

ENGLISH AND INDONESIAN TYPES OF WARRANTS IN CLAIMS OF FACT, VALUE AND POLICY

Rohmani Nur Indah¹, Wenyk Ambarwati, Burhanudin Syaifulloh²

¹Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

²University of Canberra, Australia

indah@bsi.uin-malang.ac.id

Abstract

Warrant is an important thing in argumentative essay which connects the claim and support in order to give proves that the supports are valid and credible. This study seeks the comparison between the warrant inn English and Indonesian argumentation. The rhetorical analysis in this study is to get deep understanding on the types of warrant that is used by the writers in the opinion section of www.theaustralian.com.au and www.seputar-indonesia.com in the claim of fact, of value, and of policy. The finding shows that on claims of fact, English writers show authoritative and substantive warrants while Indonesian writers prefer substantive and motivational warrants. In constructing the support for claims of value, almost similar result shown by both English and Indonesian writers that is the domination of motivational warrant. The writers attempt to strengthen the claims of policy show the use of substantive and motivational warrants by English writers. Meanwhile the Indonesian writers make use of substantive and authoritative warrants to convince the readers on the need to accept the proposed policy. Further studies are expected to dig more on the critical discourse analysis of warrants across different languages within different context, types of issue presented and different form of publication.

Keywords: claims, supports, warrants

INTRODUCTION

Writing is one of the language skills that it is prominent to express ideas and opinions. It is considered difficult by some writers because it needs some processes which comprise thinking out sentences and considering various ways of combining and arranging them, rereading for exploring ideas, making notes, drafting and revising it for a better result (Blanchard & Christine, 2003). Moreover, writing essay is not a simple thing since it concerns with how the writer builds ideas to give much explanation to the readers (Langan, 2013). Not only the ideas but also the language use must be appropriate with the audience who will read the essay. Four types of essay are commonly used in academic

writing such as exposition, description, narration, and argumentation (Zemach & Rumisek, 2016). Furthermore, argumentation is the most significant essay since the writer tries to give some opinion or argument to influence the readers in order to have the same aim with the writer (Smalley et al., 2012).

In the more recent past, argument becomes the choice of people when they want to refute other people's opinion. Many mass media such as newspaper, television, magazines, etc are used to share their arguments. Convincing other people to believe people's opinion is not an easy thing. Therefore, argumentation turns out to be an alternative way to persuade and make other people to have the same opinion with ours since argumentation gives a conclusion by using logical reasoning based on claim, idea and a well-reasoned argument to verify the issue that is stated (Craswell & Poore, 2011). It shows the writer's way of taking a position on a debatable topic, supporting the topic with relevant evidences and keeping the readers on their side. It may also involve a refutation (Rohmah; 2009: 9). In conclusion, argumentative essay is an essay which is used to persuade or convince the readers.

Based on Rottemberg's perspective, argumentation is the art of influencing others, through the medium of reasoned discourse, to believe or act as we wish them to believe or act (1997). It means that to influence someone is not only done by giving an opinion but also showing good and valid reasons to make them believe. In addition, a notorious British philosopher, Toulmin (2003), states that an argument is composed of at least six parts: the claim, the ground, the warrant, backing, qualifier, and rebuttal. Warrant is an important thing in argumentative essay. Warrant is general, hypothetical statements, which can act as bridges and entitle one to draw conclusions or make claims. It means that warrant becomes a bridge between claim and support. It connects the claim and support in order to give proves that the supports are valid and credible. As an example, for the claim —I was born in Bermuda, and the support —I am a British citizen, then the warrant is —A man born in Bermuda will legally be a British citizen.

Rottemberg (1997) classifies warrant into three categories: authoritative, substantive, and motivational. Identifying the types of warrant across different argumentation context is interesting. Viewed from the language used, the warrant is also influenced by the cultural bound in relation with the way argumentation is expressed. Based on this standpoint, this study seeks the comparison between the types of warrant by capturing the data on English and Indonesian argumentation.

There are two interesting sites having different dimensions of argumentation namely www.theaustralian.com.au and www.seputar-indonesia.com. Basically, there are numerous online newspapers in English and Indonesian but both online news providers belong to the national newspaper which sets the agenda for other news media around the nation which are read by most people. This study focuses the analysis on the section referring to the opinion column in both online newspapers.

Previous writers presented the result of their findings on claims. Sari (2010) found that the claims of policy that are showed explicitly in introductory paragraph in *The New*

York Times mostly used funnel type to give general statement concerning the subject in order to attract readers' attention before coming to the thesis statement. The finding is different from Yuningsih (2010) who discovered that the claims of fact in opinion editorial columnist section of the New York on-line newspaper are served in funnel and turn-about. Also Rusliyah (2011) explored the claims of policy in opinion column of *The Jakarta Post* which mostly used funnel type. In addition, study on contrastive rhetorical analysis shows no significant difference between texts produced by English native and non-native writers (Ansary & Babaii, 2009).

Concerning the analysis on the argumentation elements in Indonesian, Pusposari (2020) found that the opinion articles on the issue of Covid-19 has the complete elements of claim, data and warrant. However, most of the authors did not use the backing, qualifier, and rebuttal. Yet, the more specific parts of argumentative essay which is called warrant in English and Indonesian argumentation has not been much explored.

Based on the focus of the study above, the objectives of the study are as the following: to identify the similarities or differences on the types of warrants used in the argument of claim of fact, value, and policy in English and Indonesian online newspapers. The result of this study is expected to give contribution to the readers as additional reference especially in the field of argumentative essay writing. By comprehending the types of warrants, it will help the writers to improve their writing quality. The result of this study is also expected to give contribution to the researchers as an empirical evidence to support enlarging the perspective of the theory of warrants which are stated by Toulmin and Rotterberg.

METHOD

This study uses qualitative approach as the interpretive paradigm focusing on the rethorical analysis of the argumentation in article or written material. The concern is to get deep understanding on the types of warrant that is used by the writers in the opinion section of www.theaustralian.com.au and www.seputar-indonesia.com. Moreover, this study portrays the types of warrant that is used by the authors in every claim such as claim of fact, of value, and of policy. Accordingly, it is called as descriptive qualitative research.

The data of this study is taken from www.theaustralian.com.au and www.seputar-indonesia.com in the opinion column. In these two selected publication, the claims in the opinion section present various viewpoints related to the area of social, political, education and socioeconomic issues. The data are taken from the latest publication.

In collecting the data, the data are downloaded from the latest publication in both sites. All of the articles have been clustered in based on the period of time. Then, the articles are read carefully from the first article until the last article to identify the claim. Then, all of the articles are classified into claim of fact, of value, and of policy. Grouping articles which have different topic or theme also becomes one of the processes of collecting the data.

In the step of analyzing the data, the first step is identifying the types of warrant in the articles that have been classified into claims of fact, of value, and of policy. During this process, the data is analyzed based on the Rottenberg's theory. Subsequently, discussing the entire articles is done to discover the whole data whether there is any gap or not with the theory. The data reduction is also implemented to see whether the analysis had been completed to the whole data which represent the warrant in the two publications until it reached saturation. Finally, making conclusion is the last step on the process of analyzing the data to understand the types of warrant by using Rottenberg's theory of warrant as the result of this study.

FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Table 1. Types of claim and warrant

Language/ Datum	Title & author	Claim type	Number of supports	Warrant type
English/ 1.1	<i>After these findings, Smith should resign</i> by Dennis Shanahan	policy	three	substantive
English/ 1.2	<i>Bill on illegal logging could trigger trade dispute with Jakarta</i> by Peter Alford	policy	four	authoritative
English/ 1.3	<i>Campbell Newman must clean up state finances</i> by Henry Ergas	policy	seven	motivational
English/ 1.4	<i>The rot extends to federal labor</i> by Peter van Onselen	fact	four	authoritative, motivational
English/ 1.5	<i>Libs should fall in line as PM takes on China</i> by Greg Sheridan	fact	four	substantive
English/ 1.6	<i>Living on the edge</i> by Phillip Adams	value	three	motivational
English/ 1.7	<i>Aussie leave US bloke behind in their recovery from the GFC</i> by George Megalogenis	fact	three	authoritative
Indonesian/ 2.1	<i>Mereposisi Ujian Nasional</i> by Biyanto	fact	seven	substantive, authoritative
Indonesian/ 2.2	<i>Verifikasi Parpol yang Objektif dan Adil</i> by Jeffrie Geovanie	fact	six	authoritative, motivational
Indonesian/ 2.3	<i>Belajar dari Piagam Madinah</i> by Kuncoro Probojati	value	three	motivational
Indonesian/ 2.4	<i>Kekuatan Arus Bawah</i> by Mohamad Sobary	value	two	motivational, authoritative
Indonesian/ 2.5	<i>Islam Aswaja Melawan Terorisme</i> by Said Aqil Siradj	fact	three	substantive, motivational
Indonesian/ 2.6	<i>Persiapan PON</i> by editorial	fact	three	substantive, authoritative
Indonesian/ 2.7	<i>Menata Sektor Keuangan</i> by Ahmad Erani Yustika	fact	six	authoritative, motivational

The Types of Warrant Used in The Claims of Fact

In the argumentative essays, warrant is one of the elements which relates between the claim and the support. It can act as a bridge between the claim and the support (Toulmin 2003). The claim is called claim of fact whenever it covers a condition or situation based on factual information that exist, has existed, and will exist (Rottenberg & Winchell, 2011). In both English and Indonesian publications, the claims of fact chosen are those involving the factual information on the existing situation related primarily with current political issues (data 1.4; 1.5; 1.7; and 2.2) and social issues (data 2.5 and 2.6). Those are asserted with the data in the form of statistical, percentage, and numbers. Since, many articles talk about political issues, they need factual information to convince the readers.

The following is the example of the analysis on English warrant in claims of fact on datum 1.4: *The rot extends to federal labor* by Peter van Onselen (March 27th, 2012). The writer of this article shows the claim explicitly by stating that Queensland labor's problems extend to the federal party. The claim is presented in the first sentence, thus it is easy and clear to be understood. This claim is classified into a claim of fact since a condition regarding Queensland labor's problems has existed. It is also proven based on the data or facts that are verifiable. This article talks about Queensland labor's problems which enlarge to the federal party. In defending his claim, the writer provides some data.

The text in datum 1.4 mentions the first support that the government of Anna Bligh picked up 26.9 per cent of primary vote whereas Julia Gillard would have received just 28 per cent primary support if a federal election were held last weekend. This data give the support to the claim that it is one of the Queensland labor's problems. Newspoll said Julia Gillard's government would have received low support if the federal election were held earlier. Thus, it becomes a big debate between Queensland labor to the federal party since the election was held on Saturday. Therefore, the correlation between the claim and support is Queensland labor's problems extend to the federal party. Finally, the article exploits the authoritative warrant as the type of warrant since the support is from trustworthy and credible source indicated by the percentage given as the fact of the result of primary vote.

To sum up, this article from datum 1.4 has four supports, three of which are classified into the authoritative warrant and one of them is a motivational warrant. Most of the warrants are included into authoritative warrant because the writer serves the support by giving credible source. For instance, showing the number of percentage and giving numeral data. This rethorical aspects are meant to convince the readers to view the phenomenon raised similarly with the writer's perspective.

Rottenberg and Winchell (2011) stated that authoritative warrant is based on the credibility or trustworthiness of the sources. She also asserted that substantive warrant is based on beliefs about the reliability of factual evidence. The last, motivational warrant is based on the needs and values of the arguer and the audiences. In the English argumentation, authoritative and substantive warrants are found mostly in the claims of fact since it is based on factual information in which the characteristics of the authoritative warrant are credible and trustworthy. In addition, it is also supported by reliable factual

evidence as the characteristics of substantive warrant. Only one support belongs to motivational warrant. In the Indonesian argumentation, different proportion of warrant is found. The substantive and motivational warrants dominate more than the use of authoritative warrant. It refers to the intention of the writer to share the values or beliefs with the readers so that the similar perception on the fact presented can be achieved through the use of motivational warrant. While, the substantive warrants help the writer to convince the readers through various types of evidence employed such as statistics, research studies, comparison and analogies, logical explanation, writer's pointing out consequences, and historical facts.

The following the example of the analysis on Indonesian warrant on claims of fact. Datum 2.2: *Verifikasi Parpol yang Objektif dan Adil* by Jeffrie Geovanie (September 10th, 2012). The claim of this article is stated explicitly in the beginning of the article that all of the political parties including the old and the new ones have to be verified by the General Election Commission. This asserts that a condition is true regarding the need to verify the political parties as part of the preparation for the general election. This description belongs to claim of fact as the writer intends to share the similar viewpoint concerning the fact preceding the general election.

As the first support, this article in datum 2.2 mentioned the fact on the policy issued by the Constituent Assembly which shows the authority as the nation institution to uphold the principle of justice. Formerly, the old parties whose members have participated in the parliament are not have to be verified. However with this decision, there will be similar treatment to all parties as the consequence. This statement belongs to substantive factual supports. In addition, this text also mentions another factual evidence on the high number of the political party which brings about another difficulty for the people to vote for. These substantive warrants strengthen the claim on the reason why all the political parties have to be verified.

Another evidence in datum 2.2 is presented to show the factual supports of the issue to verify the parties. The text mentions the fact on the process of establishing the political institution completed after the transition process in Indonesian politic since May 1998. This historical fact belongs to the authoritative warrant which is based on the credible source shown by the historical evidence presented by the writer. Beside using the substantive and authoritative warrants, the writer elaborates the claim by strengthening his argument on the need to verify all of the political parties using some shared values. First, the writer wants the readers to believe that a political party has the right to join the general election only after being verified in objective, fair and transparent way. Second, the number of the political party should be made minimum for enabling the party to gain bigger vote for president. And third, the verification process is an attempt to identify the main objectives of the parties joining the election. All of these statements become the shared values of the writer as the arguer who believes that the readers would agree with his proposition. In this case, the warrant given by this support belongs to motivational warrant.

To sum up, the writer's rhetorical strategy in datum 2.2 to convince readers to understand the true phenomenon deciphered deals with the use of the three types of warrants. Out of six supports, three supports belong to motivational warrant, two supports belong to substantive warrant and the last one is authoritative warrant. All of the supports given employ the factual evidence in the form of historical fact, statistic on the number of party, logical explanation and the writer's pointing out consequences. These evidences are used to help readers understand the reason behind the fact on the need to verify all the political parties.

The Types of Warrant Used in The Claims of Value

Another type of claim that has been stated by Rottenberg and Winchell (2011) is claim of value which suppress on the situation where some people may agree or disagree with the statement that is stated. Claim of value also asserts that a condition where some people may like or dislike with something, people thing something is better than others. People's values are not always the same. According to the one might ask, some things are better or worse than others. The claims of value always deal with judgment by giving approval or disapproval about action, belief, or condition (Rottenberg & Winchell, 2011). The claim of value constructed in English argumentation concerns with social issue (datum 1.6), while in Indonesian argumentation deals with social issue (datum 2.3) and political issue (datum 2.4).

Based on the result of findings of the types of warrant that has been identified in the claim of value in English obtained one type of warrant that is motivational warrant (datum 1.6). The finding shows only motivational warrant since the claim of value does not need authoritative and substantive warrants. Yet, it needs motivational warrant which contains the values and needs both of the writers and audience in giving a new statement.

This finding is in line with Rottenberg and Winchell (2011) who explained that motivational warrant is based on the needs and values of the arguer and the audience. This warrant provides the preference of each individual to have their own values. No other types of warrant are found in this claim since this claim wants to present motivational warrant as the supporting data.

The following is an analysis example on English warrant in claims of value. Datum 1.6: *Living on the edge by Phillip Adams* (March 31st, 2012). The writer asserts the claim of this article implicitly that is living in a gorgeous place is not always nice as it is not safe. It is claim of value due to its attempt to establish that something is better than others. The writer utilizes funnel in introductory paragraph in the essay. The writer uses funnel since he wants to furnish the general and background information to the readers on living in place foredoomed to flood or fire. This article shows the risk live in places which have risk to flood and fire. The writer gives detail information regarding the places which are dangerous by giving examples and evidences.

The first support in datum 1.6 is that living in a Heidelberg School landscape is romantic but foggy. This is the first support that gives pillar to the claim in the form of

value of the arguer. Throughout this support, he offers that San Francisco is a romantic place but it is not always nice since it is foggy. This is a motivational warrant due to the fact that it is based on the value shared by the writer. The audience will regard this opinion as important since not all beautiful places are good for health, consequently the audience will accept it as important value.

In short, this article in datum 1.6 consists of three supports which entirely employ motivational warrant since the writer gives priority to the values and needs of the audience. The values shared are in the form of facts, comparison and analogies and pointing out consequences. As the evaluative argument, the use of the value shared is to convince readers that they need to have similar standard in viewing the phenomenon presented.

The data of Indonesian argumentation show that the use of motivational warrant also dominates the rethorical strategy and it is supported by another type of warrant namely substantive warrant (datum 2.3) and authoritative warrant (datum 2.4). This is done to eliminate the degree of subjectivity proposed in evaluating the phenomenon given.

The following is an example of the analysis on Indonesian warrant in claims of value of social issue. Datum 2.3: *Belajar dari Piagam Madinah by Kuncoro Probojati* (September 10th, 2012). The claim of this article is not stated explicitly in the beginning of the article as the writer describes the background of the Indonesian characteristic as an archipelago country with the diversity as its richness. The writer raises the claim on the value of keeping the peace within the country which has big conflict risk for its diversity. Therefore, he proposes the Madinah Pledge as an ideal model for keeping the peace of a country.

As the first support, this article in datum 2.3 mentioned the fact on the racial conflicts which have been severe wound of the nation. This historical evidence becomes the substantive warrant used by the writer to strengthen the claim. Beside using the substantive warrant, the writer elaborates the claim by strengthening his argument on the need to learn from the Madinah Pledge by using some shared values. First, the pledge is to accomodate the interests of the majority and the minority. It would bring the spirit of togetherness and unity without any gaps. Second, the government has not been consistent in implementing Pancasila as the five prominent pillars for the best practice of good governance. In addition the country has been failed in creating the feeling of secured for the citizens, especially those of the minority groups. These two statements become the shared values of the writer as the arguer who believes that the readers would agree with his proposition. In this case, the warrant given by this support belongs to motivational warrant.

To sum up, the writer's rethorical strategy in datum 2.3 to convince readers by accepting the proposed value deals with focusing more on the use of motivational warrant. Two from three supports employ the motivational warrant presented by the values shared to emphasize what to believe and what the basis of the belief is. The evidence involves historical fact to convince readers on the belief.

The Types of Warrant Used in The Claims of Policy

The last claim is claim of policy that has been stated by Rottenberg and Winchell (2011). They argued that claims of policy show a new solution from the problems occurred. Claims of policy are always followed implicitly, by *should*, *ought to* or *must*. Claims of policy assert that a condition needs certain policy that should be done. In English publication, the claim of policy is presented on political issue (datum 1.1) and on socio-economic issues (data 1.2 and 1.3). In Indonesian argumentation, it is constructed on education issue (datum 2.1) and socio-economic issue (datum 2.7).

The following is an example of the warrant analysis in English claims of policy on socio-economic issues. Datum 1.3: *Campbell Newman must clean up state finances by Henry Ergas* (March 26th, 2012). The claim of this article is stated explicitly that Campbell Newman must clean up state finances. This claim is a claim of policy, since the writer is proposing a new policy for the new Queensland government. Campbell Newman, as head of the Queensland government, is responsible for determining government policy. In addition, the article refers to the challenges in facing the new Queensland government. According to the author, the new Queensland government must clean up state finances as the legacy of 14 years of Labor government, improve state infrastructure, and deliver on its ambitious election promises.

As the first support, the text mentions that the capacity utilisation in Brisbane's rail and bus systems is barely 50 per cent of best practice. This support indicates that it maintains the claim to renew the rail and bus systems for cleaning up state finances. Therefore, this refers to motivational warrant since the writer invokes the values the audience regard as being important. The shared values of both the writer and the readers are based on their needs.

In summary, this article in datum 1.3 consists of seven supports, all of which are appealing to the needs and values of the arguer. All of the supports are motivational warrants, as they are based on the needs and values of writer and the audience so that the policy proposed can be well accepted.

Furthermore, the finding of the types of warrant in the claim of policy in English is dominated by substantive and motivational warrants since the writers want to give their idea by giving values and the needs supported by sufficient factual evidences. The writers show their new solutions and policies to the problems and thereby the use of substantive and motivational warrant enables the writers to convince the readers. Meanwhile the Indonesian argumentation shows different finding. The motivational warrant is rarely found. The writers make use of substantive and authoritative warrants more to convince the readers on the need to accept the proposed policy.

The following is an analysis example of Indonesian warrant on socio-economic issue that belongs to claims of policy. Datum 2.7: *Menata Sektor Keuangan by Ahmad Erani Yustika*

(September 28th, 2012). The claim of this article is stated explicitly in the beginning of the article as the writer describes that a significant variable to carefully take care of is the financial sector to accelerate the economic progress. As the writer elaborates the factual phenomenon on the socioeconomic issue presented, the claim raised in this text belongs to claim of fact.

There are numerous supports with factual evidences employed in this article. First, the World Bank has currently published the report entitled —Global Financial Development Report 2013: Rethinking the Role of the State in Finance. This means that reorganizing the financial sector needs the state's interference. Second, it helps creating a conducive economic macro environment in accord with the finding of some studies. Third, there are some steps to develop the financial sector as proposed by a reference cited by the writer. Fourth, out of 121 banks in Indonesia the government only have 10 banks. Fifth, Indonesia has low credit 29% in 2010 compared to other countries such as Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam and China which have reached above 100%. Sixth, the efficiency of banks is also at risk in the level of 85% compared to ASEAN countries which only range in 40-60%. Through the evidences here, the writer elaborates the claim by strengthening his argument on the reason underkying the organizing of financial sector using factual evidences from credible sources.

These statements therefore belong to the warrant given by the credible source as authoritative warrants. Beside using the authoritative warrants, the writer elaborates the claim by strengthening his argument by using values. He proposes that the aspect to fix in the stage of enabling environment covers some policies on financial sector. This statement become the shared values of the writer as the arguer who believes that the readers would agree with his proposition. In this case, the warrant given by this support belongs to motivational warrant.

To sum up, the writer's rhetorical strategy to convince readers in understanding the phenomenon given is by exposing authoritative warrants and using a motivational warrant. The use of the various evidences such as research studies, citing authorities, comparison and analogies, statistics and facts is to emphasize on the reader's understanding the clear picture of the phenomenon presented in the claim of fact given.

The finding of this research to some extent establishes different viewpoints compared to the related studies mentioned in the previous chapter. While Sari (2010) showed that the writers rarely stated the claims explicitly in their introductory paragraphs, this research found that in both English and Indonesian publication some writers state their claims explicitly. The explicit claims are made especially those on claim of fact and policy. Meanwhile in claims of value, the writers rarely state it.

While Yuningsih (2010) found in the claims of fact that the method of the writers to serve the claim are funnel and turn about, this research focuses not on the way the claim is introduced but more on the way it is strengthened by the supports to construct warrant. Rusliyah (2011) explored the claims of policy which demonstrated the use of chronological order, topical order, and climate orders of the data, while this research concerns more on

the type of data used as evidence in the support. The writers in English and Indonesian argumentation employ various types of evidence to strengthen claims of policy such as pointing out consequences, logical explanation, statistics, research studies, comparison and analogies, citing authorities, and historical facts. Looking into the study of Ansary and Babaii (2009) which shows no different Generic Structure Potential of genre in L1 and L2, this study found that to some extent difference exists in the proportion of warrant types in both languages.

CONCLUSION

To strengthen the claims of fact, English writers show authoritative and substantive warrants as they emphasize on the factual information from trustworthy source used to convince readers. Meanwhile Indonesian writers tend to strengthen their claims by substantive and motivational warrants. It refers to the intention of the writer to share the values or beliefs with the readers so that the similar perception on the fact presented can be achieved.

In constructing the support for claims of value, almost similar result shown by both English and Indonesian writers that is the domination of motivational warrant. The writers share the values or beliefs with the readers to make them evaluate the issue from similar angle and viewpoint. Yet, Indonesian writers add the motivational warrant with a few authoritative or substantive warrant to make the evaluation less subjective.

The writers attempt to strengthen the claims of policy shows different tendency in English and Indonesian. In English, the writers show the use of substantive and motivational warrants. Meanwhile the Indonesian writers make use of substantive and authoritative warrants more than the use of motivational warrant to convince the readers on the need to accept the proposed policy.

The findings of this research is expected to be meaningful for readers and future researchers as it offers the empirical evidence on the different types of warrant employed by English and Indonesian writers. Those interested in rethorical studies are expected to dig more on the critical discourse analysis on the different warrant accross different languages. In addition, teachers of critical writing are recommended to use the findings of the research as a model in how to deconstruct the idea of the writers in the form of warrant, through analyzing the types of evidence to support strengthening the claims. And finally, the future researchers should elaborate more on the issue of comparative rethorical strategies of L1 and L2 argumentation within different context, types of issue presented and different form of publication.

REFERENCES

- Ansary, H & Babaii, E. (2009). A Cross-cultural Analysis of English Newspaper Editorials: A Systemic-Functional View of Text for Contrastive Rhetoric Research. *Regional Language Center Journal*. Vol 40(2) 211-249

- Blanchard, K & Christine, R. (2003). *Ready to write: A first composition text. 3rd edition.* New York: Peason Education. Inc.
- Craswell, G., & Poore, M. (2011). *Writing for academic success.* Sage.
- Langan, J. (2013). *College writing skills with readings.* Tata McGraw-Hill Education.
- Pusposari, W. (2020) Analisis Argumentasi pada Kolom Opini di Surat Kabar Kompas (Bachelor's thesis, Jakarta: FITK UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta).
- Rohmah, G. N. (2009). *How to Write Autonomously.* Malang: UIN-Malang Press.
- Rottenberg, A. T., & Winchell, D. H. (2011). *Elements of argument: A text and reader.* Macmillan.
- Rusliyah, M. (2011). *Claims of Policy in Opinion Column of the Jakarta Post.* Unpublished Thesis
- Sari, L. (2010). *Claims of Policy in Editorial Column of "The New York Times" Newspaper.* Unpublished Thesis.
- Smalley, R. L., Ruetten, M. K., & Kozyrev, J. (2012). *Refining composition skills: Academic writing and grammar.* Cengage.
- Stapleton P. (2001). *Assessing Critical Thinking in the Japanese university students. Written Communication.*18(4), 506-548.
- Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The Uses of Argument Updated Edition.* New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Yuningsih, B. (2010). *Claims of fact in Opinion Editorial Columnist Section of the New York Times On-Line Newspaper.* Unpublished Thesis
- Zemach, D. E., & Rumisek, L. (2016). *Academic writing.* Macmillan.