

Argumentative Indicators in *Mata Najwa* Talk Show Pragmadiialectical Study

Kamariah Kamariah^{1,*} Kisyani Laksono¹ Agusniar D. Savitri² Suhartono Suhartono³
Darni Darni⁴ Udjang Pairin⁵

^{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: kamariah.19015@mhs.unesa.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This article aims to find indicators of argumentation contained in the *Mata Najwa* talk show using pragmadiialectical studies. The data used in this study was from a debate speech at the *Mata Najwa* event on the topic “*Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes*.” The method used was descriptive qualitative. The data collection technique used the listening and note-taking technique. A pragmadiialectical analysis study was employed in this study, and it is based on four meta-theoretical principles (functionalization, socialization, externalization, and dialectification). The method of testing the validity of the data used data source triangulation techniques and theoretical triangulation. The results show that the argumentation indicators found in the *Mata Najwa* talk show the speakers’ expressions. The argumentation indicator was the distribution of speech acts that occur at each stage of the argument. The argumentation stages are the confrontation stage, the opening stage, the argument stage, and the closing stage. At each location, it was found that the speech acts used by the debate participants were assertive, directive, commissive, and declarative speech acts.

Keywords: *Argumentative indicators, Pragmadiialectical, Mata Najwa.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Mata Najwa is an argumentative debate program. This program is broadcast every Wednesday from 8.00 p.m. to 9.30 p.m. on Trans7 Television Station. Apart from Trans7, *Mata Najwa* rebroadcast can be watched on Najwa Shihab YouTube account. In every broadcast, *Mata Najwa* always presents exciting topics that discuss various social phenomena and facts in Indonesia [1]. According to Lado [2], *Mata Najwa* plans to shape public opinion so that every topic presented is always critical.

This event reveals the existing facts and aims to straighten out hoax news spread in the community. The speakers presented are not familiar but extraordinary and first-class sources, such as public figures, experts in their fields, officials, and even the president. The figures clashed in argumentative debate. The argumentative debate confronts different opinions, accessible to many, about issues that affect many people [3]. Such discussions shape public attitudes and social norms based on different values.

Contentious debate is a linguistic phenomenon. This phenomenon is in the form of verbal discourse. Discourses of the argumentative discussion, especially those that discuss politics, often find verbal violence in their speech [4]. The violence occurred because of the status of the debate participants, who were usually equal. This violence occurs because the position of the debate participants is typically similar, which makes the debate discourse into a symbolic dispute.

One of the studies used to analyze argumentative debate discourse in linguistic studies is the pragmadiialectical study developed by van Eemeren and Grotendorst [5]. This statement can be proven from several previous studies that used this study in analyzing argumentative debates. Among these researchers are Betti and Ghadhab [6], using pragmadiialectical studies to find indicators of argumentation used in America’s election campaign debate. Svacinova’s [7] research on the character of argument in the inner dialogue is the dialogue a person has for herself in her mind. Subuki [8] examines the pragmadiialectical dimension of a fatwa. The results show that problem solving is carried out in three ways: first, accommodating mutual opinions

between parties. Second, hold on to their respective positions regarding the right time according to the science used. Third, by adapting the determination of the Indonesian Ulema Council for the sake of state unity and jurisdiction.

Based on the previous research that has been described, it can be seen that pragmadialectics can be applied to examine contentious debate. This study is one of the main approaches in argumentation studies [9]. The basis of pragmadialectics is a concept of critical discourse that is natural. This concept is an ideal model of a critical discussion theory. Pragmadialectics is a normative theory that views discussion as a process-oriented towards resolving differences of opinion. Systematic integration of the combination of pragmatic and dialectical dimensions into pragmadialectics in argumentative discourse analysis [10].

Pragmadialectics offers a systematic theoretical basis for developing models of analysis and evaluation of arguments in specific contexts [11]. Pragmadialectical evaluation begins with discourse analysis in terms of the so-called 'critical discussion model.' Such research aims to reconstruct the discourse that contains all the elements relevant to evaluation [5]. This statement was supported by Henkemans and Wagemans [12] which state that pragmadialectics express norms that generally apply to all contexts of argumentation activity.

Pragmadialectical studies consider argumentative discourse as an orderly exchange of speech acts, each of which has a specific function in resolving differences of opinion. [5]. The exchange of speech acts occurs at every stage of critical discussion. These stages are divided into four stages, namely the confrontation stage, the opening stage, the argumentation stage, and the closing stage. The locations of argumentation and speech acts in it are referred to as argumentation indicators. Argument indicators are critical in the discussion. Its function is to facilitate the identification and reconstruction of argumentative movements made in dialogue and argumentative texts.

The function of pragmadialectical studies views discussion as a process of resolving differences of opinion and finding a conclusion from the phenomena discussed in a public discussion. So this study can be applied to analyze the argumentative debate discourse in the *Mata Najwa* general discussion program with the topic "*Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes*." Thus, this study aims to find indicators of argumentation in the *Mata Najwa* event using pragmadialectical studies. Through this research, it was hoped that more other researchers would be interested in using pragmadialectical examinations to analyze the discourse of argumentative debate, both oral and written.

2. METHODS

This study used the descriptive qualitative method. Bogdan and Taylor [13] explained that qualitative research is the method used to produce descriptive data. The subjects in this study were oral speech data in argumentative discourse from debate participants at the *Mata Najwa* event with the topic *Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes*. Participants in the debate on this topic consisted of the host, Najwa Shihab, and Minister of Health Budi Gunawan Sadikin (Budi GS). The data collection technique in this study used observation referring to notes and documentation.

The data analysis technique used the pragmadialectical analysis study. These are based on four meta-theoretical principles: functionalization, socialization, externalization, and dialectification [5]. There are three steps of data analysis in this study: (1) exploring data in the form of debate discourse arguments through listening and data transcription, (2) grouping of data based on research focus, and (3) finding argumentation indicators using four meta-theoretical principles (Functionalization, socialization, externalization, and dialectification).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

According to Betti and Ghadhab [6], argument indicators represent expressions used by speakers in the critical discussion stage. There are four stages of discussion in the argumentation indicator: confrontation stage, opening, arguments, and closing. There is a distribution of speech acts in these four stages, which builds discussion and debate [14]. In *Mata Najwa*'s talk show on fixing the *Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes* (B2KM), the four stages of discussion mentioned by van Eemeren were found. Each step of the debate on the *Mata Najwa* event also contains complex speech acts. The speech acts found at each stage of the discussion are described as follows.

3.1. Confrontation Stage

The confrontation stage is the initial stage in critical discussion. At this stage, a problem is presented that will be discussed and solved together [15]. There are four speech acts found at this stage: assertive, directive, commissive, and declarative. Here is the discussion.

3.1.1. Assertive

Assertive speech act in confrontation stage is a speech shown by expressing a point of view [14].

Budi GS (Minister of Health): "*We happen to see that this is our opportunity to make a huge heavenly investment because there are so many*

benefits to people. I feel that we have taken our opportunity to do good for each other."

Budi GS, firmly in his speech, stated his point of view regarding the immense responsibility he would assume as the minister of health. Budi GS thinks that the task is not a burden but a charitable investment for him. He got this charity by helping many people by accepting the offer as the new Minister of Health, which of course, in this pandemic is not easy and requires hard work. Budi GS expresses this statement according to van Eemeren et al. [14]. A person who performs a speech act of this type is committed to accepting a specific propositional ability based on a degree such as greater or less.

3.1.2. Directive

The directive is related to speech to express the point of view in the confrontation stage [14].

Najwa: *"Um, I was appointed Minister of Health in an uncontrolled situation. After ten months ago, there was much public criticism directed at your Ministry, Mr. Budi. Why are you desperate to accept this responsibility?"*

In the speech above, Najwa expressed her doubts of the ability of the new Minister of Health to handle the increasingly endemic cases of Covid-19. This was also coupled with a lot of public criticism regarding the performance of the Ministry of Health. Therefore, Najwa felt that Budi GS's decision to accept the post of health minister was reckless. At this stage, Najwa wanted to get answers from Budi GS regarding his decision to take up the offer to become Minister of Health. Saifuddin [16] states that the function of the directive speech act is to challenge the arguments that arise with the point of view, defend the point of view, request arguments from the opponent to support his point of view, or ask for the definition, explanation of the statement of the opponent.

3.1.3. Commissive

Commissive in the confrontation stage is represented by the agreement or disagreement of the participants' opinions [14].

Budi GS (Minister of Health): *"I was assigned by the president to be surprised, frankly, Mba Nana, yes, but I feel that the mandate given has been done from above. I will do my best. God willing, it will work."*

In Budi GS' speech, this speech act is found. Budi disagreed with Najwa's question, which cast doubt on his ability as the new Minister of Health. Budi GS also feels confident to carry out this responsibility because he thinks it is God's destiny. This made him feel sure that he would be successful in handling the epidemic

cases of Covid-19 and had overwhelmed the previous Ministry of Health in handling them. From his speech, Budi GS expressed his promise to the community. This is in line with the opinion of van Eemeren et al. [14], which says that the commissive prototype is a promise in which the speaker or writer describes a commitment to do something.

3.1.4. Declarative

The use of declarative is represented by definition, classification, and viewing of specification points [14].

Najwa: *"Good evening, welcome to Mata Najwa, I am Najwa Shihab the host of Mata Najwa. The world has entered a new year, but the pandemic is not over. The virus mutation occurred in the UK until the lockdown again. Even though vaccinations have started, it is a sign that the fight against the pandemic is still long, especially since many hospitals have begun to collapse, which is a tough challenge for the new health minister. The complexity of the problem makes his breakthrough very much awaited. What are the critical issues that he will prioritize, or can the vaccination be completed in a matter of months? This is Mata Najwa Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes"*

Najwa started the program by stating according to the facts that were happening. Then, Najwa mentioned the corona outbreak that is still endemic throughout the world. All of his explanations then refer to the change of the minister of health in Indonesia. The evolution of the minister of health in the virus that is still threatening is indeed a public concern and is a hot topic that, of course, the *Mata Najwa* event will not miss. Therefore, at the event, Najwa directly invited the new health minister, Budi GS, to explain his work program so that the community becomes calmer in the disaster that is still hitting.

Declarative speech acts do not have much role in a critical discussion. Declarative does not directly contribute to resolving differences of opinion by mutual agreement. However, the use of declarative speech acts in the confrontation stage can have constructive results to reveal pseudo-disputes.

3.2. Opening Stage

The opening stage is related to the participant's commitment to the discussion rules [6]. In an argumentative discussion, the exchange of views at the opening stage usually remains largely implicit because fundamental differences can be taken for granted. Distribution of speech acts in the opening stage of the *Mata Najwa* event with the topic *Beres-Beres Kursi Menteri* (B2KM) as follows:

3.2.1. Directive

According to van Eemeren et al. [14], the directive speech act at the opening stage is represented by the challenge to defend the point of view by the proponent.

Najwa: “The Minister of Health explained, the problems are too many, the problems are many, the homework is a lot. If I ask you for self-criticism, what is the most crucial thing that must be corrected from the policies that your ministry and your predecessors have carried out?”

As the discussion host, Najwa opened the meeting by asking questions that challenged Budi GS’s arguments. Najwa asked Budi GS to give self-criticism to the previous health minister, which left many problems to be resolved quickly by the new health minister. With the questions posed by Najwa, Budi GS should be able to express his point of view on the challenge of criticizing the previous Ministry of Health. This analysis follows what van Eemeren said the prototype of a directive speech act is an order that requires a unique position from the speaker or writer about the listener or reader [14].

3.2.2. Commissive

van Eemeren et al. [14] states that to explain commissive was seen as an opponent’s agreement or disagreement in a contentious debate through supporters’ point of view.

Budi GS (Minister of Health): *“There is still a lot of overturning to embrace more figures, yes groups, community movements because all of them also want to solve this problem. If we can embrace them, we can knit their social capital. I think it will be mighty to solve this problem.”*

Budi GS explained that he disagreed with people’s doubts about his work program in his speech. According to him, the best way to deal with Corona is to involve social roles. Budi calls it social capital, cooperation from all walks of life is the most appropriate solution to solve the problems that are currently happening. The previous minister has not done this, so Budi thinks it is a mistake to be corrected. Disagreement is a commissive speech act that the speaker can make to strengthen the argument and state his belief.

3.2.3. Declarative

Declarative speech acts at the opening stage in critical discussion, according to van Eemeren et al. [14], in the form of clarification and specifications at the opening stage.

Budi GS (Minister of Health): *“Our nation has passed from the old colonialism and managed to become the winner? If I see it is not only because*

of the financial capital. I come from the financial world. I came here holding power. I feel that it is not only the capital of power that can solve the problem of this pandemic. However, it takes strong social capital that can be accessed with togetherness to solve this pandemic. I think that if I in the government were able to mobilize all the social capital owned by all Indonesians, this huge task should have been much lighter and could be completed.”

In his speech, Budi GS explained and specified the actions to be taken to resolve the pandemic. Budi GS said that the capital to solve these problems is not only power but togetherness. According to him, the Indonesian people have this potential, and it was proven long ago. Budi clarified his work program, which was doubtful because of his background. The clarification was also supported by the specifications of what will be supported. This statement follows what was said by van Eemeren et al. [14], that this speech act is a direct challenge to maintain opinion.

3.3. Argument Stage

The argumentation stage is concerned with the development of critical discussion. The protagonist can present his argument with a point of view that systematically refutes the antagonist’s doubts or critical responses or denies its relevance [6]. The following describes the findings and identification of speech acts in the argumentation stage on B2KM data.

3.3.1. Assertive

Assertive in the argumentation stage is a speech act that shows how to increase the point of view of the discussion participants [5].

Najwa: *“Okay, back to my question, do you think the reduced mobility through the regulation is enough, or do you want to be stricter, Sir?”*

Najwa asked Budi GS a question with two answer choices. The goal is to improve Budi GS’ point of view. Najwa challenged Budi GS to present arguments about mobility and the rules he would implement to reduce the coronavirus’s spreading.

The use of assertiveness at the argumentation stage, which aims to increase the point of view, is a technique for extracting data and truth from the interlocutor’s speech. Opponents who feel challenged will answer with various arguments they have. In addition, the end goal is an honest confession from the other person to reveal the facts. The statement may express the point of view being discussed and advance an argument in defense of a point of view or determine the outcome of a discussion.

3.3.2. Directive

Directive speech acts at the argumentation stage are in the form of speech acts that ask debate participants to advance their arguments [5].

Najwa: *“Ee... but will there be a plan to make this free or is it true that in the future, people must spend money independently to find out the condition?”*

Najwa asked about the use of rapid tests to check the condition of people exposed to Covid-19. This quick test is quite expensive so that many people cannot afford it. Najwa asked for an argument from Budi GS as the Minister of Health, whether the trial would be free or paid. Budi GS must answer Najwa’s question with the correct arguments because all Indonesian people will hear every word he utters.

Directive speech acts as described by Saifudin [16], has a constructive function to challenge arguments that come up with a point of view, defend a point of view, request opinions from an opponent to support his point of view, or ask for a definition, explanation of a statement from his opponent.

3.3.3. Commissive

Commissive speech acts are speech acts that show the agreement or disagreement of the debate participants on the argumentation [5].

Budi GS (Minister of Health): *“Whatever we do, it will be better than before the incident.”*

Budi GS disagrees with what the previous minister of health has done. He expressed this by affirming that what the Ministry of Health will do under his direction must be better than before the incident. The incident referred to by Budi GS was a spike in the spread of the virus throughout Indonesia. Therefore, the definite sentence is better as an affirmation of his disagreement with the previous policy.

3.3.4. Declarative

Declarative speech acts at the augmentation stage are speech acts whose use is more towards the specification and definition of point of view [5].

Budi GS (Minister of Health): *“I want this mobility to be done last month, December if you want to ask. Because we know that every long vacation will go up, it should have been done earlier, so there won’t be too much mobility, but it’s already happened again.”*

Budi GS’s speech above explains his point of view on mobility that is not well regulated. So that the spike in the virus occurred during long holidays because people were not in an orderly manner with the rules.

Budi emphasized his point of view by mentioning that it should have been done before, and it happened again. So based on his speech, Budi said that the previous policy was inappropriate and had a fatal impact, but it has already happened. Therefore, according to him, there is no need to discuss it again. The most important thing is that everything will be well controlled under his command as the new minister of health in the future. According to Saifudin [16], declarative speech acts are illocutionary acts that cause changes to propositions and reality.

3.4. Closing Stage

The closing stage is the end of a critical discussion, the conclusion or final result of the discussion regarding the exchange of argumentative views in the closing stage [6], [14]. At the closing stage also found argumentative speech acts. The following describes the findings and identification of speech acts at the closing stage of the topic *Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes*.

3.4.1. Assertive

At the closing stage, assertive speech acts are speech acts that contain statements about the results of the discussion [5].

Budi GS (Minister of Health): *“I believe this nation is great. It has been proven for decades since Independence that our social capital is substantial. So, my job is to make sure that our institutions can be trusted so that all people are willing to give their social capital so that together we can solve this problem.”*

Budi GS gave a closing statement to his argument. The information contains confidence in the success of its work program. This belief is based on the assumption that the Indonesian people have owned social capital for a long time. His current job as Minister of Health is to make sure the plan goes well. One of the ways he will take is to restore people’s trust in the Ministry of Health. According to Budi GS, a problem will be solved if we work together. Budi GS also took the opportunity to attend the *Mata Najwa* talk show to convey his message directly to the people who witnessed the event. The arguments presented by Budi GS have two functions, as a strategy to defend the point of view and determine the outcome of the discussion.

3.4.2. Commissive

Commissive at the closing stage is a speech act of agreement or disagreement from the participant’s point of view [5].

Najwa: *“Okay, seriously, Sir, about this... Can we hope to see the Ministry of Health be more open, willing to accept criticism, and willing to*

invite the community, not only blame the community for the pandemic because often the messages received by the community are the people who always get blamed? Can we see a new style of ministry from you?"

Najwa, in Her speech, asked seriously about the commitment of the Ministry of Health to be open to the public. However, Najwa seemed still to doubt the change in attitude from the health minister even though the current minister is different. Najwa emphasized her doubts by challenging Budi GS' closing argument, with the question, "Can we see your new style Ministry?" The sentence was a question sentence that contained doubts and must be adequately answered by Budi GS so that the people who hear will believe in the new policy that will be implemented.

3.4.3. Declarative

The role of declarative speech acts in the closing stage aims to determine whether differences of opinion are resolved or not [5].

Najwa: "It has been a year since humans have faced the Corona pandemic. There are many lessons that we have received. The pandemic solution is not only about vaccines, and many factors need to be given first. How there is no shortcut to reach, there is no single formula for fast free. This virus will continue to run rampant if egoism dominates a nation. Qualified leadership, citizens who are aware of the dangers of the pandemic, are integrated into the plan of one country—guided by science, guided by solitary policies, executed by leaders and citizens together. It's been too long since the pandemic has been handled carelessly. It has been proven that we, too, are finally distraught. Let's welcome the critical times that have already arrived with the new shipmaster who has the trust to look after us".

At the end of the event, Najwa made a declarative speech in the form of her conclusion on the discussion and the facts that occurred in the field. Najwa explained in a speech that contained many language styles but contained all the findings from his meeting with the health minister, Budi GS. Najwa concluded that the pandemic that hit had taught everyone a lesson. Najwa also said that to resolve it all, it was not only done by one party but all parties must be involved. Budi GS presented a work program in the discussion. Najwa also added that he hopes that the new Minister of Health will be able to carry out his work program in a trustworthy manner so that all Indonesian people can be well maintained and immediately free from the dangers of the coronavirus.

The conclusion given by Najwa was an illustration of the results of the argumentative debate she conducted with Budi GS regarding the policies and work programs that will be carried out in the face of the Covid-19 pandemic. The use of declarative speech acts at the closing stage is proof that the conclusions given follow the facts. This is under what was said by van Eemeren et al. [14], which states that the use of declarative speech acts at the closing stage can prevent the emergence of false conclusions. Based on this, it can be concluded that declarative speech acts can control many things from being excessive in a critical discussion.

4. CONCLUSION

The argumentation indicator is an element that builds the structure of the argumentative discourse. It consists of the stages of argumentation and argumentative speech acts. On tidying up the chairs of the Minister of Health, which aired on the *Mata Najwa* program, an indicator of argumentation was found. At each argumentation stage, argumentative speech acts are discovered: assertive, commissive, directive, expressive, and declarative.

Based on this indicator, conclusions from the critical discussion held by Najwa and the Indonesian Minister of Health regarding the work program to be carried out by the new Minister of Health to deal with the Covid-19 pandemic are better than before. Therefore, all elements in the State of Indonesia, both the government and the wider community, are a strategy.

REFERENCES

- [1] Najwa Shihab, Indonesia. *Beres-Beres Kursi Menkes (full version)*. (Jan. 10, 2021). Accessed: Jun. 4, 2021. [Online Video]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hY54IIxqylE>
- [2] C. R. Lado, "Analisis wacana kritis program *Mata Najwa* 'Balada Perda' di MetroTV," *Jurnal E-Komunikasi*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2014.
- [3] E. Dalmaijer, "Debating online over less meat and other matters of public concern: A pragma-dialectical characterization and analysis of online large-scale complex public debates," Leiden University, 2019.
- [4] M. Luginbuhl, "Conversational violence in political TV debates: Forms and functions," *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 39, no. 8, pp. 1371–1387, 2007, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2007.04.003>.
- [5] F. H. van Eemeren and R. Grootendorst, *A Systematic Theory of Argumentation: The Pragma-Dialectical Approach*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- [6] M. J. Betti and A. O. Ghadhab, "A pragma-dialectical study of the argumentative indicators in American electoral campaign debates," *International Journal of Advancement in Social Science and Humanity*, no. 9, pp. 1–2, 2020.
- [7] I. Svačinová, "Pragma-dialectical reconstruction of crisis diary-writing as a communicative activity type," *Argumentation*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 237–264, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10503-020-09524-0.
- [8] M. Subuki, "Dimensi pragma-dialektis fatwa," *Ahkam Jurnal Ilmu Syariah*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 127–136, 2015, doi: 10.15408/ajis.v15i2.2856.
- [9] F. H. van Eemeren, B. Garssen, E. C. W. Krabbe, A. F. S. Henkemans, B. Verheij, and J. H. M. Wagemans, *Handbook of Argumentation Theory*. Amsterdam: Springer, Dordrecht, 2014, doi: 10.1007/978-90-481-9473-5.
- [10] I. Svačinová, "The role of quasi-logical arguments in critical dialogue: A pragma-dialectical redefinition," *Informal Logic*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 42–69, 2017, doi: 10.22329/il.v37i1.4468.
- [11] E. T. Feteris, "The pragma-dialectical analysis and evaluation of teleological argumentation in a legal context," *Argumentation*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 489–506, 2008, doi: 10.1007/s10503-008-9083-1.
- [12] A. F. S. Henkemans and J. H. M. Wagemans, "Reasonableness in context: Taking into account institutional conventions in the pragma-dialectical evaluation of argumentative discourse," *Argumentation Library*, vol. 28, pp. 217–226, 2015, doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-21103-9_16.
- [13] V. W. Sujarweni, *Metodologi Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru, 2014.
- [14] F. H. van Eemeren, P. Houtlosser, and A. F. S. Henkemans, *Argumentative Indicators: A Pragma-Dialectical Study*. Netherlands: Springer, 2007.
- [15] F. H. van Eemeren, *Strategic Maneuvering in Argumentative Discourse: Extending the Pragma-dialectical Theory of Argumentation*, 2nd ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2010.
- [16] A. Saifudin, "Teori tindak tutur dalam studi linguistik pragmatik," *Lite Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, dan Budaya*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2019.