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Abstrak

Persuasive language is different from declarative language in bahasa Indonesia. This distinctive
form impacts the functional pattern and the argument structure. Thus, this study was aimed
at identifying and describing argument structure of persuasive language in public space of
Indonesia – Timor Leste. Since this study was a qualitative study, the data obtained were analyzed
qualitatively using lexical-functional grammar theory (LFG). Persuasive language found in the
research was in the form of intransitive and monotransitive clauses. Intransitive clauses have
the pattern V – OBJ and V – OBJ – ADV. The monotransitive clauses have the pattern SUBJ
– V – OBJ, V – OBJ – SUBJ, and OBJ – V – SUBJ. The intransitive verbs found always bind
arguments that semantically have a locative role, therefore the model of the argument structure
is ‘jauhi’ <locative> and ‘jaga’ <locative>. The argument structure of monotransitive clauses
can be modeled as ‘bersatu membangun’ <agent, locative>, ‘bersatu membangun’ <locative, posesif>,
‘membangun’ <experiencer, theme>, and ‘wujudkan’ <agent, locative>.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Persuasive language is the language used to persuade or make people believe, convince someone of something, and even enable someone to adopt an idea (Agyekum, 2004: 4) and (Khoiria, 2020: 206). It is also utilised to have someone act in a certain way, and occasionally go against their will.

The public space tends to be employed by stakeholders as a useful place to promote themselves and influence audiences by playing language as the core weapon. Therefore, it could be argued that the language in the public space tends to be persuasive.

The persuasive language has a different structure from the general structure of Indonesian or other languages used in everyday life. The general structure of Indonesian in terms of asking and conveying information to audiences is always in the S-P, S-P-O, S-P-O-K, and S-P-K patterns, but in persuasive language it has a different pattern.

The persuasive language investigated in this study includes persuasive language in the public space of the border between Indonesia and Timor Leste, namely the areas of North Central Timor, Belu, and Malaka districts. Persuasive language is usually found in various types of containers for conveying information in public spaces, namely banners, billboards, and brochures. Some of these containers are used as media for self-promotion and as a commercial container. In addition, stakeholders utilise them to familiarize themselves with grassroots communities who are basically not related by blood.

The researchers intended to investigate about argument structure of persuasive language due to the fact that persuasive language is different from declarative language. This distinctive form can impact the functional pattern and its argument structure.

The problem investigated in this research was what was the argument structure of the persuasive language in the public space of the border of Indonesia - Timor Leste? Consequently, this research was aimed at identifying and describing the argument structure of the persuasive language in the public space of the border of Indonesia - Timor Leste.

A descriptive qualitative method was utilised this study. It was because it produced descriptive data in the form of written words that can be observed in the public space of the border of Indonesia-Timor Leste. Punch and Oancea (2014) stated that the characteristics of qualitative study focus on the natural designs; it is naturalistic, and the study of people, events, and their natural settings in depth. In line with Punch and Oancea’s idea, King et al., (1994) argued that the use of a qualitative approach largely concerns showing how people describe and understand the world around them. This study was aimed at making systematic, factual, and accurate descriptions...
of linguistic facts related to persuasive language in the public space of the border of Indonesia-Timor Leste.

The type of data used in this study was in the form of written data, especially in the syntax field. The written data meant in this study were persuasive language data found in banners, billboards, and the like which were displayed in the public space of the border of Indonesia - Timor Leste, meanwhile in order to document the data a digital camera recording device was utilised.

In collecting the data, the authors applied the observation method as a way to obtain the data needed in this research. The observation activity aimed at gaining information about language data, especially persuasive language sentences in the public space of the border of Indonesia-Timor Leste. The implementation of the observation method in this study was that the researchers observed banners, billboards, and the like in the public space of the border of Indonesia – Timor Leste which contained persuasive language. Then, the method used by the author to analyze the data in this study, namely the method of analysis of Miles and Huberman model (Miles & Huberman in Gumilang, 2016). Based on this method, data analysis is carried out in three stages, namely: (a) data reduction, (b) data display or presentation, (c) drawing conclusions and verification (Iskandar, 2009: 139). Based on the above method, the techniques used by researchers in analyzing data, namely reducing or selecting data that had been collected to obtain data that were truly relevant to the problem of this research. After reducing the data, then the data were arranged systematically for analysis. After analyzing the data, the researcher then drew temporary conclusions. The next technique, researchers re-examined the accuracy of the data that had been collected by exchanging ideas with peers or people who were competent in the field of language so that the results of this study could be scientifically trusted. After testing the results of data analysis, the researcher drew final conclusions to answer the problem.

Presentation of the results of data analysis in this study used formal and informal methods (Sudaryanto, 1993). The formal method led to the presentation of the results of the study using lingual signs and symbols and in the form of diagrams. Meanwhile, the informal method is a way of presenting rules with the formulation of ordinary words that are easy to understand. Then, the technique used was the inductive technique, namely the presentation of data analysis by suggesting specific matters first and then drawing a general conclusion.

2. THEORITICAL REVIEW

To analyze data related to the argument structure of the persuasive language in this study, the researchers utilised the Lexical-Functional Grammar theory (LFG). This theory was put forward by Joan Bresnan and Ronald Kaplan who classified LFG
into non-transformational and lexicon-based generative grammar. LFG refers to the basic generative concept, namely that grammar consists of an unlimited number of modules, principles and certain constraints. LFG makes lexical entries as a basis, with the basic assumption that an element can be combined with or can represent other elements to build a clause or a sentence, it really depends on the lexical element itself.

In LFG, verbs have a fundamental role in the construction of a clause or a sentence. Verbs are seen as a central point whose existence binds a number of arguments or participants which have an impact on the verb’s authenticity or valence degree. Shopen (1985: 96) states that valence refers to the number of different types of elements associated with verbs. The term valence is used to refer to the number of arguments for a clause noun at whatever level people address it.

In terms of type, valence can be divided into two, namely semantic valence and syntactic valence. Semantic valence is valence related to the number of participants that must be present which is expressed by a verb, while syntactic valence or grammatical valence is valence related to the number of real arguments in a particular clause. In addition, the understanding of valence also leads to the number of arguments in the syntactic framework associated with verbs caused by grammatical functions (Payne, 1977: 169 - 170; Haspelmath, 2002: 210 - 211; and Katamba 1993: 266, in Budiarta, 2013: 81). Furthermore, valence is the number of arguments bound or required by the verb. Valence is closely related to terms related to increasing the number of arguments, namely the use and application of and the terms associated with decreasing the number of arguments, namely passivation, replacement, and intransitivity.

The argument is a syntactic and semantic element required by a verb, which generally correlates with participation in an event or state that is stated by the verb or predicate. Based on this understanding, it is known that the number of arguments in a clause or a sentence is determined by the verb as the core (head) of the clause or the sentence (Wiliams in Budiarta, 2013: 82).

The argument structure is an intermediate structure in which information is contained, namely (a) information about the valence of verbs (such as verbs with one argument, verbs with two arguments, and verbs with three arguments); (b) information about the essence of the argument (core argument and non-core argument); (c) information about the prominence of an argument that has (i) core over non-core, and (ii) in this series of core and non-core prominence describes semantic prominence (Arka, 1998, 2003a, 2003b; Maning, 1996; Alsina, 1996 in Kosmas, 2008: 38).

A study related to argument structure was carried out by Fauzi and Mulyadi (2020) with the title “Argument Structure in Malay Language, Akit Dialect, Padang, Meranti Island”. This study was aimed at raising the phenomenon of the Akit dialect Malay language in the island of Padang, the Meranti archipelago. The results showed
that the argument structure in the Akit dialect was somewhat easy. Akit dialect Malay language had limited vocabulary, phrases, clauses and sentences. In addition, Akit dialect was also an isolative type of language.

Further study was conducted by Ardianto (2015) with the title “Argument Structure in Discourse of Student Scientific Writing”. Ardianto’s study was aimed at describing the argument structure based on the type of complexity and the drawing of conclusions in students’ scientific papers. The results showed that the argument structure based on the type of complexity consisted of a simple argument structure and a complex argument structure, while the argument structure based on drawing conclusions consisted of deductive and inductive argument structures.

The two studies above and this study have similarities, namely discussing the argument structure, while the difference is the object of study. Fauzi and Mulyadi took the Akit dialect Malay as the object of study, while Ardianto took students’ scientific papers as the object of study.

Another relevant study was conducted by Wardani and Utomo (2021) with the title “The Analysis of Function, Role, and Synthactic Catagories of Covid 19 Recession Resistant Vaccine By Sarman Simanjorang’s Opinion in Suara Merdeka’s Newspaper”. Wardani and Utomo focused on functions, roles, and categories in the opinion of the covid-19 vaccine. Based on the syntactic function, the Covid-19 vaccine opinion had SPOK pattern, while based on the semantic role of the Covid-19 vaccine opinion, the subject’s function was to carry out the role of actor, person, and cause. The predicate function had the roles of action, state, and quantity. The similarity between the previous study and this study was that they both examined the field of syntax that focuses on functions and roles. Then, the difference was the object of study in which previous research took the opinion of Covid-19, while this study took persuasive language in the public space.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section is the answer to the main problem that has been formulated in the introductory section of this study. This means that all data obtained regarding persuasive language verbal clauses in the Republic of Indonesia–Timor Leste public space are displayed and discussed in detail. The focus of this study is the structure of arguments and persuasive language markers in the Republic of Indonesia - Timor Leste public space. Therefore, the discussion of the data in the study will be directed at the structure of arguments and markers of persuasive language.

The data of persuasive language obtained in the study were eight data. The eight data in this study were classified based on the syntactic function of the clause. Based on the syntactic function, there were two intransitive clause data and six transitive
Intransitive Clauses of Persuasive Language in Public Spaces Indonesia – Timor Leste

An intransitive clause is a clause that contains an intransitive verb, namely a verb that does not require an object, in this case an intransitive clause is a clause whose verb ability only binds one core argument (Tarigan, in Darwin, 2017: 28). In other words, a verb that potentially only binds one main argument in a clause is an intransitive clause. The intransitive clause data found in persuasive language in the Indonesian-Timor Leste public space is shown as follows.

(01) Jauhi Miras!
    V OBJ
(01a)# Miras jauhi.
    OBJ V
(02) Jaga diri dan keluarga Anda dari virus corona.
    V OBJ Adv.
(02a)# Diri dan keluarga Anda jaga dari corona.
    SBJ V Adv.
(02b)# Dari corona jaga diri dan keluarga Anda
t(02c)# Diri dan keluarga Anda dari corona jaga

The data (01) and (02) above are data on persuasive language intransitive clauses taken in the public space of Indonesia – Timor Leste. The persuasive markers in the data of clauses (01) and (02) are words ‘jauhi’ and ‘jaga’ which functionally occupies the position of a verb (V). The clause in data (01) is a minor clause, which has a Verb (V) – Object (OBJ) structure. This clause begins with a verb that potentially only binds one core argument, namely OBJ which is shown in the post-verb position. Meanwhile, the structure as shown in the data (01a) is a form of revaluation of the structure of the data (01). The clause structure (01a) is OBJ - V which is structurally unacceptable and is not a persuasive language structure. In this case, persuasive language does not want the OBJ structure to precede V. The clause in the data (02) is displayed with the structure Verb (V) – Object (OBJ) – Adverb (Adv.). The clause in data (02) also begins with a verb that potentially binds one core argument, namely OBJ that is shown at the post-verb position, and one non-core argument, namely an adverb that is shown after OBJ. The data (02a), (02b), and (02c) above are the result of the revaluation of the structure of the data (02) which is structurally unacceptable in the context of persuasive language.
In general, the acceptance of a clause requires mandatory elements, namely subject and predicate. However, in the context of the persuasive language clause in the data (01) and (02) above, the subject element is not included but conceptually the clause above is acceptable, and is seen as a complete clause. Thus, it could be said that the existence of a mandatory element in this case the subject (SBJ) in a persuasive language clause is arbitrary. The persuasive language argument structure in data (01) above can be modeled as ‘jauhi’ <locative>’, while the argument structure model in data (02) is ‘jaga’ <locative>.

Transitive Clauses of Persuasive Language in Public Spaces Indonesia – Timor Leste

A transitive clause is a clause whose verb ability is able to bind two or more than two main arguments. Transitive verbs are classified into two groups, namely, monotransitive verbs and bitransitive verbs (Kridalaksana in Kesuma, 2010: 70). The transitive clause data found in this study is monotransitive clause, namely a clause whose verb ability only binds two core arguments. The data of monotransitive clauses found in persuasive language in this study are shown in the following data (03) and (04).

(03)  Kita bersatu membangun TTU
     SUBJ V OBJ
(03a) Bersatu membangun TTU kita
      V OBJ SUBJ
(03b)* TTU membangun kita bersatu
     OBJ V SUBJ
(03c)# Membangun kita bersatu TTU
      V SUBJ OBJ
(04)  Kita wujudkan TTU bersinar
     SUBJ V OBJ
(04a)# Wujudkan TTU bersinar kita
      V OBJ SUBJ
(04b) TTU bersinar kita wujudkan
     OBJ SUBJ V
(04c)# Wujudkan kita TTU bersinar
      V SUBJ OBJ

The transitive clauses of persuasive language in data (03) are marked with a constructing serial verb ‘bersatu membangun’ which is functionally filled by the verb. The verb ‘bersatu membangun’ binds two core arguments, namely ‘Kita’ which functionally
fills in the subject (SUBJ) and ‘TTU’ fills in the object (OBJ). The transitive clause of persuasive language in the data (03) above is still syntactically acceptable with the pattern V – OBJ – SUBJ and OBJ – V – SUBJ as in the constructions (03a) and (03b). The acceptance of the clause in the construction (03a) is seen from the role of the ‘Kita’ SUBJ which does not carry the role of the actor in the data (03) but plays a possessive role. The acceptability of the construction (03b) is caused by the change in the function of the verb ‘bersatu’ to become an affirming obligator in the SUBJ ‘kita’. The clause in the construction (03c) is not syntactically acceptable because the persuasive language in this study does not require the V – SUBJ – OBJ pattern. The argument structure for data (03) can be modeled as ‘bersatu membangun’ <agent, locative>, while the argument structure model for data (03a) is ‘bersatu membangun’ <locative, possessive>. The argument structure in the data (03b) is modeled as ‘membangun’ <experiencer, theme>. The argument structure in data (03c) cannot be modeled because it is not a persuasive language and, this clause is syntactically unacceptable from a structural point of view.

The transitive clause of persuasive language in data (04) is marked with the verb ‘wujudkan’ which structurally has the ability to bind two core arguments, ‘kita’ which functions as SUBJ and ‘TTU bersinar’ which functions as OBJ. The clauses in the data (04a) and (04c) are not persuasive language because they are structurally unacceptable. The position of the SUBJ ‘kita’ and the OBJ ‘TTU bersinar’ at the end of the clause obscures the persuasive meaning of the word ‘wujudkan’. The clause in the data (04b) is a form of inversion or rearrangement in the clause data (04). Therefore, syntactically the meaning of the persuasive clause in data (04b) is the same as the clause in data (04) both in terms of function and role. The argument structure in clauses (04) and (04b) is modeled as ‘wujudkan’ <agent, locative>, while the argument structure in data (04a) and (04c) cannot be modeled.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Persuasive language in the public space of Indonesia–Timor Leste found in the research is in the form of intransitive and monotransitive clauses. Intransitive clauses of persuasive language in the public space of Indonesia – Timor Leste have the pattern V – OBJ and V – OBJ – ADV. The monotransitive clauses have the pattern SUBJ – V – OBJ, V – OBJ – SUBJ, and OBJ – V – SUBJ. The persuasive intransitive verbs found in this study always bind arguments that semantically have a locative role, therefore the argument structure can be modeled as ‘jauhi’ <locative> and ‘jaga’ <locative>. The argument structure of monotransitive clauses can be modeled as ‘bersatu membangun’ <agent, locative>, ‘bersatu membangun’ <locative, possessive>, ‘membangun’ <experiencer, theme>, and ‘wujudkan’ <agent, locative>. 
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