



Language Choice and Politeness Strategies in Junior High School Students' Argumentative Texts: A Sociopragmatic Study

Asih Purwianti¹, Farida Nugrahani^{2*}, Veronika Unun Pratiwi³
Universitas Veteran Bangun Nusantara, Sukoharjo, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Farida Nugrahani: faridanugrahani01@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Language
Politeness, Argumentative
Text, Sociopragmatics

Received : 27, April

Revised : 20, May

Accepted: 8, June

©2026 Purwianti, Nugrahani,
Pratiwi(s): This is an
openaccess article distributed
under the terms of the

[Creative Commons Atribusi
4.0 Internasional](#).



ABSTRACT

This study examines language politeness in junior high school students' argumentative texts in Indonesian language learning from a sociopragmatic perspective. The research adopted a descriptive qualitative approach, with data sourced from

argumentative texts written by ninth-grade students of SMP Negeri 4 Tawangsari, selected purposively. The research data consisted of linguistic units in students' argumentative texts that represented forms of politeness strategies. Data were collected through document analysis. Data validity was ensured through methodological and theoretical triangulation, as well as persistent observation during the analysis process. Data analysis was conducted based on Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and the sociopragmatic framework in education through the stages of data reduction, classification of politeness strategies, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. The findings reveal that students' argumentative practices are characterized by the dominant use of positive and negative politeness strategies through neutral diction, mitigating expressions, and non-confrontational declarative sentence structures. These linguistic strategies reflect students' awareness of social norms, institutional relationships within the school environment, and the need to maintain readers' social acceptance. The findings confirm that students' argumentative texts constitute a social practice that integrates argumentative rationality with communication ethics. Therefore, argumentative writing instruction plays an important role in developing students' pragmatic competence and language politeness.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59890/ijels.v4i6.29>

(ISSN: 3026-2429)

<https://journal.multitechpublisher.com/index.php/ijels>

INTRODUCTION

Indonesian language learning plays an important role in developing students' effective communication skills, particularly in understanding and producing argumentative texts. These skills are not only related to grammatical

accuracy but also to the selection of language that is appropriate to the social context and communicative purpose. The effectiveness of conveying argumentative messages is greatly influenced by the speaker's ability to employ appropriate linguistic strategies so that ideas can be accepted effectively by the audience. From a sociopragmatic perspective, language is viewed not merely as a tool of communication but also as a social practice embedded with intentions, values, and interpersonal relationships. Prayitno (2017) explains that sociopragmatics emphasizes the relationship between social context and pragmatic functions in language use. Language is strategically employed to represent attitudes, establish social relationships, and influence audiences according to cultural backgrounds and communicative goals. Research by Sudiyana et al. (2024) demonstrates that communication strategies in public discourse reflect the social values and local wisdom possessed by speakers. Therefore, analyzing language choice in argumentative texts is important for understanding how linguistic strategies are consciously used to influence readers or listeners.

Language use by teachers and students also reflects sociopragmatic practices that occur during the learning process. Verbal interaction in the classroom functions not only to deliver instructional content but also to build understanding, direct students' responses, and create shared meaning. Maryanto (2022) found that teachers' illocutionary acts in classroom interaction can influence how students respond, interpret instructions, and construct meaning. These findings indicate that language choice has a direct impact on the effectiveness of communication in educational settings. Teachers need to pay attention to the forms of utterances they use so that learning objectives, including students' argumentative competence, can be achieved optimally. Indonesian language instruction should therefore train students to use language strategically according to its communicative functions. Previous studies have shown that the implementation of appropriate language learning models can improve students' communication skills and academic achievement in Indonesian language subjects (Darmuki et al., 2023).

The phenomenon of language use in school environments reveals variations in speech styles influenced by factors such as age, situation, and social relationships among participants. These variations reflect the social dynamics that develop within educational settings. Ameliyah et al. (2025) found that elementary school students employ particular speech registers when interacting in school contexts, reflecting group identity and social dynamics among peers. Similar variations also appear in students' argumentative texts. Word choice, sentence structures, and message-delivery strategies are often used to establish closeness with the audience or to reinforce the writer's position on a particular issue. Language choice in argumentative texts does not occur randomly but follows social patterns that develop within learners' environments. A sociopragmatic approach is therefore necessary to reveal how students and teachers select particular linguistic forms in their efforts to influence their audiences.

Numerous studies have highlighted the importance of sociopragmatic approaches in understanding linguistic politeness within argumentative discourse. Mahmudi et al. (2021) found that students' linguistic politeness in interactions with teachers is influenced by contextual understanding and the appropriate use of pragmatic strategies. Research conducted by Febrina et al. (2024) revealed that elementary school students' argumentative writing skills still require improvement, particularly in constructing effective and polite arguments. Findings reported by Musyawir et al. (2024) indicate that adherence to politeness principles is highly dependent on social context and communicative objectives within discourse. Studies in pragmatics further emphasize the significance of politeness principles and contextual factors in language use (Suri et al., 2024). Research on speech acts in Indonesian language learning has also shown that understanding pragmatic functions can enhance students' ability to communicate politely and effectively (Mualamah et al., 2023). Ultimately, politeness in argumentative texts is determined not only by lexical choices but also by an understanding of social context and pragmatic functions in communication.

Although studies on sociopragmatics, politeness, and argumentative strategies are abundant, most have not specifically examined how linguistic politeness in argumentative texts emerges through language choices made by students within the context of Indonesian language learning at the junior high school level. The research gap lies in the limited attention given to the relationship between classroom social factors—such as teacher-student relationships, instructional objectives, and interactional situations—and the linguistic strategies that construct politeness in argumentative texts. The novelty of this study lies not merely in identifying forms of politeness but also in analyzing the social functions of politeness strategies within Indonesian language learning contexts.

This study aims to describe: (1) forms of language choice that reflect politeness in argumentative texts produced by students, and (2) politeness strategies employed by students in constructing argumentative texts from a sociopragmatic perspective. The findings are expected to contribute theoretically to the development of linguistic politeness studies in Indonesian language learning and practically to assist teachers in designing argumentative writing instruction that is more effective, contextualized, and supportive of polite language use in accordance with social norms and communicative purposes

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theory of linguistic politeness in pragmatics is primarily grounded in the works of Brown and Levinson and Leech, which provide the conceptual foundation for understanding speakers' linguistic strategies. Brown and Levinson (1987) define politeness as speakers' efforts to maintain both their own and their interlocutors' face through positive and negative politeness strategies.

Positive politeness reflects attempts to establish social closeness and solidarity, whereas negative politeness demonstrates respect for individual autonomy and seeks to minimize threats to the interlocutor. Leech (1993) proposes the Politeness Principle through six maxims—tact, generosity, approbation, modesty, agreement, and sympathy—as guidelines for maintaining harmonious communication. Both theories emphasize that language use involves social considerations, ethical values, and interpersonal relationships within communicative contexts. In Indonesian language learning, politeness theory provides a framework for understanding how students manage linguistic choices in argumentative texts to remain both persuasive and respectful.

Politeness principles constitute an essential aspect of language choice, particularly when argumentative texts aim to persuade without offending others. Mahmudi et al. (2021) argue that linguistic politeness plays a crucial role in teacher–student interactions because it serves as the foundation for harmonious communication. The use of polite language in argumentative texts can enhance message acceptance by readers. From a sociopragmatic perspective, politeness principles illustrate how speakers adapt their linguistic choices to prevailing social norms. Language and literature education in schools also contributes to the development of social values and character through ethical language practices that respect interlocutors (Nugrahani & Al-Ma'ruf, 2019). Sociopragmatic analysis therefore provides a useful framework for identifying politeness strategies employed in argumentative texts within Indonesian language learning.

Speech act strategies play a significant role in strengthening the persuasive force of argumentative texts. Language use functions not only to convey information but also to direct, influence, and shape audience attitudes. Morelent et al. (2022) explain that directive speech acts employed by teachers in classroom interactions contribute to the development of students' character and behavior. Speech acts such as invitations, suggestions, and recommendations are frequently utilized in argumentative texts to enhance persuasive effectiveness. Emotional and evaluative dimensions are likewise involved in argumentative strategies. Sudiyana and Emzir (2020) demonstrate that emotional language and evaluative stances in argumentative discourse influence audience perceptions. Language as a means of communication also contains ethical and moral dimensions that reflect societal values; consequently, language use is often associated with value-based considerations in communication (Al-Ma'ruf et al., 2024). Sociopragmatics offers an analytical framework for understanding language as a social action strategically employed to influence others within educational contexts.

One of the current challenges in Indonesian language learning concerns students' ability to use language that is not only structurally correct but also socially and pragmatically appropriate. Nasarudin et al. (2023) emphasize that pragmatics and language use are inherently connected to social context, speakers' intentions, and listeners' interpretations. Understanding argumentative texts cannot be separated from the social contexts in which they are produced. Students need to be trained to recognize implicit meanings, persuasive

intentions, and effective linguistic choices when composing argumentative texts. Indonesian language instruction should therefore provide opportunities for sociopragmatic analysis so that students can both interpret and produce communicative and effective argumentative texts.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed a descriptive qualitative approach conducted within the context of Indonesian language learning at the junior high school level. A qualitative approach was selected because it enables an in-depth and contextual understanding of the implementation of linguistic politeness and sociopragmatic strategies in students' argumentative texts. In this study, language is viewed not merely as a means of conveying ideas but also as a medium that reflects students' social attitudes, linguistic ethics, and pragmatic awareness within educational settings.

Research participants were selected through purposive sampling based on their relevance to the research objectives. Ninth-grade students of SMP Negeri 4 Tawang Sari were chosen because they had already studied argumentative writing, allowing them to produce texts that directly reflected practices of linguistic politeness and argumentative strategies. The selection was further justified by the diversity of topics and argumentative positions represented in students' texts, which provided rich data for sociopragmatic analysis.

The research data consisted of linguistic units found in students' argumentative texts that represented forms and strategies of linguistic politeness. These linguistic units included lexical choices, mitigating expressions, sentence structures, and linguistic forms used to express agreement and disagreement toward particular issues. The primary data source comprised argumentative texts produced by students during Indonesian language learning activities.

Data were collected through document analysis by systematically examining students' argumentative texts to identify manifestations of linguistic politeness and sociopragmatic strategies. The data collection process involved careful reading, coding, and categorization of linguistic units relevant to the research focus. Data trustworthiness was ensured through methodological and theoretical triangulation, as well as prolonged engagement during the analytical process, thereby enhancing the credibility of the findings.

Data analysis was conducted using a sociopragmatic framework grounded in Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. The analytical procedure consisted of several stages: data reduction to select relevant data, classification of politeness strategies into positive and negative politeness categories, descriptive data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Through these stages, the study aimed to provide a comprehensive understanding of linguistic politeness practices in students' argumentative texts and to reveal how sociopragmatic considerations shape language choices within Indonesian language learning contexts.

RESEARCH RESULT Forms of Language Choice Reflecting Politeness in Students' Argumentative Texts

The forms of linguistic politeness identified in students' argumentative texts were predominantly characterized by the use of positive and negative politeness strategies, as presented in Table 1 (T1–T14). Data T3 and T4 revealed the use of mitigating expressions such as *in my opinion* and *I disagree*, which functioned to soften the force of disagreement. Classroom observations further indicated the use of non-confrontational language during instructional interactions (O1, O2). Interview findings showed that students consciously attempted to maintain polite language when expressing their opinions to readers (W1, W2).

Data T1, T2, and T6 demonstrated the use of inclusive and persuasive language. Observation results revealed the frequent use of inclusive expressions such as *we* during classroom activities (O2, O3). Interview data also indicated that students tended to emulate their teachers' ways of expressing opinions politely and respectfully (W2, W3).

Politeness strategies were identified across students' argumentative texts (T1–T14), classroom observations (O1–O3), and student interviews (W1–W3). The forms of language choice included non-confrontational diction, mitigating expressions, persuasive language, and expressions that considered the perspectives and interests of others. Several argumentative texts also employed declarative sentence structures when presenting opinions. Observation data further demonstrated the consistent practice of polite language use in classroom interactions. Examples of polite language choices found in students' argumentative texts are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample of Students' Argumentative Texts Reflecting Polite Language Choices

Code	Issue	Position	Example of Language Choice	Indication of Linguistic Politeness
T1	Male students' haircut regulations	Agree	<i>I agree that haircuts should be kept short because they look neater, do not interfere with learning, and help students stay focused.</i>	Declarative language supported by rational reasons and free from coercion.
T2	Male students' haircut regulations	Agree	<i>I agree with the school's haircut policy because it complies with school regulations, promotes a neat appearance, and supports a comfortable learning environment.</i>	Neutral diction oriented toward collective benefits.
T3	Male students' haircut regulations	Disagree	<i>I disagree because long hair does not interfere with learning, and students can still study effectively.</i>	Disagreement expressed politely and personally.

T4	Male students' haircut regulations	Disagree	<i>In my opinion, long hair does not disrupt learning as long as students maintain neatness and remain focused.</i>	Use of a mitigating expression to soften disagreement.
T5	Mobile phone use among elementary school students	Disagree	<i>I disagree with allowing elementary school students to use mobile phones because they may become less focused on learning and more likely to play during lessons.</i>	Preventive argumentative language without blaming or attacking others.
T6	Mobile phone use among elementary school students	Agree	<i>I agree that elementary school students may use mobile phones because they can help them access information and facilitate communication with parents.</i>	Persuasive language emphasizing social functions and benefits.
T7	Motorcycle use by junior high school students	Agree	<i>Using motorcycles can help students who live far from school by saving time and reducing the burden on their parents.</i>	Empathetic and context-sensitive argumentation.
T8	Motorcycle use by junior high school students	Disagree	<i>Students are not yet old enough to ride motorcycles and may not fully understand traffic regulations.</i>	Disagreement based on social norms and safety considerations.
T9	Leaders must be male	Disagree	<i>Leaders do not always have to be male because women are equally capable of becoming effective leaders.</i>	Inclusive language sensitive to gender-related issues.
T10	Leaders must be male	Disagree	<i>Everyone possesses different leadership qualities that are not determined by gender.</i>	Rational argumentation without attacking opposing viewpoints.
T11	The Free Nutritious Meals Program (MBG) should be converted into cash assistance	Disagree	<i>If the program is converted into cash assistance, students may misuse the money by purchasing less beneficial items.</i>	Cautious language reflecting social considerations.

T1 2	The Free Nutritious Meals Program (MBG) should be converted into cash assistance	Agree	<i>I agree because cash assistance could be more economical, reduce waste, and provide opportunities for students to learn financial management.</i>	Persuasive and nonconfrontational language.
T1 3	Black shoe policy at school	Agree	<i>Wearing black shoes makes students appear neater and reflects discipline.</i>	Positive evaluation that reinforces social norms.
T1 4	Black shoe policy at school	Disagree	<i>Not all students own black shoes, which may impose a burden on some students.</i>	Empathetic disagreement that considers social circumstances.

Note. MBG refers to the *Free Nutritious Meals Program (Makan Bergizi Gratis)*, a government-sponsored school nutrition initiative.

Based on the data presented in Table 1, students' argumentative texts reflected both agreement and disagreement toward social issues and school regulations. Texts expressing agreement were characterized by the use of declarative and persuasive language, as well as neutral diction containing justifications and perceived benefits. In contrast, texts expressing disagreement employed mitigating expressions, rational reasoning, empathetic considerations, and statements related to safety, social conditions, and equality. Table 1 also indicates the use of indirect language in students' expression of opinions.

Politeness Strategies Employed by Students in Constructing Argumentative Texts from a Sociopragmatic Perspective

The findings reveal that politeness strategies in students' argumentative texts were manifested through the use of indirect sentence structures, mitigating expressions, and language choices that avoided commanding or patronizing tones (T1–T14). The textual data demonstrated the frequent use of expressions such as *in my opinion*, *I agree*, and *I disagree* when presenting arguments. Classroom observations indicated that teachers consistently employed polite and non-confrontational language during instruction (O1–O3). Interview data further showed that students adjusted their language when expressing opinions to readers in order to avoid offending others (W1–W3). These patterns were consistently identified across argumentative texts, classroom interactions, and interview responses.

Table 2 presents the politeness strategies employed by students in constructing argumentative texts from a sociopragmatic perspective. The data were coded as T1–T14 and purposively selected to represent variations in issues and argumentative positions. Analysis was conducted using Brown and Levinson's politeness theory and Leech's politeness principles.

Table 2. Politeness Strategies in Students' Argumentative Texts.

Co de	Topic	Positio n	Strate gy Code	Brown & Levins on Strateg y	Leech Maxim	Linguistic Indicator
T1	Hair regulations	Agree	KP1	Positiv e	Agreeme nt	Rational, noncoercive opinion
T2	Hair regulations	Agree	KP2	Positiv e	Tact	Emphasis on collective benefits
T6	Mobile phones in elementary school	Agree	KP3	Positiv e	Agreeme nt	Implicit persuasion
T7	Motorcycle use in junior high school	Agree	KP4	Positiv e	Sympath y	Social empathy
T9	Gender and leadership	Disagre e	KP5	Positiv e	Agreeme nt	Inclusive language
T10	Gender and leadership	Disagre e	KP1	Positiv e	Agreeme nt	Rational and non- confrontational
T12	MBG cash assistance	Agree	KP2	Positiv e	Tact	Efficiency and benefits
T13	Black shoe policy	Agree	KP2	Positiv e	Approba tion	Positive evaluation
T3	Hair regulations	Disagre e	KN1	Negati ve	Tact	Indirect rejection
T4	Hair regulations	Disagre e	KN2	Negati ve	Tact	Mitigation through “in my opinion”
T5	Mobile phones in elementary school	Disagre e	KN3	Negati ve	Tact	Preventive argumentation
T8	Motorcycle use in junior high school	Disagre e	KN3	Negati ve	Tact	Safety-based norms
T11	MBG cash assistance	Disagre e	KN3	Negati ve	Tact	Social consequences

T14	Black shoe policy	Disagree	KN4	Negative	Sympathy	Economically empathetic rejection
------------	-------------------	----------	-----	----------	----------	-----------------------------------

Strategy Codes: KP1 = Rational non-confrontational agreement; KP2 = Emphasis on collective benefits; KP3 = Implicit persuasion; KP4 = Social empathy; KP5 = Inclusive language/solidarity; KN1 = Indirect rejection; KN2 = Mitigation (hedging); KN3 = Normative/preventive argumentation; KN4 = Empathetic rejection.

Based on Table 2, politeness strategies were mapped through the distribution of positive politeness (KP) and negative politeness (KN) codes. Negative politeness was identified in T3, T4, T5, T8, T11, and T14 through KN1, KN2, and KN3 strategies. These texts employed expressions such as *in my opinion*, *it would be better*, and *perhaps* when presenting opinions. Interview findings indicated that students intentionally used indirect expressions when communicating their views (W1–W3). Classroom observations likewise revealed the use of polite language during instructional interactions (O1, O2).

Positive politeness appeared through KP1, KP2, and KP4 strategies in T1, T2, T6, T7, T12, and T13. These texts utilized persuasive language, inclusive diction, and expressions emphasizing collective interests. Students frequently employed inclusive pronouns such as *we* when presenting arguments. Interview data showed that students often justified agreement by referring to shared benefits (W2, W3), while observations demonstrated similar language practices during classroom activities (O2, O3).

The distribution of strategies in Table 2 indicates that KN3 and KP2 occurred more frequently than other categories. These patterns were identified consistently across argumentative texts, classroom observations, and interview data. Teacher interview triangulation further confirmed that language guidance and corrective feedback were routinely provided during the learning process.

DISCUSSION Forms of Language Choice Reflecting Politeness in Students' Argumentative Texts

Linguistic politeness practices in students' argumentative texts can be understood through the sociopragmatic framework proposed by Levinson et al. (1983) and Prayitno (2017), which conceptualizes language as a context-bound social action. The politeness strategies employed by students demonstrate the integration of linguistic competence and social awareness, as reflected in the argumentative text data (T1–T14). Argumentation is not produced in a neutral environment but within a school context characterized by institutional norms and social relationships, as observed in classroom interactions (O1–O3) and confirmed through student interviews (W1–W3). This finding supports Nasarudin et al. (2023), who argue that pragmatic practices are always shaped by communicative purposes and social structures. Students' argumentative language reflects a negotiation between expressing viewpoints and maintaining social harmony.

As a persuasive genre, argumentative writing requires a balance between argumentative strength and social acceptability. Logical arguments identified in T1, T2, T6, and T7 were accompanied by linguistic strategies designed to minimize reader resistance, including persuasive and inclusive language. This finding aligns with Lida (2022) and Utami et al. (2024), who emphasize that argumentative quality depends not only on content but also on delivery. In this study, linguistic politeness functions as a rhetorical device that strengthens persuasive effectiveness, particularly through the use of positive politeness strategies (KP codes).

Research on argumentative writing skills has highlighted the close relationship between argument structure, language management, and audience sensitivity. Febrina et al. (2024) and Sirait et al. (2022) argue that successful argumentative texts depend not only on the completeness of reasoning but also on the ability to formulate statements that are logically sound and socially acceptable. Consistent with these findings, students in the present study tended to employ non-confrontational language strategies when expressing disagreement, particularly in T3, T4, T5, T8, T11, and T14. Interview findings further revealed that students considered readers' feelings when constructing arguments (W1, W2). This pattern suggests that argumentative writing in schools serves as a space for integrating critical thinking skills with pragmatic awareness.

Politeness Strategies in Students' Argumentative Texts from a Sociopragmatic Perspective

The dominance of negative politeness in texts expressing disagreement reflects efforts to protect readers' negative face, as proposed by Brown and Levinson. This pattern is represented by KN1, KN2, and KN3 strategies in T3, T4, T5, T8, T11, and T14. Indirect, personal, and mitigated expressions of disagreement minimize threats to readers' autonomy. Expressions such as *in my opinion* (T4) and *norm-based arguments* (T5, T8) are consistent with Leech's tact maxim. Interview data further indicated that students intentionally employed indirect language to avoid appearing forceful (W1, W2).

Positive politeness strategies appeared in texts emphasizing collective benefits and shared interests, represented by KP2, KP1, and KP5 in T1, T2, T6, T7, T9, T12, and T13. Inclusive and persuasive language functioned to strengthen solidarity between writers and readers. Classroom observations similarly showed that teachers adopted inclusive language approaches during instruction (O2, O3). Within Leech's framework, these strategies are associated with the agreement and sympathy maxims, which contribute to maintaining social harmony.

The school environment as a formal institution plays a significant role in shaping students' politeness preferences. The predominance of KN3 and KP2 strategies suggests that students carefully consider social norms and collective benefits when constructing arguments. Observational data revealed habitual use of polite language (O1-O3), while interview findings confirmed students' awareness of selecting appropriate linguistic forms when expressing opinions

(W1–W3). These findings indicate that politeness in argumentative texts results from the internalization of formal communication norms cultivated within the school environment.

Overall, the study demonstrates that politeness strategies in students' argumentative texts are not merely individual choices but are socially and pedagogically constructed practices. The dominance of KN3 and KP2 strategies indicates that students integrate rational argumentation, social norms, and audience sensitivity in their writing. The findings further suggest that language learning contributes to the development of communicative character by fostering social values, respect for diversity, and consideration for others. Argumentative texts can therefore be understood as social practices that combine critical thinking with ethical language awareness within formal educational contexts.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings indicate that the forms of language choice reflecting politeness in junior high school students' argumentative texts are characterized by the use of neutral diction, mitigating expressions, persuasive language, and nonconfrontational declarative sentence structures. Agreement is expressed through language emphasizing collective benefits, shared interests, and social functions. Disagreement, on the other hand, is conveyed through indirect rejection, rational reasoning, and empathetic expressions designed to avoid appearing coercive or offensive to readers. These language choices demonstrate that students construct argumentative discourse while taking social norms and interpersonal relationships into account within the context of Indonesian language learning.

The politeness strategies employed by students in constructing argumentative texts are predominantly represented by positive and negative politeness strategies. Positive politeness is realized through the use of inclusive and persuasive language, as well as an emphasis on collective benefits. Negative politeness is reflected in the use of mitigation, indirect rejection, and normative argumentation. The distribution of these strategies suggests that students present arguments logically while remaining attentive to readers' social acceptance. The use of politeness strategies is influenced by the habituation of polite language practices in classroom interactions and by the communication models demonstrated by teachers during the learning process.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

This study has limitations because the data source is derived solely from argumentative texts written by Grade IX students of SMP Negeri 4 Tawang Sari. As a result, the findings cannot fully represent the variation of politeness strategies in different school contexts, cultures, and educational levels. The analysis is also focused on written language products, thus it does not comprehensively capture the relationship between politeness practices in argumentative texts and spoken interactions occurring during the learning process. Furthermore, this study employs the politeness perspectives of Brown

and Levinson and Leech's politeness principles; therefore, it does not explore broader dimensions such as social identity, power relations, and wider sociocultural factors in students' language use.

Future research is recommended to involve more diverse participants from various educational levels and cultural backgrounds, integrate textual analysis with classroom interaction observation and in-depth interviews, and apply broader methodological approaches such as mixed methods or critical discourse analysis. Future studies should also examine the effectiveness of sociopragmatics-based learning models in improving students' argumentative skills, language politeness, and pragmatic awareness, so that they can make a more comprehensive contribution to the development of Indonesian language learning oriented toward communicative competence and character building of students

REFERENCES

- Al-Ma'ruf, A. I., Arifin, Z., & Nugrahani, F. (2024). Language, Literature, and Social Values in Educational Discourse. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 12(1), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v11i1.35142>
- Ameliyah, A., Sutardi, S., & Mustofa, M. (2025). Register Gaya Bicara Siswa Sekolah Dasar pada Konteks Percakapan di Sekolah: Kajian sosiopragmatik. *LISTRA: Jurnal Linguistik dan Sastra Terapan*, 2(1), 51–61. Retrieved from <https://e-jurnal.unisda.ac.id/index.php/LISTRA/article/view/9469>
- Aziz, A. (2022). *Sosiopragmatik Politik: Kajian Sosiopragmatik dalam Debat Pilkada*. Banda Aceh: Syiah Kuala University Press.
- Darmuki, A., Nugrahani, F., Fathurohman, I., Kanzunnudin, M., & Hidayati, N. A. (2023). The Impact of Inquiry Collaboration Project-Based Learning Model of Indonesian Language Course Achievement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 16(2), 247–266. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2023.16214a>
- Febrina, A. H., Asfitri, Y., Chandra, C., & Wijanarko, T. (2024). Analisis Kemampuan Siswa Kelas 5 SD dalam Menulis Teks Argumentasi di Sekolah Dasar. *Protasis: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra, Budaya, dan Pengajarannya*, 3(1), 166–170. <https://doi.org/10.55606/protasis.v3i1.151>
- Feranti, N., Charlina, C., & Permatasari, S. (2024). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Problem Based Learning Terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Teks Argumentasi Kelas XI SMA. *Jurnal Basataka (JBT)*, 7(2), 731-743. <https://doi.org/10.36277/basataka.v7i2.529>
- Firdaus, A. A., Setiawan, B., & Suwandi, S. (2024). Implementasi Pembelajaran Menulis Teks Argumentasi dengan Model Problem Based Learning di SMA Negeri 1 Ngrambe. *Jurnal Onoma: Pendidikan, Bahasa, dan Sastra*, 10(3), 3223-3233. <https://doi.org/10.30605/onoma.v10i3.4102>
- Junaidi, F., Mustopa, E., Putra, A., & Aryanto, S. (2020). Analisis Fungsi Bahasa dalam Komunikasi Adat Bejeghum: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *Jermal*, 1(2),

- 79-88. 10.31629/jermal.v1i2.2709
- Leech, G. (1993). *Prinsip-prinsip Pragmatik* (M. D. D. Oka, Trans.). Jakarta: UI Press. (Karya asli diterbitkan 1983)
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lida, U. M. (2022). Struktur Isi Argumen dalam Teks Argumentasi Siswa Tahap Operasi Formal. *Diglosia: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajarannya*, 5(2), 377-388. <https://doi.org/10.30872/diglosia.v5i2.318>
- Lubis, R., Simaremare, J. A., & Simanjuntak, H. (2024). Pengaruh Penggunaan Media Padlet terhadap Kemampuan Menulis Teks Argumentasi pada Siswa Kelas VIII SMP Negeri 14 Medan. *JlIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 7(6), 5426-5431. <https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i6.4485>
- Mahmudi, A. G., Irawati, L., & Soleh, D. R. (2021). Kesantunan Berbahasa Siswa dalam Berkomunikasi dengan Guru (Kajian Pragmatik). *Deiksis*, 13(2), 98-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30998/deiksis.v13i2.6169>
- Maryanto, P. B. (2022). *Ilokusi Tuturan Guru dalam Interaksi Pembelajaran di SMA: Kajian sosiopragmatik*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit NEM.
- Mendrofa, E. J., Harefa, N. A. J., Halawa, N., & Riana, R. (2025). Pengaruh penggunaan media Audio Visual terhadap Kemampuan Mengidentifikasi Teks Argumentasi Siswa SMP Negeri 2 Gunungsitoli Utara kelas VIII 2023/2024. *Jurnal Kata: Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pembelajarannya*, 13(1), 64-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.23960>
- Morelent, Y., Fikri, H., Fauziati, P., & Krisna, E. (2022). Pengaruh Tindak Tutur Direktif Guru Terhadap Pembentukan Karakter Siswa dalam Proses Pembelajaran selama Pandemi Covid-19. *Ranah: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa*, 11(2), 420-435. <https://doi.org/10.26499/rnh.v11i2.3121>
- Mualamah, S., Robiah, S., Robiah, S., Nurarifin, R. Y., Nuraini, N., & Siagian, I. (2023). Tindak Tutur dalam Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Kelas VII SMP Nahdatul Ulama Bogor. *Journal on Education*, 5(3), 71387145. <https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v5i3.1503>
- Munandar, A., Fadli, B. M., & Yani, M. (2025). Penggunaan Bahasa Indonesia pada Generasi Milenial di Media Sosial: Sebuah Kajian Sociolinguistik. *Bahtra: Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 6(1), 21-28. <https://doi.org/10.56842/bahtra.v6i1.629>
- Musyawir, M. (2024). Pematuhan Prinsip Kesantunan Berbahasa dalam Wacana Politik pada Media Sosial (Kajian sosiopragmatik). *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 4(6), 4045-4058. <https://doi.org/10.53625/jirk.v4i6.9763>
- Nasarudin, N., Susanti, S., Akmal, A., Razak, N. K., Annisa, A., Herman, H., ... & Ndjoeroemana, Y. (2023). *Pragmatik: Konsep Teori dan Praktek*. Yogyakarta: CV. Gita Lentera.
- Nugrahani, F., & Al-Ma'ruf, A. I. (2019). Strengthening Pluralism in Literature Learning for Character Education of School Students. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 7(3), 207-213. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7330>
<https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7332>

- Nugrahani, F. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dalam Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa*. Solo: Cakra Books.
- Prayitno, H. J. (2017). *Studi Sosiopragmatik*. Surakarta; Muhammadiyah University Press.
- Ratna Susanti, S. S. (2023). Pragmatik dan Bahasa Dalam Konteks Sosial. *Bahasa dan Budaya*. Solo: bukukatta
- Ruswi, I., & Sudiyana, B. (2025). Penerapan prinsip kesantunan dalam bahasa komunikasi WhatsApp oleh siswa SD kepada guru. *Journal of Indonesian Linguistic and Literature Studies*, 2(2), 17–33.
<https://doi.org/10.62667/jills.v2i2.109>
- Setiawati, E., & Nazilah, H. M. (2025). Kesantunan Berbahasa Antarordinat dan Antarbudaya: Bahasa Lokal dan Kehalusan Akal-Budi Generasi Muda. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Bahasa Ibu*, 2(1), 189–201.
<https://ejournal2.unud.ac.id/index.php/snbi/article/view/662>
- Setyorini, E., Nugrahani, F., & Pratiwi, V. U. (2025). Instilling diversity: Actualization of cultural diversity values in Indonesian textbooks in elementary schools. *European Journal of Arts, Humanities, and Social Science*, 2(2).
<https://doi.org/10.59324/ejahss.v2i2>
- Suri, N. K., Noviyanti, S., & Agustina, A. T. (2024). Teori Pragmatika Bahasa dan Kesantunan Berbahasa. *JOURNAL ON EDUCATION Учредители: Universitas Pahlawan Tuanku Tambusai*, 7(2), 1010710116..
<https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v7i2.8016>.
- Utami, A. D., Fadlilah, M., Aini, N. Q., & Syafutri, R. A. (2024). Struktur dan Ciri-Ciri Teks Argumentasi dalam Bahasa Indonesia: Analisis dan Contoh. *Semantik: Jurnal Riset Ilmu Pendidikan, Bahasa dan Budaya*, 2(3), 234-243. <https://doi.org/10.61132/semantik.v2i3.845>
- Pratiwi, V. U., & Anindyarini, A. (2021). Students' Politeness Strategies to Lecturers in Sending Messages through WhatsApp. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)*, 4(3), 6021-6032.
<https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i3.2402>
- Yazir, M. (2025). Makian Positif dalam Bahasa Coel di Lubuklinggau: Kajian Sosiopragmatik. *JurnalTrendi: Jurnal Linguistik, Sastra, dan Pendidikan*, 10(1), 225–234. <https://doi.org/10.51673/jurnalistrendi.v10i1.2428>