

Enhancing Critical Thinking and Character Development through Argumentative Reasoning in High School Students

Muhammad Fuad¹, Istiqomah Ahsanu Amala², Ulul Azmi Muhammad³

^{1,3} Universitas Lampung, BandarLampung, Indonesia

²Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Correspondence Author: abuazisah59@yahoo.co.id

Received: 26 September 2024

Accepted: 17 January 2025

Published: 24 January 2025

Abstract

This study aims to enhance the culture of critical thinking in high schools by identifying the reasoning techniques used by students in written argumentative texts. Employing a qualitative approach with discourse analysis as the theoretical framework, this research investigates how students construct arguments in their writing assignments. Data collection involved analyzing these assignments to identify reasoning techniques. This study identifies four argumentation patterns used by high school students in argumentative writing: (1) C-G-B, (2) C-G-W-B, (3) C-G-B-MQ, and (4) C-G-W-B-MQ, as well as three argumentation techniques: (1) argumentation with examples, (2) argumentation with authority, and (3) argumentation with cause. The C-G-B and C-G-W-B patterns promote analysis, while the C-G-B-MQ and C-G-W-B-MQ patterns encourage synthesis. These argumentation techniques help students evaluate, strengthen logical thinking, and analyze cause-and-effect relationships. Recommendations for enhancing critical thinking skills and character development include incorporating these argumentation patterns into teaching materials and facilitating the learning of diverse argumentation techniques.

Keywords: *critical thinking, character development, argumentative reasoning, high school students*

Introduction

Argumentation is a critical component of daily life, as nearly every interaction involves constructing and presenting arguments. According to Weston (2007), argumentation serves two primary functions: first, as a means to explain and defend ideas, and second, as a tool for evaluating the validity of perspectives. This ability to argue effectively is fundamental to critical thinking, a skill essential for both academic and professional success. Keraf (2007) emphasizes that argumentation underpins scientific knowledge by enabling individuals to

evaluate theories or statements based on evidence and facts, which aligns with the broader responsibility to think critically.

In the context of rhetoric, argumentation goes beyond defending ideas; it also involves influencing others. As Keraf (2007) notes, effective arguments encourage audiences to adopt certain attitudes or actions. However, crafting persuasive arguments requires more than well-arranged words; it demands strong evidence and examples. Without critical evaluation, arguments may lack validity and credibility. This critical perspective is especially vital in writing argumentative discourse to ensure that the arguments presented are logical and well-supported.

The link between argumentative writing and critical thinking has been highlighted in various studies. Haruna and Nahadi (2021) observe that students' argumentative abilities correlate with their capacity to answer critical thinking questions. While some students exhibit critical thinking characteristics, their analysis often lacks depth. Additionally, student writings frequently reflect insufficient argumentative skills, resulting in superficial content. These shortcomings underscore the importance of fostering critical thinking skills at all educational levels, as mandated by Ministerial Regulation No. 12 of 2024, which aims to develop independent, resilient, and internationally competitive individuals.

One effective way to cultivate critical thinking is through argumentative writing, which allows students to engage in cognitive activities such as observing, categorizing, and evaluating. These reasoning processes form the foundation of argumentative discourse, as noted by Shadiq (2004), and include techniques such as reasoning by example, authority, cause-effect, and deduction. By mastering these techniques, students can construct strong arguments supported by relevant evidence.

To further enhance the importance of argumentative reasoning, it is crucial to recognize the role of character development in the process. Engaging in argumentative reasoning not only sharpens students' cognitive abilities but also plays a significant part in their moral and intellectual growth (Fuad et al., 2023). As students develop the ability to construct and evaluate arguments, they simultaneously cultivate values such as intellectual honesty, responsibility, and open-mindedness (Fuad et al., 2024). These traits are integral to character development, as they encourage students to engage with diverse perspectives and critically assess the evidence behind their beliefs. By fostering these qualities, argumentative reasoning supports the development of well-rounded individuals who are capable of making informed decisions, respecting differing viewpoints, and contributing thoughtfully to discussions. Thus, mastering argumentative reasoning does not only contribute to academic success but also shapes students into more thoughtful, responsible, and empathetic members of society.

Despite its potential, the state of writing skills among Indonesian students remains concerning. Indonesian students' writing abilities are relatively low and there is still much room for improvement (Imran, 2000). This deficiency reflects a broader lack of a critical thinking culture. Although writing skills are taught from elementary to high school, their application often remains inadequate, particularly in argumentative writing. This gap highlights the need for targeted interventions to enhance both writing and critical thinking skills.

Given these challenges, this research focuses on identifying the reasoning patterns and techniques students use in argumentative writing. By analyzing these patterns, the study aims to provide insights into how critical thinking can be fostered through improved writing practices. Ultimately, this research seeks to contribute to the development of a culture of critical thinking in high schools, empowering students to construct well-founded arguments and approach complex problems with greater intellectual rigor.

Methods

This study adopts a qualitative research approach with a theoretical orientation toward discourse analysis, as proposed by Brown and Yule (1983). Discourse analysis is particularly well-suited for exploring reasoning in argumentative writing because it focuses on how language is used to construct meaning, enabling an in-depth examination of the structure, coherence, and rhetorical strategies employed by students in their arguments. This method allows the study to uncover patterns in students' reasoning processes that may not be immediately apparent through quantitative approaches.

The research design aims to analyze the structure of argument reasoning patterns and techniques used by high school students in argumentative writing. The study follows structured procedures, beginning with the collection of data from students' writing assignments. The assignments were based on prompts designed to elicit reasoned arguments on socially relevant topics, such as environmental sustainability, the role of technology in education, or ethical dilemmas. Students were instructed to use a specific framework for constructing their arguments, which included an introduction presenting their stance, body paragraphs supporting their claims with evidence and reasoning, and a conclusion summarizing their position. These guidelines were provided to ensure a consistent structure across all submissions.

Participants

The primary data source consists of argumentative essays written by eleventh-grade students from a high school. The tasks were administered as part of their regular classroom activities under the guidance of their teachers. The study

systematically analyzed these essays to identify reasoning techniques, such as argument by example, authority-based arguments, and cause-effect reasoning.

Instruments

The primary instrument used in this study was the argumentative writing assignment, which required students to develop their ideas, thoughts, and opinions critically, based on the evaluation of observed conditions or statements. Data on students' argument reasoning patterns and techniques were captured using data cards to systematically record and categorize the reasoning found in their written discourse.

In addition to the writing assignments, data cards were used to systematically capture and organize the reasoning techniques identified in the students' written discourse. These data cards were designed with predefined coding categories based on established reasoning techniques. The reasoning techniques were categorized into four argumentation patterns and three argumentation techniques.

Argumentation Patterns:

- a. C-G-B (Claim - Grounds - Backing)
- b. C-G-W-B (Claim - Grounds - Warrant - Backing)
- c. C-G-B-MQ (Claim - Grounds - Backing - Modal Qualifier)
- d. C-G-W-B-MQ (Claim - Grounds - Warrant - Backing - Modal Qualifier)

Argumentation Techniques:

- a. Argumentation with Examples: Arguments based on specific examples that support or illustrate the claim.
- b. Argumentation with Authority: Arguments that rely on expert opinions, authoritative sources, or established principles to support the claim.
- c. Argumentation with Cause: Arguments that establish cause-effect relationships to justify or explain the claim.

Data analysis

Data analysis in this study followed the model of Miles and Huberman (1994), which includes three main steps conducted simultaneously: data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction involved selecting and simplifying relevant information from the students' written work. Data display included organizing the data into comprehensible formats to facilitate understanding of the argument reasoning techniques. Finally, conclusion drawing was used to interpret the data, describing the characteristics of the students' argument reasoning patterns and outlining the reasoning techniques employed in their argumentative writing.

- a. Data Reduction: Filtering and organizing the collected essays to focus on the relevant parts of the text where reasoning patterns are most evident.

- b. Data Display: Categorizing the identified reasoning techniques and mapping their occurrences to identify common patterns.

Table 1. Research Display Data

Reasoning Technique	Frequency
Argumentation with Examples	15
Argumentation with Authority	12
Cause-Effect Reasoning	18
C-G-B Pattern	10
C-G-W-B Pattern	7
C-G-B-MQ Pattern	5
C-G-W-B-MQ Pattern	6

- c. Conclusion Drawing and Verification: Interpreting the results to generate insights into the reasoning processes employed by the students, while cross-referencing with theoretical frameworks to ensure validity.

Results and discussion

Patterns of Student Argument Reasoning in Argumentative Written Discourse

The analysis of high school students’ argumentative written discourse reveals that the argument reasoning patterns used are closely related to students’ critical thinking skills. This is because reasoning is an integral part of critical and logical thinking. The maturity level of students’ arguments is significantly influenced by their ability to use logic and critical thinking. Effective argumentative discourse consists of structured statements built on logic and critical thinking, creating clear reasoning patterns. Based on the analysis, four distinct reasoning patterns emerged in students’ argumentative discourse: C-G-B, C-G-W-B, C-G-B-MQ, and C-G-W-B-MQ. Each pattern reflects varying levels of complexity in reasoning and argument construction.

- a. C-G-B: Basic structure with minimal evidence.
- b. C-G-W-B: Adds logical connections between evidence and claims.
- c. C-G-B-MQ: Introduces nuanced perspectives with qualifications.
- d. C-G-W-B-MQ: Comprehensive structure integrating all reasoning elements.

1. C-G-B Pattern

This pattern includes Claim (C)—a statement or assertion, Ground (G)—the basis or reasoning supporting the claim, and Backing (B)—additional evidence or rationale that strengthens the ground.

Example: Flooding

Text:

Currently, floods occur every year. Many residents are accustomed to the floods and are no longer surprised. Recently, Jakarta and Bandung experienced severe flooding. The main problem is the behavior of the community that causes flooding. People often throw garbage into rivers and cut down forests for personal gain. Forests, which should absorb water, no longer function properly. As a result of flooding, many people face difficulties in their daily activities. Children cannot go to school, and floods also become sources of diseases such as dengue fever. Flooding disrupts the entire environment. (Data Source 1)

In this discourse:

- a. The C (Claim) element asserts that flooding has become an annual phenomenon.
- b. The G (Ground) element identifies the causes of flooding, namely community actions such as littering and deforestation.
- c. The B (Backing) element suggests that human activities damaging the environment exacerbate flooding and its consequences.

The use of the C-G-B pattern in the argumentative discourse reflects the student's critical thinking skills, particularly in analysis and synthesis. Through analysis, the student successfully identifies the primary issue—flooding—and its root causes, such as community behaviors like littering and deforestation. This demonstrates the ability to break down a complex problem into its essential components. Additionally, the student showcases synthesis skills by connecting these causes to the broader impacts of flooding, including disruptions to daily life, such as difficulties in education and the spread of diseases. However, while these skills are evident, the argument would benefit from deeper exploration and more robust evidence in the backing, which could enhance the overall reasoning and strengthen the critical thinking demonstrated. Improvement in the depth of analysis and the use of credible evidence will strengthen students' critical thinking skills, as well as their ability to present strong, evidence-based arguments, which will ultimately contribute to a more thoughtful, reflective, and responsible approach in addressing complex issues (Alsaleh, 2020; Haruna & Nahadi, 2021).

2. C-G-W-B Pattern

This pattern builds on the previous structure by adding a Warrant (W)—a logical connection between the ground and the claim, explaining why the ground supports the claim.

Example: HIV/AIDS

Text:

AIDS is a type of virus that attacks the human immune system and is usually incurable. In Indonesia, many AIDS patients do not receive adequate treatment

because no effective cure exists for this disease. Typically, AIDS patients can survive for about four months or less. One symptom of AIDS is extreme fatigue. Although symptoms like flu may be early indications, not all AIDS patients show clear symptoms. Because AIDS can be transmitted through sexual intercourse, whether anal, vaginal, or oral, as well as through changing partners, it is known as a sexually transmitted disease (STD). However, AIDS can also be transmitted through needle sharing and non-sexual contact, making it a non-sexually transmitted disease (NSTD). According to research by an expert, the highest number of AIDS patients is in Indonesia, especially in Papua, and data shows that Indonesia ranks at the top in this regard. Therefore, the government recommends using condoms when engaging in sexual activities with multiple partners. (Data Source 2)

In this example:

- a. The C (Claim) is that HIV/AIDS spreads through various means.
- b. The G (Ground) describes transmission methods and statistical prevalence.
- c. The W (Warrant) links specific behaviors (e.g., unprotected sex) to increased risk.
- d. The B (Backing) supports the claim with recommendations like using condoms.

The C-G-W-B pattern in this argumentative discourse showcases the student's critical thinking skills, particularly in analysis and problem-solving. The claim (C) asserts that HIV/AIDS can be transmitted through sexual contact and other means, while the ground (G) provides a detailed explanation of the virus, its symptoms, and its impact on the human body. The warrant (W) connects the behaviors contributing to HIV/AIDS transmission, such as unsafe sexual practices or needle sharing, to the overall argument. Finally, the backing (B) reinforces this connection with supporting evidence, such as statistics on the prevalence of HIV/AIDS in Indonesia and recommendations for preventive measures.

This pattern reflects the student's analytical skills through their ability to identify and explain the problem of HIV/AIDS transmission. They demonstrate an understanding of its causes, effects, and transmission mechanisms, breaking down a complex issue into its fundamental components. Furthermore, their problem-solving skills are evident in the recommendation to use condoms as a preventive measure, providing a practical solution to mitigate the risks associated with HIV/AIDS. However, while the argument structure is clear, the warrant could be strengthened with more credible sources to enhance the overall persuasiveness of the discourse. This would further demonstrate the student's ability to synthesize evidence and provide well-supported reasoning, thereby improving the critical thinking reflected in the C-G-W-B pattern (Shadiq, 2004; Hardianti et al., 2023).

3. C-G-B-MQ Pattern

This pattern includes a Modal Qualifier (MQ)—a statement that adds nuance or conditions to the argument, acknowledging limitations or contextual factors.

Example: The Consequences of Dishonesty in Life

Text:

This discourse begins with the statement that honesty is a crucial element in human life. According to this discourse, honesty is essential for achieving future success and creating a comfortable and peaceful life. This statement is supported by reasons explaining that honesty brings many benefits but is still difficult to find in everyday practice. Concrete examples are provided to support this claim, such as corrupt government officials who harm society by using public funds for personal gain.

The discourse outlines the negative impacts of dishonesty, such as guilt, shame, and social ostracism. The writer concludes the discourse with a qualification, emphasizing that honest behavior will make life more meaningful and fulfilling. By including this qualification, the discourse shows that although honesty is beneficial, its application in everyday life may face challenges. This qualification reinforces the argument by adding nuance to the claim that living honestly is a better choice, despite implementation challenges. (Data Source 3)

In this text:

- a. The C (Claim) asserts that honesty is crucial.
- b. The G (Ground) explains the benefits of honesty.
- c. The B (Backing) highlights the negative impacts of dishonesty.
- d. The MQ (Modal Qualifier) acknowledges the practical challenges of practicing honesty.

The C-G-B-MQ pattern in the discourse titled "The Consequences of Dishonesty in Life" effectively demonstrates critical thinking skills, particularly in analysis, synthesis, and evaluation.

The claim (C) asserts the importance of honesty in human life, emphasizing its role in achieving success and comfort. The ground (G) provides reasons supporting the claim, explaining that honesty is beneficial but often difficult to practice. This is substantiated with concrete examples, such as corrupt government officials who misuse public funds, illustrating the real-life consequences of dishonesty. The backing (B) further strengthens the argument by detailing the negative impacts of dishonesty, including guilt, shame, and social ostracism, offering evidence that underscores the claim.

The modal qualifier (MQ) adds a nuanced perspective, acknowledging the challenges of practicing honesty despite its significant benefits. This element highlights the complexity of the issue, suggesting that while honesty is the better

choice, its implementation may be hindered by real-world obstacles. This qualification encourages the reader to critically reflect on the practical aspects of honesty in daily life, making the argument more realistic and balanced.

In terms of critical thinking, this pattern reflects analysis through the identification of key elements, such as the benefits of honesty and the consequences of dishonesty. The student also demonstrates synthesis by connecting the claim, supporting reasons, and real-world examples into a cohesive argument. Additionally, the inclusion of the MQ showcases evaluation, as the writer considers counterarguments and practical difficulties, ultimately reinforcing the argument's credibility.

By integrating these elements, the C-G-B-MQ pattern not only delivers a structured and compelling argument but also reflects a mature application of critical thinking skills. This approach enables students to construct nuanced and well-supported arguments, demonstrating depth in reasoning and the ability to address complex issues (Fuad et al., 2024).

4. C-G-W-B-MQ Pattern

This most complex pattern integrates all elements—Claim (C), Ground (G), Warrant (W), Backing (B), and Modal Qualifier (MQ)—to present a comprehensive and balanced argument.

Example: Gas Explosions

Text:

Everyone knows that recently there have been many LPG gas explosions due to leaking gas cylinders. In some cases, homeowners have been burned as a result. Most of the leaking gas cylinders are government-subsidized cylinders weighing 3 kilograms. I believe that while the owners of these 3 kg gas cylinders may be negligent, the fault lies with the government because many of the subsidized cylinders have very thin protective rubber. One cause is the prevalence of counterfeit 3 kg gas cylinders in circulation.

Owners of 3 kg gas cylinders usually do not know how good and perfect the gas cylinder is. As buyers, we need to pay attention to the items we purchase and protest to the seller if there are any minor faults. Just like with these 3 kg gas cylinders, we need to weigh and check the rubber to ensure there are no issues. If there are, we should avoid using it for cooking as it could endanger our family.

The government is also at fault, as any 3 kg gas cylinders that appear unfit for use should be withdrawn from circulation to prevent safety hazards. Additionally, since these 3 kg cylinders have been in circulation for a long time, unscrupulous people may produce counterfeit cylinders that do not meet government standards, which can also endanger innocent customers.

As consumers, we should be aware that 3 kg gas cylinders often lead to dangerous explosions. Before using such cylinders, we should check their completeness and use thick hoses to ensure our safety, and replace the hose if necessary. Be cautious before use. (Data Source 4)

In this example:

- a. The C (Claim) states that gas explosions are caused by faulty cylinders.
- b. The G (Ground) describes the causes, including poor-quality and counterfeit cylinders.
- c. The W (Warrant) links consumer negligence and product quality to the issue.
- d. The B (Backing) suggests government regulation and consumer vigilance as solutions.
- e. The MQ (Modal Qualifier) recommends preventive measures while emphasizing safety.

The claim (C) is the assertion that LPG gas explosions occur frequently due to leaks in government-subsidized gas cylinders. This statement establishes the central argument that these cylinders, especially the 3 kg ones, pose a safety risk. The ground (G) provides the reasons behind this issue, identifying the poor quality of these cylinders, including thin protective rubber and the presence of counterfeit products. These reasons set the stage for further analysis of the issue. The warrant (W) justifies why these issues with gas cylinders lead to dangerous outcomes. The writer emphasizes that owners are often unaware of the cylinders' quality, and the need for proper inspection before purchasing is essential. This connects the claim and reasons, showing how the lack of consumer knowledge contributes to the widespread problem of leaks and explosions. The backing (B) strengthens the argument by suggesting specific actions that should be taken, such as withdrawing unfit cylinders from circulation to prevent hazards. Additionally, the backing highlights the danger posed by counterfeit cylinders that do not meet government standards, which exacerbate the safety risks for consumers. The modal qualifier (MQ) introduces a practical solution and adds nuance by recommending precautionary measures, such as inspecting gas cylinders for completeness and using thick hoses. This qualification provides a more balanced perspective, acknowledging that while the risks are real, consumers can take steps to minimize danger through careful inspection and maintenance.

In terms of critical thinking, this structure reflects analysis by breaking down the problem into identifiable causes (poor quality, counterfeit products) and outcomes (explosions, fires). The student demonstrates synthesis by connecting the various components—claim, reasons, justifications, and solutions—into a cohesive argument. The evaluation aspect is evident in the modal qualifier, which not only suggests a solution but also considers the feasibility and effectiveness of these measures in addressing the safety concerns.

By using the C-G-W-B-MQ pattern, the writer showcases a deep understanding of the issue, connecting different pieces of information and offering practical, actionable

advice. This argumentative structure demonstrates well-developed critical thinking skills, as it integrates reasoning with real-world implications, solutions, and qualifications (Weston, 2007; Fuad et al., 2023).

Argumentation Techniques in Students' Written Argumentative Discourse

1. Argumentation Technique with Examples

The argumentation technique with examples involves using specific instances or case studies to support and illustrate an argument. This approach helps to clarify abstract concepts and make an argument more tangible and relatable.

For example, in the discourse:

"... There are various ways to improve environmental conditions. For instance, we can avoid indiscriminate deforestation, plant and care for trees, and reduce the use of products that emit CO₂, such as air conditioners and perfumes. CO₂ contributes to global warming because it cannot escape from Earth's atmosphere, leading to an increase in global temperatures." (Data Source 5)

The use of the phrase "for instance" by the student to introduce concrete examples such as deforestation, tree planting, and reducing CO₂ emissions reflects critical thinking skills, particularly analysis and synthesis. By evaluating various solutions to the environmental issue, the student demonstrates the ability to critically assess real-world problems. Moreover, by connecting these actions to the broader goal of improving global conditions, the student showcases synthesis skills, linking individual efforts to a larger cause. This approach not only strengthens the argument but also contributes to the development of character by promoting responsible engagement with global issues. As such, it highlights the role of argumentative reasoning in enhancing both critical thinking and character development in high school students, encouraging them to approach complex issues thoughtfully and responsibly (Keraf, 2007; Jimola & Olaniyan, 2021).

2. Argumentation Technique with Authority

The argumentation technique with authority relies on expert opinions, statistical data, or historical evidence to bolster an argument. This technique draws on established sources to provide credibility to the student's claim.

An example of this technique can be found in the following discourse:

"Although Indonesia continues to contribute gold medals in the Olympics, overall, the performance of Indonesian badminton has been declining. This is evidenced by the minimal individual achievements in international tournaments and the failures of the team in the Thomas and Uber Cups held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. In the latest edition of the Thomas Cup, the Indonesian team reached the final but lost to China with a score of 3-0. Meanwhile, the Uber Cup team had to concede to China's superiority in the semifinals with the same score, 3-0." (Data Source 6)

The student's use of statistical data, such as the 3-0 match scores and tournament dates, to support the claim about Indonesia's badminton performance, exemplifies critical thinking skills, particularly in the areas of evaluation and synthesis. By grounding their argument in verifiable facts rather than general statements, the student demonstrates the ability to evaluate reliable sources and analyze how data strengthens the argument. This approach not only enhances the credibility of the claim but also allows the student to synthesize historical and statistical information to offer a more comprehensive perspective on the topic. In the context of enhancing critical thinking and character development, this method encourages high school students to engage with evidence thoughtfully, evaluate sources critically, and present well-supported arguments, fostering both intellectual rigor and responsible, evidence-based decision-making (Brown & Yule, 1983; Stobaugh, 2013).

3. Argumentation Technique with Cause

The argumentation technique with cause is built on identifying and explaining the cause-and-effect relationships between events. It is often used to argue that one factor directly contributes to another, helping students present logical and persuasive arguments.

An example of this can be seen in the following passage:

"Recently, many middle and high school students have dropped out of school. This is due to several factors, such as financial problems and the students' own laziness. Laziness among students also contributes to their decision to leave school." (Data Source 7)

Here, the student connects financial problems and laziness as primary causes of school dropout. By explaining these causal relationships, the student presents a coherent argument about why students leave school. The use of cause-and-effect reasoning requires the student to critically analyze the various factors contributing to the issue, a skill that aligns with analysis and evaluation. The student also synthesizes these factors to create a more comprehensive argument that links multiple causes to the observed effect of dropping out (Widyastuti, 2018; Hardianti et al., 2023).

Conclusion

This study highlights four key argumentation patterns employed by high school students in argumentative writing: (1) C-G-B pattern, (2) C-G-W-B pattern, (3) C-G-B-MQ pattern, and (4) C-G-W-B-MQ pattern. Additionally, students use several argumentation techniques, including: (1) argumentation with examples, (2) argumentation with authority, and (3) argumentation with cause. Each of these patterns and techniques plays a crucial role in enhancing students' critical thinking skills.

The C-G-B and C-G-W-B patterns promote analysis by requiring students to evaluate the relationships between their claims and supporting reasons, while the C-G-B-MQ and C-G-W-B-MQ patterns encourage synthesis by integrating qualifiers and backing to build more nuanced and comprehensive arguments. Argumentation with examples fosters evaluation, as students must analyze real-world instances to substantiate their claims, while argumentation with authority strengthens students' logical reasoning by urging them to engage with credible sources to validate their points. Finally, argumentation with cause enhances problem-solving by encouraging students to trace the cause-and-effect relationships in their arguments.

To further develop critical thinking in high school students, several recommendations can be proposed: (1) leverage the critical thinking potential demonstrated through these argumentation patterns as a foundation for developing teaching materials on argumentative writing; (2) assist students in recognizing and using a variety of argumentation techniques to facilitate the expression of well-rounded arguments; and (3) enhance students' understanding of these techniques to enable them to more effectively construct and present their arguments, ultimately fostering their ability to think critically and independently.

References

- Alsaleh, N.J. (2020). Teaching Critical Thinking Skills: Literature Review. *TOJET: The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology*, January 2020, volume 19 issue 1.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuad, M., Amala, I.A., Muhammad, U.A. (2023). Pembangunan Karakter Bangsa Melalui Pengembangan Literasi Digital di Era Teknologi. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pendidikan*, Volume 2, Desember 2023.
- Fuad, M., Dahlan, S., Muhammad, U.A., Sumarno, Amala, I.A. (2024). Implementing Character Education Values in Lampung Regional Songs for Critical Reading Learning Materials in Junior High School: Critical Discourse Analysis. *AKSARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra* 25:1 (2024), 224 - 245. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23960/aksara/v25i1.pp224-245>
- Hardianti, Jabu, B., Salija, K. (2023). Students' Critical Thinking Skills in Writing Analytical Exposition Text. *ELT Worldwide Journal of English Language Teaching*, Volume 10 Number 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.26858/eltww.v10i2.52992>
- Haruna, A., & Nahadi. (2021). Menjelajahi hubungan level argumentasi dengan kemampuan berfikir kritis siswa dalam menyelesaikan soal ikatan kimia. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Kimia*, Vol 15, No 1, 2021.
- Imran, A. (2000). Keterampilan Menulis Indonesia paling Rendah di Asia. *Pikiran Rakyat*, 26 Oktober 2000.
- Jimola, F. E., & Olaniyan, A. S. (2021). Conceptualisation of critical literacy and argumentative writing as an essential tool for the development of dialectic

- reasoningamong students. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Sociality Studies*, 1, 8-15.
<https://doi.org/10.51986/ijss-2021.vol1.02>
- Keraf, G. (2007). *Argumentasi dan Narasi*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Source Book of New Methods*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Shadiq, F. (2004). *Pemecahan Masalah, Penalaran dan Komunikasi*. Disampaikan pada Diklat Instruktur/Pengembang Matematika SMA Jenjang Dasar Tanggal 6 s.d. 19 Agustus 2004 di PPPG Matematika. Yogyakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Pusat Pengembangan Penataran Guru (PPPG) Matematika Yogyakarta.
- Stobaugh, R. (2013). *Assessing Critical Thinking in Middle and High Schools*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315853451>
- Weston, A. (2007). *Kaidah Berargumentasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Widyastuti, S. (2018). Fostering Critical Thinking Skills Through Argumentative Writing. *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, Edisi Juni 2018. [10.21831/cp.v37i2.20157](https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v37i2.20157)