

## CONSTRUCTION OF ARGUMENTS FOR JAMBI DISTRICT COURT DECISIONS ON CORRUPTION CRIMES

<sup>1</sup>Ardinah, <sup>1</sup>Prihadi, <sup>1</sup>Anwar Efendi, <sup>1</sup>Hartono

<sup>1</sup>Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Language, Art and Culture  
Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia

Corresponding Author Email: [ardinah.2022@student.uny.ac.id](mailto:ardinah.2022@student.uny.ac.id)

Article Info	Abstract
<b>Article History</b> Received: November 2023 Revised: December 2023 Published: January 2024	<i>Indonesia has imposed penalties for criminal acts of corruption by sentencing defendants to additional crimes in addition to the main crime through court decisions. This is realized in many corruption cases through court decisions. As a text, the court decision with the sentence is a practice of using language, like texts in general, open to linguistic analysis. This research examines the construction of arguments for court decisions related to criminal acts of corruption as an argumentative text, with all legal considerations becoming the basis for the dictum. The data in this research is the text of the Jambi District Court decision no. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb uses qualitative descriptive methods with documentation techniques and a forensic linguistic approach. The research results show that the panel of judges used an indictment with a high level of empathy and focalization because the indictment was obtained from interviews with the defendants. Thus, it can be concluded that because the claims "legitimate and convincing" and "committing criminal acts of corruption together" are met argumentatively, the claim "deserves to be sentenced to criminal acts of corruption and additional criminal acts" can be categorized as good from the perspective of argumentation theory.</i>
<b>Keywords</b> Argumentative text; Corruption crime; Forensic linguistics;	
<b>How to cite:</b> Ardinah, A., Prihadi, P., Efendi, A., & Hartono, H. (2024). Construction of Arguments for Jambi District Court Decisions on Corruption Crimes, <i>JOLLT Journal of Languages and Language Teaching</i> , 12(1), pp. 416-426. DOI: <a href="https://dx.doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v12i1.9434">https://dx.doi.org/10.33394/joltt.v12i1.9434</a>	

### INTRODUCTION

The rise of corrupt practices in Indonesia, accompanied by law enforcement, which is considered weak, has led some parties to believe that revoking the political rights of those convicted of criminal acts of corruption is an effort that needs to be taken in order to eradicate corruption in the country. On the other hand, some parties believe that revoking political rights for corruptors is not the right policy, some even believe that this additional punishment is actually contrary to the values of Human Rights (HAM). This is based on law enforcement, which is considered weak. It is not surprising that judges rarely revoke the political rights of those convicted of corruption. As in the article written by Wangga et al. (2019), the results of their research state that law enforcement through penal policies still has shortcomings, namely light sentences for perpetrators of compensation crimes, as well as a lack of awareness among judges to apply additional penalties in the form of time to obtain rights.

Furthermore, as a text, a court decision is a practice of using language like any other text. This way, court decisions are open to linguistic analysis like other linguistic phenomena. Apart from that, it is commonly known that within linguistics, there is a field of forensic linguistics, a special discipline that studies language in relation to law, including court decisions. Mahsun (2018); Correa (2013) more clearly state that forensic linguistics plays a role in uniting various fields of linguistic studies with the broader area of law. Apart from that, forensic linguistics is a scientific study that discusses language in the application of a legal (criminal) context, whether in text, oral, or written form—the basis for the study,

analysis, and measurement of language (McMenamin, 2002; Beckman, 2007; Perkins, 2018; Imamah et al., 2023).

This article wants to look at the text that is manifested in court decisions regarding the death penalty as a linguistic phenomenon. The decision is built into a text that must not only be understood but must also be implemented. Text is an important part of forensic linguistic analysis. This is because the text is the main material that is viewed and analyzed in order to obtain a more comprehensive solution. Mahsun further asked the question, why does it have to be text-based? The complete forensic text is discussed by Coulthard & Johnson (2007); Halliday & Ruqayah (1992) define text as a part of language that is related to the context of certain situations or verbal social activities.

The argumentative text used in this research is Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb. This text was issued by the Jambi District Court for the defendants SP, SA, SND, MTL, RW, and SPY, who were tried to have committed a criminal act of corruption together and were sentenced to a criminal act of corruption and an additional crime in the form of revocation of the right to be elected to public office for five years. Years since the defendants finished serving their principal sentences. In the court decision, there is an indictment written by the public prosecutor, which causes the quality of the arguments in the text to be questioned.

For this purpose, this research will use argumentation theory in examining the text of court decisions involving criminal acts of corruption. It is important to carry out an argumentative study of court decisions involving criminal acts, considering that decisions that can be considered as claims or conclusions in argumentation theory must be supported by convincing evidence (Toulmin, 2003; Jimenez–Aleixandre et al., 2006). Only in this way can a decision be called a linguistically valid decision, and that means the decision can be called logically valid.

In its most minimal form, an argumentative text is at least composed of conclusions or claims and premises or data (Walton, 2006; Keraf, 1982; Govier, 1985). A premise is a statement presented as a reason so that the conclusion conveyed can be stronger. Meanwhile, a conclusion is a statement that is a form of confession or claim (Walton, 2006). In Indonesian, conclusions are usually marked with the expressions therefore, thus, and other similar expressions, while premises are sometimes marked with the words because or cause. In fact, premise and conclusion markers in argumentative texts are often absent or not used explicitly. In this case, we can usually still infer these markers at the mental level.

Cases of criminal acts of corruption have occurred in various countries. Usually, the defendants in cases of criminal acts of corruption come from people who are educated and have relatively high positions (bureaucracy). In principle, every corruption that occurs in the bureaucracy has the same characteristics, namely the use of power by government officials to benefit themselves or a group. In this case, the action deviates from the oath of office and applicable laws and regulations. In terms of financial losses, corruption is divided into two categories: financial losses and public financial losses (Saragih & Medalin, 2018).

Research related to criminal acts of corruption and additional crimes, especially revocation of rights in office, has been carried out by several previous researchers. Likewise, books or articles that review criminal acts of corruption and additional crimes in the form of revocation of rights in office and several matters related to them have been published in several journals. As has been done by Anjari (2015), Ardiansyah (2017), Fajrin & Triwijaya (2020), Sjarif (2021), Karo (2021), Tahir (2021), Cibro et al. (2022), Zifana et al. (2022) Handrawan (2023), and Bawano et al. (2023).

The first research was conducted by Anjari (2015), entitled “Revocation of Political Rights of Corruption Convicts from a Human Rights Perspective”. This research focuses on analyzing the in-depth investigation into the implementation of the crime of revoking political

rights. The conclusion from this research is that there is an urgency to apply additional punishment in the form of revocation of political rights with the criteria of corruption carried out by state administrators who have political access and holders of executive positions, and the consequences of corruption cause misery to the people. In its implementation, there must be a time limit for revoking a convict's political rights.

Further research was conducted by Cibro et al. (2022) with the title “Imposing Additional Criminal Revocation of Political Rights Against Perpetrators of Corruption Crimes Related to Public Positions.” The results of this research found that the Decision of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia No. 1995K/Pid.Sus/2014 the revocation of political rights, such as active voting rights and passive rights in general elections held based on statutory regulations, can actually be a deterrent for those convicted of criminal acts of corruption as well as causing fear for public officials and other politicians so as not to commit crimes of corruption with the modus operandi of using political power.

Handrawan (2023), in his article, states that in the legal context, if there is a legal conflict issue related to the revocation of political rights, then the resolution refers to the decision of the constitutional court, which has a higher position based on the principle of authority. Therefore, he stated that in developing additional criminal sanctions related to the revocation of political rights in the future, the dimensions of criminal objectives must be absolute, with terms and conditions, criminal objectives relative to terms and conditions, dimensions of balance with terms and conditions, and eliminating revocation. Political rights are based on terms and conditions.

Furthermore, Bawono et al. (2023) wrote an article examining and analyzing the weaknesses of regulations regarding criminal acts of corruption due to abuse of authority and reconstructing these regulations based on the value of justice. The conclusion from the article he wrote is that there are weaknesses in the issue of light sentences for defendants in corruption cases, so legal reconstruction is needed in Article 5 of the Corruption Law by adding a minimum sentence period of 5 years and adding the removal of political rights for five years.

Another research that focused on forensic linguistics was conducted by Sekerazh (2020) entitled “Forensic Psychological Aspects of the Term ‘Provocation’ in Criminal Proceedings,” using the expert concept of provocation - used in forensic and complex psychological-linguistic examinations. The difference between this research and this research is the object and approach used. In this research, the object used was the text of the court decision, whereas previous research focused on aspects of forensic psychology related to the term ‘provocation’ in the criminal process.

Based on several previous studies that have been carried out in general, mostly analyze the application of additional crimes-revocation of political rights for criminal acts of corruption. This is what differentiates it from the research conducted by the author. In this research, the author focuses on using court decision text data as a case study. Another difference is that previous relevant studies focused more on legislation using normative juridical legal studies. Meanwhile, the difference with this research is that it refers to the argumentative text side by utilizing forensic linguistic investigations as an approach. Apart from that, previous research focused on reviewing statutory regulations by reconstructing the rules for criminal acts of corruption based on Pancasila values. In contrast to this research, the author focuses on the quality of the arguments in the text of the court decision without reconstructing the text of the decision. Thus, it can be said that this research is pure and focuses on the study of argumentation by looking at the text as part of the law.

The data used in this research comes from Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb. This data is uploaded on the Jambi District Court Case Tracking Information System page and is open data that can be accessed by anyone, so it can

also be used as linguistic research data. Referring to the problems above, this research aims to explore the argumentative structure of court decisions regarding criminal acts of corruption and additional crimes as argumentative texts. In his analysis, all legal considerations become the basis for decision-making. Thus, it is hoped that this study will be useful in contributing to the field of forensic linguistics research by building a bridge between language and law to determine the quality of argumentation texts in court decisions. By understanding the quality of argumentation texts in court decision texts, you can gain a better understanding of how judges make decisions and how they consider arguments from both sides.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Research Design**

This research is a qualitative descriptive research that refers to a forensic linguistic approach. This method is used because the data obtained is in the form of the text of the court decision. Argumentation text is a realm of science that explains opinions based on evidence, reasons, and examples or facts. So, the argumentation structure is appropriate when used in forensic linguistics studies, which are worthy of research because this field combines research in the fields of linguistics and law. In this way, argumentation theory deserves to be studied because this research aims to examine the structure of argumentation in court decisions for corruption crimes.

### **Object of Research**

The data in this research is in the text of the trial decision, which has been uploaded by the Jambi district court case tracking information system so that it is very open for analysis of the text of the trial decision. The trial decision data used as the focus of the research is the Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb. Data collection techniques are carried out using documentation and literature studies using a form of forensic linguistic study—the scientific study of language applied to legal purposes and contexts (McMenamin, 2002) or—more generally—the application of linguistics to legal problems (Strazny, 2005). Apart from that, it can also be defined as the study of language in a legal context, which takes the form of text, both spoken and written (Backman, 2007). From a linguistic perspective, the theory that will be used is argumentation theory. For the purposes of analysis, several argumentation theories will be used simultaneously as a framework for interpreting data. However, the analysis and explanation of certain details of the data will use critical argumentation theory developed by Douglas Walton. Coincidentally, what Walton calls critical arguments is also put forward when discussing legal arguments.

### **Data Analysis**

The methodological framework employed in the data analysis of this research adheres to an inductive approach, characterized by an examination of data collected through specific data collection techniques, as advocated by Thomas (2006). The researcher follows a systematic and rigorous analytical process, drawing upon Walton's theory (2006) and its interactive model. The analysis unfolds through several meticulously structured stages, each designed to unravel the intricacies of argumentation present in the Jambi District Court Decision. The initial stage involves data reduction, wherein the researcher condenses the extensive data derived from the court decision to facilitate a nuanced assessment of the quality of arguments presented. Following data reduction, a meticulous identification process ensues, focusing on discerning words, phrases, and sentences that encapsulate both conclusions or claims and premises or data within the decision. This step serves to distill the essential components of the argumentative structure embedded in the document. Subsequently, having identified claims and premises, the researcher undertakes a rigorous evaluation of the argumentation quality. This evaluation is conducted through the application

of several evaluative questions, strategically designed to gauge the robustness and validity of the claims delineated in the decision. This analytical approach ensures a comprehensive examination of the argumentative framework employed in the Jambi District Court Decision, offering valuable insights into the reasoning processes and legal discourse encapsulated within the document. The methodological rigor underpinning this data analysis aligns with established scholarly practices, contributing to the academic integrity and reliability of the research outcomes.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

By using argumentation theory, we can consider statements from a legal decision as claims or conclusions, because in that statement there is a final conclusion, which determines how to resolve a particular case through statements that must be implemented. In Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb, the following two statements are important to get attention, because they state the claim that a defendant is guilty and therefore deserves to be sentenced.

*“Declare that defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY have been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing the crime of ‘joint corruption’ as in the alternative indictment first...etc...;*

*Sentencing defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY to imprisonment...etc....;*

*Imposing additional penalties on defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY in the form of revocation of the right to be elected to public office for 5 (five) years after the defendants have finished serving their main sentences;” (Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb).*

Referring to the dictum “Sentence the defendant...etc...with imprisonment; Imposing additional penalties against the defendant...etc...in the form of revocation of the right to be elected to public office...etc...;”. The dictum can be considered as a textual marker of a claim or conclusion. As a claim or conclusion, the dictum must be supported by convincing data or premises. In this case, we can see that the data used to state the claim comes from the first dictum, namely “Declaring that defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY have been proven legally and convincingly guilty of committing criminal acts of corruption together”.

In the theory of argumentation developed by Toulmin (2003), the relationship between claims and data or between conclusions and premises is contained in decisions which are usually implicit. If stated explicitly, the decision is in the claim-data or conclusion-premise relationship of these two dictums, namely, "Every person who with the aim of benefiting himself, which can harm the state's finances or the state's economy, shall be punished with life imprisonment or a minimum prison sentence. 1 (one) year and a maximum of 20 (twenty) years, as well as additional penalties in the form of fines and revocation of rights in office; and SP, SA, SND, MTL, RW, and SPY should be sentenced to imprisonment, and an additional penalty in the form of revocation of the right to be elected to public office because they have been proven to have committed criminal acts of corruption together". In general, by only referring to the applicable law and ignoring the debate about whether additional criminal penalties in the form of revocation of rights in office are contrary to Human Rights (HAM) values, there is no problem in this decision. The six defendants deserve additional sentences because they committed criminal acts of corruption together.

However, the problem lies in the data “... Defendant I SP, Defendant II SA, Defendant III SND, Defendant IV MTL, Defendant V RW, and Defendant VI SPY have been legally and

convincingly proven guilty of committing the crime of corruption together. Together' have been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing criminal acts of corruption together...". The statement is a claim. This means that the statement "a person can be declared to have been legally and convincingly proven to have committed a criminal act of corruption" can be stated as a true statement if there is an empirical fact that can be verified conclusively. Thus, this claim requires other data to prove or convince the audience to support the statement. In argumentation theory, supporting data is referred to as backing—it is not only useful for strengthening data but also for strengthening decisions as a basis for reasoning that guarantees claims and data (Toulmin, 2003; Zhang, 2022).

From the explanation above, what needs to be determined is the data for the claim (first statement). The decision document shows that the backing used to strengthen the connection between the first and second decisions came from the indictment, which had been examined and tried at trial. The contents of the indictment statement are as follows.

(2) "...

*The defendants, namely defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY as members of the Jambi Provincial DPRD with the budgeting authority they have were involved several times in discussions on the RAPERDA APBD TA 2017, including attending the plenary meeting of the Jambi Province DPRD.*

...

*Furthermore, KSN distributed the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money amounting to IDR 1,100,000,000.00 (one billion one hundred million rupiah) to the defendants...etc" (Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb).*

The analysis of the indictment, when viewed through the lens of argumentation theory as expounded by Walton (2006), reveals a distinct pattern wherein the building blocks of arguments within the court decision are interconnected serially. This pattern underscores a systematic linkage where each piece of data or premise forms the foundation for subsequent conclusions, creating a cohesive and logically structured argumentative framework. In essence, the court decision employs a serial connection of premises and conclusions, adhering to the principles outlined by Walton in his theoretical framework. The evaluative lens for the quality of this argumentative pattern is situated in the final conclusion, specifically, the pronouncement of a sentence for the criminal act of corruption and the additional punitive measure of revocation of the right to be elected to office for the six defendants. The robustness and cogency of this final conclusion can only be adequately comprehended by scrutinizing the quality of the premise-conclusion relationship within the first argument—the foundational basis from which this ultimate conclusion stems. This methodological approach, grounded in the principles of argumentation theory, emphasizes the intricate interplay between premises and conclusions within the court decision. It underscores the significance of the coherence and logical alignment of the sequential components in crafting a persuasive and well-founded argumentative structure. This analytical framework, applied to legal discourse, serves to elucidate the nuanced layers of reasoning and justification underpinning the imposition of legal consequences, thereby contributing to the scholarly comprehension of the argumentative dynamics within the court's decision-making process.

### **Quality of argumentation on claims "legitimately and convincingly"**

Referring to the claim, "...defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY have been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing criminal acts of corruption together...". This is based on data in the form of an indictment regarding committing or participating in receiving

gifts or promises. Based on the theory of argumentation developed by Walton (2006), this kind of argumentation is called an argumentation scheme for appeal to popular opinion, namely an argumentation scheme that can be accepted as true and produces supporting reasons. In particular, to find out the connection with this court decision, several evaluative questions were asked to test the indictment written by public prosecutor AHN, namely whether the indictment contained a series of events and supporting evidence.

Regarding the first question, does the indictment written by the public prosecutor contain this series of events? Based on this problem, Rankema (2004) states that in terms of analyzing the information structure of discourse, statements often describe the level of knowledge (empathy) and, at the same time, the level of involvement (focalization). To be clearer, the analysis of the indictment is not only carried out to find out the form of the public prosecutor's statement but also the level of knowledge of the public prosecutor regarding the incident.

Referring to the text of the copy of the decision, the summary of the indictment written by the public prosecutor briefly begins with the statement "That defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY respectively as a civil servant or state administrator... has done or participated in receiving gifts or promises... etc" (Jambi State District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb, 2023). From this statement, it means that the public prosecutor who wrote the indictment was not involved or directly experienced the incident. However, based on this statement, the public prosecutor learned about the incident from the statements of other people who saw or were directly involved, namely the defendants.

Thus, it can be concluded that the data used to support the claims of the first statement—defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY have been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing a crime. Corruption together is data with a high level of empathy and focalization because the statements written by the public prosecutor were obtained from the defendants. From this statement, it means that the public prosecutor who wrote the indictment was not involved or directly experienced the incident.

However, regarding this statement, the public prosecutor learned about the incident from the statements of other people who saw or were directly involved, namely the defendants. Referring to this, it can be concluded that the data used to support the claims of the first statement—defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY have been legally and convincingly proven guilty of committing corruption crimes together are data with a high level of empathy and focalization because the statements written by the public prosecutor were obtained from the defendants.

Based on the statement above, it is important for us to know the sequence of events and the evidence contained in the indictment written by the public prosecutor. The series of events states as follows.

*(3) In January 2017 at the house of defendant I SP...etc, defendant I SP received the first phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN. Furthermore, in March 2017 at KSN's house...etc, Defendant I SP received the second phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN. In January 2017 at the house of defendant II SA...etc, defendant II SA received the first phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN. Furthermore, at the beginning of 2017, at his house, defendant II SA received the*

*second phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN.*

*At the beginning of 2017 defendant III SND received the first phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN via GM. Furthermore, still at the beginning of 2017...etc, defendant III SND received the second phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock money in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN.*

*At the beginning of 2017, defendant IV MTL received the First Phase 2017 APBD hammer knock money in the amount of IDR 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN via GM. Furthermore, still at the beginning of 2017 at KSN's house...etc, defendant IV MTL received the second phase of the 2017 FY APBD hammer knock in the amount of Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) which was handed over by KSN.*

*At the beginning of 2017...etc, KSN met with defendant V RW as Chair of the PKS Fraction and conveyed the existence of 2017 APBD hammer knock money amounting to IDR 300,000,000.00 (three hundred million rupiah) which was the share of defendant V RW, defendant VI SPY and AEP each amount to IDR 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah)...etc..." (Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb).*

Referring to the series of events above, the quality of the claim from the statement "...defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY have been legally and convincingly proven guilty..." (Jambi District Court Decision Number: 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb). Based on the claim, this statement can be categorized as good, because it is supported by convincing evidence so that the defendants are legally and convincingly proven to have committed the action.

### **Quality of arguments on the claim of 'committing criminal acts of corruption together'**

Furthermore, referring to the claim of the first court decision, namely the sentence "...committed a criminal act of corruption together..." (Jambi District Court Decision Number: 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb). To determine the quality of the argumentation for this claim, a general scheme of argumentation based on fact/perception arguments is needed. Walton (2006) states that a fact that is narrated can also involve the five senses (perception). In this case, to know and explore something, and the facts or events that are sensed can be perceived as evidence.

Based on the claim above, to find out the quality of the argument, you can look at the following argument which states it is a fact/perception.

- (4) *"That defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant III SND, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY...etc...have done or participated in receiving gifts or promises, namely defendants I, II, III, and IV received the money each amounted to Rp. 200,000,000.00 (two hundred million rupiah), and defendants V and VI received Rp. 100,000,000.00 (one hundred million rupiah) each...etc" (Decision Jambi District Court No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb).*

The analysis of the public prosecutor's statement within the indictment reveals a discernible participation by the defendants in the receipt of gifts or promises, colloquially referred to as "hammer knock money" within the political sphere. The subsequent judicial decision, which ascribes to the defendants the act of "committing a criminal act together," suggests a deliberate alignment with Toulmin's (2003) argumentative framework.



Specifically, the court's decision can be categorized as a claim buttressed by evidence of commendable quality, congruent with factual and perceptual considerations. In accordance with Toulmin's perspective, an argument gains strength when its justification, or warrant, is reinforced by additional supporting evidence, referred to as backing (Zhang, 2022; Suhartono et al., 2020). The court's decision, characterized by the categorical assertion of the defendants' joint commission of a criminal act, aligns with Toulmin's model by presenting a well-supported claim. The integration of facts and perceptions, as substantiated by the prosecutor's statement and subsequently corroborated by the court's decision, enhances the overall persuasive force of the argument. This adherence to established argumentation frameworks and the integration of supporting evidence underscores the methodological rigor applied in the legal discourse and decision-making processes, aligning with scholarly conventions and contributing to the robustness of the legal reasoning presented in this context.

### **Quality of arguments on the claim 'deserves corruption crime and additional crimes'**

Finally, after determining the quality of the claim 'legally and convincingly' and 'committed a criminal act of corruption jointly' in the first decision. The next step is to look at the quality of the claims in the second and fourth decisions, namely "Sentencing defendant I SP, defendant II SA, defendant IV MTL, defendant V RW, and defendant VI SPY with imprisonment...etc, with imprisonment for 4 (four) years and 3 (three) months and a fine of Rp. 250,000,000.00 (two hundred and fifty million rupiahs) each...; Imposing additional penalties on the defendant...etc...in the form of revocation of the right to be elected to public office for 5 (five) years...etc;" (Jambi District Court Decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb). As previously explained, the claimed quality of the first decision statement is categorized as good because it is supported by convincing evidence. Thus, it can be estimated that the conclusion 'is worthy of being sentenced to criminal acts of corruption and additional crimes' is in the good category. Because from the perspective of Toulmin's (2003) argumentation theory, arguments will be better when sometimes a justification (warrant) is supported by other evidence (backing). Therefore, it is appropriate for the defendants to be sentenced to additional criminal and criminal sentences.

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the analysis that has been carried out, it can be concluded that in determining the quality of the argumentation of the text of court decision No. 18/Pid.Sus-TPK/2023/PN Jmb requires supporting or backing data to strengthen statements/claims. Thus, to test the quality of argumentation in this research, researchers used evaluative questions referring to the theory developed by Walton (2006), namely argumentation schemes for appeal to popular opinion. Referring to this theory, the claim 'legally and convincingly' in the first decision statement can be said to be good argumentatively because it is supported by convincing evidence in the form of backing, likewise with the claim of 'committing criminal acts of corruption together' so that it is fulfilled argumentatively. This research can be used by policymakers as a consideration in making policies and decisions. With various considerations, we hope that this decision will be beneficial for all parties and will not be detrimental. Based on this research, researchers realize that presenting results and discussions still have limitations on argumentation theory alone. Thus, it is hoped that future researchers who have an interest in conducting similar research are expected to link it to logical theory so that in analyzing the argumentation construction, it is also based on logical structure.

## REFERENCES

- Anjari, W. (2015). Pencabutan Hak Politik Terpidana Korupsi dalam Perspektif Hak Asasi Manusia. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 1(8), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v8i1.37>.
- Ardiansyah, D. (2017). Pencabutan Hak untuk Memilih dan Dipilih Bagi Terpidana Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, 8(Desember), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v8i2.1802>.
- Backman, K. (2007). *An Immigrant's Run-in with the Law: a Forensic Linguistic Analysis*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing LLC.
- Bawono, B. T., Ridwan, E., Mashdurohatun, A., & Wahyuningsih, S. E. (2023). Legal Reconstruction of Corruption Crime As A Result of the Abuse of Authority Based on the Pancasila Justice Value. *Scholars International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 6(04), 245–250. <https://doi.org/10.36348/sijlcj.2023.v06i04.008>.
- Cibro, C. J. (2022). Penjatuhan Pidana Tambahan Pencabutan Hak Politik Terhadap Pelaku Tindak Pidana Korupsi Terkait Jabatan Publik. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review*, 1(4), 191–197. <https://doi.org/10.56128/ljoalr.v1i4.70>.
- Correa, M. (2013). Forensic Linguistics: An Overview of the Intersection and Interaction of Language and Law. *Studies About Languages*, 0(23), 5–13. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.0.23.5020>.
- Coulthard, M., Johnson, A., & Wright, D. (2017). *An introduction to forensic linguistics : language in evidence* (second edition). Routledge.
- Fajrin, Y. A., & Triwijaya, A. F. (2020). Pencegahan Korupsi Melalui Pencabutan Hak Politik Sebuah Telaah dari Perspektif Pembaruan Hukum Pidana Indonesia. *Pandecta Research Law Journal*, 15(1), 53–63. <https://doi.org/10.15294/pandecta.v15i1.18744>.
- Freeman, J. B. (2011). *Argument Structure Representation and Theory*. Springer. <http://www.springer.com/series/5642>.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Ruqayah, H. (1992). *Bahasa, Konteks, dan Teks*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Handrawan. (2023). Additional Penalty by Revoking of Political Right in Criminal Acts of Corruption: Arrange-Ment Proportionality And Imple-Mentation Disparity. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Law and Legal*, 1 (1). <https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/v3/JILI/article/view/9327>.
- Imamah, F. M., Arimi, S., Susilowat, N. E., & Surahmat. (2023). Threats and Verbal Abuse toward Feminists: Linguistic Forensic Analysis on Instagram's Comment. *Internasional Journal of Forensic Linguistic*, 4 (1), 136–146. <https://doi.org/10.55637/ijfl.4.1.6670.136-146>.
- Jimenez-Aleixandre, M. P., & Erduran, S. (2007). *Argumentation in Science Education: Perspectives from Classroom-Based Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6670-2>.
- Karo Karo, R. P. P. (2021). Pidana Uang Pengganti Terhadap Korporasi dalam Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 13(2), 145. <https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v13i2.366>.
- Mahsun. (2018). *Linguistik Forensik: Memahami Forensik Berbasis Teks dalam Analogi DNA*. Depok: Rajawali Pers.
- McMenamin, & Gerald R. (2002). *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*. CRC Press.
- Perkins, R. C. (2018). The Application of Forensic Linguistics in Cybercrime Investigations. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 15 (1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pay097>.
- Renkema, & Jan. (2004). *Introduction to Discourse Studies*. Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Saragih, Y. M. & Medalin, O. (2018). Elements of the Corruption Crime (Element Analysis of Authority Abuse and Self-Enrich and Corporations in Indonesia. *IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 126. <https://doi.org/0.1088/1755-1315/126/1/012108>.
- Sekerazh, T. N. (2020). Forensic Psychological Aspects of the Term “Provocation” in Criminal Proceedings. *Theory and Practice of Forensic Science*, 15(3), 19–33. <https://doi.org/10.30764/1819-2785-2020-3-19-33>.
- Syarief, M., Mas, M., & Siku, A. S. (2021). Analisis Yuridis Penegakan Hak Azasi Manusia Terhadap Penjatuhan Pidana Pencabutan Hak Politik Terpidana KorUPSI. *Indonesian Journal of Legality of Law*, 4(1), 83–87. <https://doi.org/10.35965/ijlf.v4i1.611>.
- Strazny, P. (2005). *Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Suhartono, D., Gema, AP., Winton, S., et al. (2022). Argument Annotation and Analysis Using Deep Learning with Attention Mechanism in Indonesian English. *Journal of Big Data*. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-020-00364-z>.
- Tahir, E. S. (2021). Kebijakan Pencabutan Hak Politik sebagai Pidana Tambahan dalam Perkara Korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Pembaruan Hukum*, 1(1), 75–106. <https://doi.org/10.19184/jkph.v1i1.23352>.
- Toulmin, S. (2003). *The Uses of Argument, Updated Edition* (Updated Edition). Cambridge University Press.
- Walton, D. N. (2006). *Fundamentals of critical argumentation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wangga, M. S. E., Pujiyono, & Arief, B. N. (2019). Revocation of Political Rights of the Perpetrators of Criminal Acts of Corruption. *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies*, 4, (2), 277–298. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v4i2.29689>.
- Zifana, M., Lukmana, I., & Sudana, D. (2022). The Construction of Victims of Defamation in Court’s Written Verdicts. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12 (1), 156–163. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v12i1.28273>.
- Zhang, C. (2022). Research on the Construction of Chinese Argument Corpus. *Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 12(1), 123–138. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2022.121010>.