposing views or conditions in which the claim does not apply. A rebuttal shows that the writer has considered various perspectives and is able to respond to potential counterarguments. By including a rebuttal, the argument becomes more balanced, reflective, and critical.

### **2.2.5 The Purpose of Argumentative Strategy**

The main objective of argumentative strategies is to build readers' confidence in the truth of a claim or opinion by presenting logical, strong, and persuasive reasons and evidence. This strategy is an important foundation in constructing effective arguments that can be accepted and understood in an academic context, especially in scientific writing based on the principles of rationality and clarity of

thought structure. According to (Toulmin, 2003), argumentative strategies aim to construct an argument consisting of three core components, namely claims, evidence, and warrants. These three components are interrelated in a coherent structure, which allows writers to organize and convey ideas systematically. Thus, the arguments presented become clearer, more structured, and more convincing to readers.

More than just constructing logical structures, argumentative strategies also have broader communicative goals. According to (F. H. van Eemeren & van Haaften, 2023), through pragma-dialectical theory, argumentative strategies in an academic context serve to achieve rational understanding between writers and readers. These goals include:

1. Support claims with valid and relevant evidence, so that the arguments presented are credible and scientifically accountable. Strong data presentation reinforces the author's authority and avoids subjective impressions when expressing opinions.
2. Organize and structure ideas logically and systematically, so that readers can follow the author's train of thought clearly and systematically. A coherent structure helps readers understand the connections between data, theory, and conclusions.
3. Anticipate and respond to counterarguments or criticism constructively, thereby strengthening the main argument. The ability to address counterarguments demonstrates the depth of analysis and clarity of logic in defending one's position.

4. Increase persuasiveness so that readers can accept the author's point of view critically and objectively. This is very important in an academic context, where readers need not only information but also credible reasons to accept an argument.

Thus, argumentative strategies not only help build valid and logical arguments, but also play an important role in shaping the quality of scientific communication. Through these strategies, writers can convince readers, defend their claims wisely, and assert their academic credibility in objective and critical scientific discussions.

## **2.3 Discussion Section in Academic Writing**

### **2.3.1 Definition of Discussion Section**

In academic writing, the discussion section is one of the most important components that serves to interpret, explain, and evaluate research results. According to (Ghasemi et al., 2019a), “*the discussion section is where the writer interprets the findings, connects them with existing literature, and explains their implications.*” meaning, this section is a space for the author to demonstrate critical thinking skills and develop arguments based on research data. Discussion usually involves careful reasoning and argumentation to justify conclusions, acknowledge the limitations of the research, and make suggestions for future research. According to (Razali & Kim, 2023) adds that the discussion section functions as a rhetorical space where the author builds arguments persuasively, using linguistic strategies such as hedging (expressions that show caution, e.g. the words maybe, likely) and boosters (expressions that affirm beliefs, e.g. clearly, definitely).

Meanwhile, (Ghasemi et al., 2019b) explains that the role of this section is to critically interpret the results, compare with previous studies, and suggest

theoretical and practical implications of the research. Thus, the discussion section has an important role as a bridge between data and critical interpretation, guiding the reader in understanding the implications of the research results, highlighting the relevance of the findings, acknowledging the limitations of the study, as well as showing the contribution of the research to the advancement of science in the academic community.

### **2.3.2 Structure of Discussion Section**

Based on the genre analysis study by (Swales, 2007) with the CARS (Create A Research Space) model and the development by (Hyland, 2004) through the move analysis approach, the discussion section usually consists of several moves or rhetorical steps as follows:

#### **1. Stating the Major Findings**

The discussion section usually begins with a recap of the most significant research findings. This recap is concise and objective, focusing on findings that directly address the research question or hypothesis. The purpose of this step is to direct the reader's attention to the core contributions of the research before moving on to further interpretation and analysis.

#### **2. Explaining or Interpreting the Findings**

After the major findings are presented, the author explains the meaning and implications of these findings. This explanation is often supported by relevant theories, concepts, or frameworks to give meaning to the data. In Toulmin's argumentative model, this section reflects the warrant (reasoning) that connects

the data (grounds) with the claim made. This interpretation is important to demonstrate the depth of analysis and theoretical contribution of the research.

### 3. Comparing with Previous Research

In this step, the author relates the results of their research to the findings of previous studies. This comparison aims to show consistency (if the results are similar) or identify contradictions that may open up opportunities for new perspectives. Thus, this section strengthens the position of the research in the broader academic discourse and can serve as backing in the argumentative strategy.

### 4. Acknowledging Limitations

A responsible author will openly acknowledge the limitations of their research, such as small sample size, methodological limitations, or other contextual factors. This acknowledgment shows that the author is aware of the scope of the research and is objective about the results obtained. This step can also serve as a form of rebuttal in the Toulmin model, anticipating potential criticism from readers.

### 5. Suggesting Future Research

Based on the results and limitations identified, authors typically provide suggestions for future research directions. These suggestions may include retesting with different variables, using new methodological approaches, or applying the findings in a broader context. This step shows that the research does not stand alone but is part of an ongoing scientific process.

### 6. Presenting Implications

In the final section of the discussion, the author explains the impact of the research findings on the development of science, policy, or practice in the field. These implications can be theoretical or practical, depending on the focus of the research. This step reinforces the significance of the research contribution and links it to real-world needs or ongoing academic developments.

### 2.3.3 Linguistic Features of Discussion Section

Linguistically, the discussion section has distinctive features that distinguish it from other sections in scientific articles (Hyland, 1998):

1. Use of Hedging

Writers often employ hedging devices such as *might*, *may*, *could*, *possibly*, and *suggests* to present claims with caution. This helps to avoid overly assertive or absolute statements and reflects the tentative nature of scientific claims.

2. Use of Boosting

In contrast to hedging, boosting involves using words like *clearly*, *evidently*, *undoubtedly*, or *it is certain that* to reinforce the strength of arguments or highlight the significance of results. Boosters are typically used when the author has strong evidence or wishes to emphasize confidence in the interpretation.

3. Metadiscourse Markers

The use of metadiscourse elements such as *it is important to note that*, *this finding indicates that*, or *what this means is that* serves to guide the reader through the argument, signal the writer's stance, and organize the structure of the discussion clearly.

4. Citation and Intertextuality

The discussion section frequently includes references to previous studies as a form of intertextuality. These citations support the credibility of the argument, show engagement with existing research, and situate the current findings within the broader academic discourse.

#### 5. Contrastive Connectors

Connectors like *however*, *nevertheless*, *in contrast*, and *on the other hand* are commonly used to signal opposing viewpoints, alternative interpretations, or contradictions with previous studies. These transitions enhance cohesion and argumentative clarity.

#### 6. Personal Pronouns

In certain academic disciplines, particularly in the social sciences and applied linguistics, authors may use the first-person plural pronoun *we* to position themselves within the argument. This personal voice can help to express stance, responsibility, and authorial engagement.

## **2.4 Academic Writing in Indonesian Higher Education**

### **2.4.1 Characteristics of Scientific Writing in Indonesia**

Scientific writing in Indonesian universities is strongly influenced by the education system and local scientific culture. In general, the writing structure still follows conventional formats such as chapter I to chapter V that are common in theses, theses, and journal articles (Abdellatif & Abdellatif, 2020). The language used is formal and lacks personal style (authorial voice), so the writing emphasizes the delivery of facts rather than the author's reflection or opinion. According to (Nurfidah, 2022), Indonesian students' scientific writing tends to emphasize

descriptive aspects rather than analytical ones. This phenomenon is influenced by an education system that prioritizes memorization over the development of critical and logical thinking skills (Ghaleb, 2024).

In addition, an academic assessment system that emphasizes adherence to technical formats such as citation style and chapter arrangement reinforces a focus on formality and structure over content and depth of analysis. Meanwhile, (Efendi et al., 2023) stated that this condition has the potential to weaken students' ability to develop and convey ideas critically and deeply, so that scientific papers often lack reflection and argumentative. This is supported by (Dayanti et al., 2024) who found the low use of critical thinking in students' scientific writing as a major obstacle in producing quality work. Thus, the characteristics of scientific writing in Indonesia indicate an urgent need to develop more critical, reflective and argumentative academic abilities, so that writing makes an intellectual and original contribution to the development of science.

#### **2.4.2 Challenges in Academic Writing for Indonesian Students**

Although various studies have emphasized the importance of mastering academic writing skills in supporting academic success in higher education, the fact is that many students in Indonesia still struggle to develop these skills optimally. Various challenges arise, both from internal and external factors, directly and indirectly hindering the effectiveness of mastering these skills. (Sahan et al., 2024), in their study on academic literacy, identified four main factors that often hinder students in developing their academic writing skills, including:

1. Difficulties in Critical Thinking and Argumentative

Students often face challenges in developing critical thinking skills and constructing logical arguments. In academic writing, they tend to merely repeat theories or data without conducting in-depth analysis. The lack of ability to evaluate information and provide personal interpretation results in weak and unconvincing arguments. This has an impact on the discussion section, which should be the main space for demonstrating critical thinking.

## 2. Linguistic and Grammatical Barriers

Errors in grammar, vocabulary choice, and sentence structure are common obstacles. Many students find it difficult to compose well-structured academic texts that comply with language rules. This is due to limited mastery of academic language, especially when writing in a foreign language. As a result, the writing becomes difficult to understand and does not fully reflect scientific thinking skills.

## 3. Limited Practice in Scientific Writing

A lack of experience in academic writing causes students to have difficulty organizing ideas, maintaining coherence between paragraphs, and developing a coherent flow of writing. They also often struggle to summarize ideas from various sources and integrate them into a consistent piece of writing. The lack of practice and guidance in scientific writing further exacerbates this situation, resulting in writing that tends to be unfocused and unsystematic.

## 4. Psychological and Motivational Challenges

Academic writing is also influenced by psychological factors such as lack of self-confidence, anxiety, and low motivation. Many students feel stressed when

writing because they are afraid of making mistakes or failing to meet academic writing standards. This often leads them to postpone the writing process or even feel reluctant to begin. As a result, the quality of their writing suffers because it is not written with confidence and enthusias.

## **2.5 The Conceptual Framework**

A conceptual framework is a logical and systematic structure developed by researchers to explain the line of thinking that connects theories, concepts, and research focus in order to answer research questions and achieve research objectives. In this study, the conceptual framework was designed to describe how argumentative strategy theory is used in analyzing the discussion section of the Muhammadiyah and 'Aisyiyah Higher Education journal in Indonesia. The researcher presents a diagram as a visual representation showing the relationship between the components of the argumentative strategy being analyzed. The following is the conceptual framework diagram used in this study, presented in Figure 1.

