

# Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies: A Primary Cause of Argumentative Deficiencies in Thesis Proposals

Yuliana Setyaningsih\*

Indonesian Language Education Department, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

R. Kunjana Rahardi

Indonesian Language Education Department, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Dian Eka Chandra Wardhana

Post Graduate Department, Bengkulu State University, Bengkulu, Indonesia

Ignatius Dimas Adi Suarjaya

Indonesian Language Education Department, Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

**Abstract**—This study seeks to identify and critically examine recurring patterns of unwarranted assumption fallacies that commonly arise in the construction of arguments, particularly those rooted in hasty generalizations and the use of logically irrelevant evidence. Drawing upon a qualitative content analysis of relevant scholarly literature and selected case studies, the investigation focuses on five prominent categories of fallacious reasoning: false causality based on irrelevant premises, premature generalizations derived from insufficient or non-representative data, hastily formulated claims, immature or weakly substantiated conclusions, and arguments relying on tangential or unrelated evidence. The analytical framework emphasizes the relationship between claims and their supporting evidence, assessing how inconsistencies and logical disconnects compromise argumentative validity. The findings reveal that all five fallacy types significantly diminish the strength, coherence, and credibility of academic arguments, often leading to misleading or erroneous conclusions. False causality typically emerges from unwarranted cause-effect attributions, while hasty generalizations are frequently grounded in anecdotal or statistically unrepresentative observations. Similarly, premature claims and immature conclusions reflect a lack of critical depth in reasoning, and the use of irrelevant evidence introduces logical discontinuities that weaken argumentative structure. These insights underscore the necessity of deliberate and rigorous evidence selection, as well as methodologically sound reasoning practices, in constructing robust and persuasive academic discourse. In doing so, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of argumentative fallacies and their implications for the integrity of scholarly communication.

**Index Terms**—unwarranted assumption fallacies, hasty generalization, irrelevant evidence, flawed reasoning, argument analysis

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the context of higher education, the thesis proposal serves as both a cognitive and rhetorical milestone in a student's academic trajectory. It marks the transition from passive knowledge consumption to active scholarly inquiry, requiring students to formulate research problems, synthesize relevant literature, and design methodologically sound investigations (Garcia-Gorrostieta & López-López, 2018). Beyond its administrative function, the proposal embodies a student's ability to participate meaningfully in disciplinary discourse, employing structured reasoning, credible evidence, and epistemic awareness (Abdulai & Owusu-Ansah, 2014; Prasantham, 2023; Tiwari, 2023). However, empirical observations and supervisory experience across graduate programs consistently reveal persistent difficulties among students in articulating coherent, logically substantiated arguments—particularly in aligning claims with appropriate warrants and evidence.

One pervasive issue in postgraduate academic writing is the presence of logical fallacies, especially those categorized as unwarranted assumptions. These include errors such as hasty generalization, false cause, and appeals to authority—reasoning flaws that often arise from inadequate engagement with literature, insufficient critical thinking, or misunderstanding of argumentative structures. Such fallacies not only weaken the rhetorical persuasiveness of the text but also compromise its epistemic credibility, thereby undermining the foundational purpose of the thesis proposal. Despite the availability of writing support programs and instructional materials, students continue to struggle with developing arguments that meet the rigorous demands of academic logic and discourse conventions.

---

\* Corresponding Author.

Existing studies have examined students' difficulties in organizing thesis components such as the introduction, literature review, and methodology (Mali, 2023; Pardede, 2015). Others have explored the structural and linguistic features of academic writing through models of argumentation such as Toulmin's framework. Yet, the presence and nature of logical fallacies—particularly fallacies of unwarranted assumption—within the thesis proposals of postgraduate students remain underexplored. This represents a significant research gap, especially given that fallacious reasoning can obscure research aims, distort methodological clarity, and reduce the scholarly value of a proposal. Moreover, while fallacies have been studied in various genres such as advertisements, debates, and media discourse, their manifestation in formal academic writing—arguably the highest-stakes genre for students—has not received proportional scholarly attention.

From a rhetorical and pedagogical standpoint, identifying and understanding the presence of logical fallacies in student writing is not merely a diagnostic task; it is an epistemological imperative. The ability to construct fallacy-free arguments reflects not only logical competence but also the student's alignment with the norms of scientific reasoning and academic integrity. Furthermore, such competence serves as a foundation for future scholarly work, influencing how students formulate hypotheses, critique literature, interpret data, and present findings. Strengthening this dimension of academic literacy is essential for cultivating critically reflective researchers capable of engaging with complex knowledge systems and contributing meaningfully to their fields.

Against this backdrop, the present study aims to (1) identify and categorize instances of fallacies of unwarranted assumption in postgraduate thesis proposals, and (2) examine the rhetorical and structural factors that contribute to their occurrence. By focusing specifically on written academic texts within the Indonesian Language Education postgraduate context, this research offers a nuanced understanding of how flawed reasoning emerges in scholarly writing. In doing so, it seeks to inform the development of pedagogical strategies and rhetorical interventions that enhance argumentative quality, thereby improving academic writing instruction and supporting the broader goal of producing logically sound, epistemically robust scholarship.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The ability to construct coherent, logically sound, and rhetorically persuasive arguments is a defining feature of advanced academic literacy, especially at the postgraduate level. Yet, extensive empirical evidence has revealed that many students continue to face significant challenges in fulfilling these expectations. Mali reported recurring structural and rhetorical weaknesses in students' thesis proposals, particularly in organizing key components such as the introduction, literature review, and methodology (Mali, 2023). Mali's findings were further reinforced by Fitria, who noted that most students experience difficulty finding relevant reference sources (Fitria, 2022). The availability of reference sources is crucial for strengthening arguments in a thesis proposal. The inability to present ideas coherently and synthesize scholarly sources undermines the communicative function of the thesis proposal as an academically persuasive text. These findings are echoed by Pardede, who noted that poor paragraph development and a lack of logical flow frequently result in fragmented and underdeveloped arguments (Pardede, 2015). These issues not only compromise the clarity and cohesion of the text but also obscure the research intent and weaken the credibility of the writer's scholarly position.

These structural weaknesses are often symptoms of deeper deficits in critical academic literacy and reasoning. A useful lens for examining these argumentative limitations is Toulmin's (1958) model of argumentation, which posits that every effective argument comprises a claim, data (or grounds), and a warrant—supported, when necessary, by backing, rebuttals, and modal qualifiers (Toulmin, 2003; Toulmin et al., 1979). The failure to appropriately connect claims with valid grounds and warrants leads to reasoning errors that can be classified as logical fallacies. Suryatiningsih (2019) and Wang and Yang (2012) emphasized that students often lack the ability to establish a well-contextualized research background, identify meaningful research gaps, and employ scholarly references strategically—capabilities which are essential for building a logically sound and rhetorically effective argument. These limitations signal broader pedagogical challenges in equipping students with the tools to participate in disciplinary discourse communities.

Within this framework, Toulmin and his followers have classified logical fallacies into two overarching categories: fallacies of unwarranted assumption and fallacies of ambiguity (Toulmin et al., 1979). The first group encompasses fallacies such as hasty generalization, false cause, faulty analogy, and begging the question, which often stem from flawed inferential reasoning or insufficient support for general claims. These fallacies are frequently observed in postgraduate academic texts, where novice researchers may draw premature conclusions, rely on questionable authorities, or overlook necessary qualifications. The second category, fallacies of ambiguity, includes semantic and syntactic errors such as equivocation, amphiboly, and misleading accent, all of which can obscure argumentative clarity and lead to misinterpretation (Toulmin et al., 1979; Walton, 2020). The frequent presence of these fallacies in student writing not only reveals gaps in logical reasoning but also indicates the need for explicit instruction in both critical thinking and rhetorical precision.

Although the literature on logical fallacies is relatively rich, it has predominantly focused on non-academic genres such as political discourse, advertising, and popular media (Abbas et al., 2024; Wang, 2021). Srimayasandy (2021), for instance, analyzed televised testimonial discourse and identified the use of emotive and fallacious appeals such as appeal to pity and bandwagon fallacies. Likewise, Sri Istiningdias and Argenti (2019) documented the presence of argumentum ad populum and ignoratio elenchi in digital news content produced by CNN Indonesia. Santoso's (2017) study identified six

types of logical fallacies in the presidential debate between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. While these studies illustrate how fallacious reasoning can be deployed for persuasive effect, their relevance to formal academic writing—particularly within high-stakes genres like thesis proposals—is limited. Academic discourse imposes more stringent epistemic and rhetorical norms than those of public or commercial communication. As such, the transferability of insights from these studies to the academic context requires further empirical scrutiny (Rahardi, 2022).

Despite the centrality of sound reasoning to scholarly writing, relatively few studies have systematically examined how logical fallacies—especially those involving unwarranted assumptions—manifest within postgraduate thesis proposals. This gap is particularly notable given that thesis proposals serve as critical gateways to formal academic research and reflect the writer's readiness to engage with disciplinary knowledge production. The underrepresentation of fallacy analysis in academic writing research underscores the need for a more nuanced investigation into how argument quality is developed—or compromised—within the academic literacy practices of postgraduate students. By identifying the types and sources of fallacious reasoning in thesis proposals, the present study aims to contribute not only to rhetorical theory and argumentation studies, but also to pedagogical innovation in the teaching of academic writing at the graduate level.

### III. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design supplemented by an intertextual analytical framework. The qualitative approach is utilized to systematically identify and categorize recurring patterns of unwarranted assumption fallacies within academic texts. Complementarily, the intertextual framework is applied to investigate the contextual and cognitive factors underpinning these fallacies, as perceived by the authors of the thesis proposals. The research corpus consists of thesis proposals submitted by postgraduate students in the Indonesian Language Education program at a private university. Data units comprise sentences containing argumentative claims, analyzed within their broader textual contexts, including preceding and subsequent discourse, to ensure comprehensive interpretation of the argumentation structure.

The methodology for data collection in this study comprises a combination of observational and interview techniques. Initially, a listening protocol supported by systematic reading and note-taking was employed to identify and categorize instances of unwarranted assumption fallacies within student thesis proposals (Sudaryanto, 2015). Complementing this, semi-structured interviews were conducted both in-person and virtually to explore the cognitive and contextual factors underlying these fallacies from the perspective of the thesis authors. During face-to-face interviews, data were collected through detailed note-taking and audio recordings to ensure accuracy and facilitate subsequent analysis. This triangulation of observational and interview data was implemented to enhance the reliability and validity of the findings.

The data analysis methodology employed in this study integrates an intertextual analytical framework with qualitative content analysis. This combined approach enables a rigorous examination of the interplay between textual components and their contextual environment, thereby allowing for a comprehensive identification and interpretation of the fundamental weaknesses that give rise to unwarranted assumption fallacies in students' thesis proposals. By systematically coding and categorizing patterns of fallacious reasoning, the methodology facilitates an in-depth understanding of how these fallacies manifest within the academic writing context (Krippendorff, 2004).

The methodology for data collection and analysis comprised the following sequential phases: (a) compiling argumentative texts sourced from relevant literature and student thesis proposals; (b) systematically identifying statements containing logical fallacies; (c) applying a coding scheme to label data according to the specific types of fallacies detected; (d) organizing the coded data into thematic categories corresponding to distinct fallacy types; and (e) conducting a comprehensive interpretative analysis by integrating intertextuality theory with qualitative content analysis to elucidate the nature and underlying causes of the identified fallacies.

### IV. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Unwarranted assumption fallacies constitute a prevalent category of logical errors in scientific argumentation, arising from premises that lack sufficient rational justification or empirical support. A notable example is false causality, wherein a causal connection is inferred between two events without adequate evidential basis, thereby compromising the argument's validity and persuasiveness. Similarly, hasty generalizations occur when broad conclusions are prematurely drawn from limited, unrepresentative, or irrelevant data. Arguments grounded on such flawed reasoning often result in misconceptions and undermine the coherence and intellectual rigor of academic texts. These fallacies not only mislead readers but also erode the epistemic foundation essential to scholarly discourse. Therefore, a rigorous and systematic examination of the various manifestations of unwarranted assumption fallacies is indispensable for constructing robust and credible arguments. The subsequent sections provide a detailed analysis of each fallacy type, revealing the underlying patterns of faulty reasoning.

#### 1. Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies Caused by False Causality Derived from Logically Irrelevant Grounds

Within the fields of logic and argumentation analysis, unwarranted assumption fallacies constitute critical reasoning errors that significantly distort the establishment of legitimate causal relationships. A prominent instance is false causality, whereby an unwarranted causal connection is inferred between two events or variables lacking sufficient logical or empirical substantiation. This fallacy is often exacerbated by reliance on logically irrelevant premises, which, despite

their superficial rhetorical persuasiveness, undermine the argument's epistemic validity and coherence within a rigorous analytical framework.

This issue is also evident in the development of educational media aimed at enhancing children's language acquisition. Some claims assert that multimodality-based picture storybooks inherently and directly facilitate improvements in children's language skills, often without adequately accounting for the multifactorial influences on holistic language development. While multimodal approaches provide diverse communicative channels with the potential to stimulate language growth, empirical evidence highlights a notable discrepancy between theoretical advantages and practical application. The scarcity of learning materials that effectively integrate multimodality with educational games results in insufficient stimulation tailored to children's varied learning preferences—whether visual, kinesthetic, or sensory. This limitation hinders the acquisition of vocabulary, narrative competence, and interactive communication skills. Consequently, attributing language development solely to the use of multimodal picture storybooks, without considering these contextual constraints, constitutes a false causality fallacy based on logically irrelevant premises. This fallacy is further compounded when arguments overlook the complexity of individual learner needs, as children with distinct learning modalities require differentiated support that no single multimodal medium can fully address. For instance, kinesthetic learners benefit from physical and sensory experiences that picture books alone cannot provide. Thus, assuming that a single instructional medium, such as multimodal picture storybooks, serves as the primary determinant of children's language development reflects an erroneous cause-and-effect attribution. This misattribution is exacerbated when claims rest on anecdotal observations rather than comprehensive empirical investigation of other critical factors, including familial environment, social interactions, and individual learner characteristics.

Within scientific inquiry, this category of reasoning error is particularly detrimental, as it has the potential to misinform the direction of research and hinder the effective design of educational programs. When policymakers or researchers formulate conclusions based on unfounded causal assumptions, the implementation of educational initiatives may become misaligned with actual learner needs—resulting in suboptimal, or even counterproductive, outcomes. Consequently, it is imperative for scholars and practitioners in the field of education to adopt a more comprehensive causal analysis framework—one that accounts for relevant contextual variables and is grounded in empirically validated evidence. By adhering to such methodological rigor, the arguments advanced are not only logically sound but also pedagogically meaningful and practically applicable within the broader context of child development and learning.

Unwarranted assumption fallacies—particularly those involving false causality and grounded in logically irrelevant premises—represent not only structural deficiencies in argumentative reasoning but also pose serious epistemological and practical risks in the context of educational media development and early language stimulation. Such fallacies may lead to misguided interpretations, ineffective pedagogical interventions, and a distortion of research-based decision-making (Cusick & Peter, 2015; Toulmin et al., 1979). Addressing these reasoning errors through critical analysis is therefore essential for preserving the integrity of academic discourse and enhancing the quality, credibility, and applicability of research outcomes in educational settings. To provide a clearer and more accurate understanding of the interrelationships among the variables under investigation, Table 1 presents relevant empirical data that illustrate the core issues discussed in this study.

TABLE 1  
FALSE CAUSES AS UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION FALLACIES

<p>Data 1: FNSDP</p> <p><i>Media pembelajaran yang mengintegrasikan pendekatan multimodalitas dan permainan edukatif masih terbatas. Keterbatasan ini menghambat perkembangan bahasa anak secara menyeluruh dan inklusif. Anak dengan gaya belajar berbeda memerlukan dukungan visual, kinestetik, atau sensorik khusus. Namun, banyak anak tidak mendapat stimulasi sesuai kebutuhannya. Kondisi ini menyebabkan kesenjangan kemampuan bahasa. Anak mengalami hambatan dalam kosakata, bercerita, dan komunikasi dua arah. [The availability of learning media that integrate multimodal approaches and educational games remains limited. This scarcity impedes the comprehensive and inclusive development of children's language skills. Given that children exhibit diverse learning styles, including visual, kinesthetic, and sensory preferences, they require tailored support to optimize their language acquisition. However, many children lack access to the necessary stimulation, resulting in a widening gap in language competencies. Consequently, children often encounter difficulties in vocabulary acquisition, narrative construction, and interactive communication.]</i></p>
<p>Causal Factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author does not provide robust empirical evidence substantiating that the constraints of learning media integrating multimodal strategies and educational games adversely affect children's comprehensive language development, including vocabulary acquisition, storytelling proficiency, and interactive communication skills.</li> <li>The data presented are largely subjective and overly generalized, lacking sufficient empirical rigor.</li> <li>The author fails to articulate clear logical warrants that rigorously link the proposed causes to their respective effects, thereby undermining the argument's causal validity.</li> </ol>

## 2. Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies Arising from Hasty Generalizations Caused by Logically Irrelevant and Insufficient Evidence

Unwarranted assumption fallacies—particularly those rooted in hasty generalizations—represent a critical lapse in reasoning, occurring when conclusions are drawn from limited, non-representative, or logically irrelevant evidence. Such fallacies frequently result in overgeneralized or overly simplistic claims that fail to meet the standards of academic rigor. In both scholarly discourse and practical applications, these errors can compromise the validity of findings and lead to misinformed judgments or interventions.

This pattern of flawed reasoning is also observable in interdisciplinary studies exploring the role of art as a medium of communication and social regulation. In socio-political contexts such as agrarian resistance movements, for example, music often serves as a powerful expressive tool (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2019). Certain musicians intentionally engage with themes that lie outside the commercial mainstream—particularly those related to social critique, justice, and moral consciousness. Through lyrical content, artists not only establish dialogic engagement with their audiences but also employ music as a vehicle for social influence. In this way, songs function as symbolic interventions—shaping public discourse, challenging dominant narratives, and at times, contributing to shifts in collective perception and behavior.

Claims regarding the effectiveness of music as a medium of social control, when derived from a narrow set of musical texts or a limited number of artists without the support of robust and comprehensive empirical evidence, risk committing a hasty generalization. This fallacy occurs when conclusions are drawn from evidence that is either insufficient in scope or logically disconnected from the claim being made. For example, asserting that all socially critical songs exert significant influence on public attitudes—based solely on the analysis of a few selected lyrics—without considering mediating factors such as the socio-political context, audience demographics, or variability in individual reception, reflects a clear instance of unwarranted assumptions grounded in overgeneralization.

Furthermore, generalizations derived from irrelevant or contextually inadequate data may also lead to serious misinterpretations. In domains such as educational media and social communication, evaluating the persuasive function of music exclusively through lyrical content—while neglecting crucial factors such as the medium of dissemination, frequency of audience exposure, and the cultural or ideological positioning of listeners—can undermine the validity of the conclusions drawn. When such claims are constructed upon data that lack both representativeness and contextual alignment, they not only exemplify false cause reasoning but also risk perpetuating misleading assumptions. These fallacies weaken the epistemic foundation of academic arguments and compromise the applicability of research findings in real-world educational and communicative settings (Rahardi, 2023; Walton, 1999).

A rigorous and critical approach to evaluating evidence and data collection procedures is essential to prevent fallacious reasoning, particularly hasty generalizations. This involves careful validation of data credibility, assessment of sample representativeness, and a thorough examination of the relevance and sufficiency of evidence in relation to the claims being made. Such methodological vigilance is fundamental to constructing well-founded generalizations and ensuring the logical coherence of academic arguments (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020a; Toulmin et al., 1979). By minimizing the risk of unwarranted assumption fallacies rooted in inadequate or irrelevant evidence, researchers contribute to the robustness, reliability, and overall integrity of scholarly discourse by emphasizing the presence of three key elements of argument (Hitchcock, 2017; Toulmin, 2003).

Taken as a whole, this phenomenon highlights the critical importance of employing a methodologically rigorous and analytically reflective approach when investigating the communicative functions of media—such as music and other educational platforms. Only through systematic and evidence-based inquiry can researchers formulate claims that accurately reflect complex social realities and avoid reasoning fallacies that undermine both theoretical coherence and practical relevance. To support a more nuanced understanding of this issue, Table 2 presents empirical data and interpretive analysis concerning the specific forms of erroneous assumptions that emerge from hasty generalizations rooted in inadequate and contextually irrelevant evidence.

TABLE 2

HASTY GENERALIZATIONS CAUSED BY LOGICALLY IRRELEVANT AND INSUFFICIENT EVIDENCE AS UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION FALLACIES

<p>Data 2: KRSDP</p> <p><i>Beberapa musisi mengangkat tema yang jarang diusung pasar. Misalnya, tema kritik sosial dan pesan moral. Musisi kerap menjadikan sebuah lagu sebagai alat kontrol sosial yang ada di masyarakat, dalam hal tersebut musisi menggunakan lagu sebagai media untuk berkomunikasi (Rusmanto, 2016). Melalui lirik lagu, musisi dapat berkomunikasi dengan pembaca atau pendengar baik secara langsung maupun tidak langsung. Setiap penulis atau penyair lagu pasti memiliki kekhasan dalam hal pembuatan lagunya. Melalui lirik lagu yang diciptakan, seseorang dapat melakukan kontrol sosial yang dapat menimbulkan keyakinan bahkan perubahan tingkah laku atau sikap bagi pendengar atau pembacanya (Destiyani, 2016).</i> [Certain musicians engage with themes that are underrepresented in mainstream markets, including social critique and moral discourse. Music functions not only as an artistic expression but also as an instrument of social control and communication within society (Rusmanto, 2016). Through their lyrics, musicians communicate with audiences in both explicit and implicit ways. Each songwriter or poet employs a distinct stylistic approach, allowing them to exercise social influence by shaping listeners' or readers' attitudes and behaviors. This lyrical agency can inspire empowerment and effect behavioral or attitudinal change among audiences (Destiyani, 2016).]</p>
<p>Causal Factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author demonstrates a lack of understanding regarding the requirement to support claims with relevant and adequate empirical evidence.</li> <li>The evidence provided is insufficient and fails to substantiate the claim that “some musicians address themes rarely explored by the market,” lacking specific examples or data to validate this assertion.</li> <li>The argumentation lacks a coherent and logically structured framework, resulting in weakened argumentative rigor and reduced overall persuasiveness.</li> </ol>

### 3. Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies Arising from Hasty Generalizations because of Premature Claim

Fallacies of reasoning, specifically those involving unwarranted assumptions, often emerge from hasty generalizations premised on premature conclusions. These conclusions are drawn in the absence of comprehensive and methodical data collection and analysis, thereby neglecting the multifaceted nature of relevant variables and contextual factors inherent to

the study. As a result, such conclusions are fundamentally flawed, undermining their validity and potentially leading to the misguidance of readers and stakeholders who rely on the research outcomes (Toulmin et al., 1979).

The issue of premature generalizations is clearly illustrated in studies examining the role of local authors within the framework of Indonesian literary history. National literary historiography often prioritizes works produced at the national level, resulting in the marginalization or omission of local writers in dominant narratives (Rusmanto, 2016). In contrast, local literary productions—such as those by Yogyakarta-based authors including Abdul Wachid B.S., Kiswando, Ngarto Februana, Angger Jati Wijaya, and Agus Noor—represent authentic articulations of their unique worldviews. These texts embody the socio-cultural dynamics, lived experiences, and educational contexts that shape the authors' intellectual frameworks, thereby making valuable contributions to the broader literary landscape.

Nonetheless, studies or narratives that limit their scope to nationally recognized works, without adequately considering the richness and diversity of local literature, risk promulgating unwarranted and premature generalizations. The assertion that local authors have made minimal contributions is therefore not only empirically unfounded but also overlooks the multiplicity of socio-cultural contexts that inform local literary production. This represents a clear example of hasty generalization, whereby conclusions are drawn without comprehensive, representative, and critical analysis of the relevant data. Such methodological shortcomings reflect a lack of rigorous empirical scrutiny and critical reflection (Hasibuan et al., 2020; Lismay, 2020).

Premature claims within this context pose significant challenges to the advancement of literary studies and the preservation of local cultural heritage. Uncritical acceptance of such claims, without thorough empirical validation, risks perpetuating historical and cultural misrepresentations that obscure the vital contributions of local authors who merit scholarly attention. This oversight can result in detrimental academic and socio-cultural consequences, including the narrowing of cultural perspectives and constraints on literary pedagogy (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020a; Suminto & Ena, 2020).

To mitigate these risks, research must adhere to rigorous methodological standards, encompassing systematic and representative data collection from diverse sources, comprehensive contextual analysis, and robust triangulation and validation procedures. Researchers should exercise caution when articulating claims, explicitly acknowledging study limitations and avoiding overgeneralizations until supported by substantial empirical evidence. This methodological rigor is essential to minimizing premature conclusions and enhancing the validity, reliability, and scholarly impact of research findings.

For further elucidation, readers are directed to Table 3, which delineates illustrative examples and detailed analyses of unwarranted assumption fallacies arising from premature claims. This synthesis offers critical insights into the mechanisms and ramifications of such fallacies within the fields of social sciences and humanities.

TABLE 3  
HASTY GENERALIZATIONS OF PREMATURE CLAIM AS UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION FALLACIES

<p>Data 3: MRS DP</p> <p><i>Karya sastra baik lokal maupun nasional telah mewakili suara pengarang yang merefleksikan pandangannya terhadap dunia melalui pola pikir yang dipengaruhi proses pendidikan, pengalaman, dan sosial budaya pengarang. Maka, karya-karyanya merupakan manifestasi sosial budaya kehidupan pengarang terhadap dunia. Sastrawan lokal Yogyakarta, misalnya, aktif menulis di surat kabar Kedaulatan Rakyat, Bernas, dan Yogya Pos, bahkan ada beberapa yang telah berhasil membukukannya, baik dalam bentuk kumpulan puisi ataupun kumpulan cerpen, seperti Abdul Wachid B.S., Kiswando dan Ngarto Februana, Angger Jati Wijaya, dan Agus Noor (Supriyadi, 2000).</i> [Literary works at both local and national levels reflect the authors' worldview, which is shaped by their cognitive frameworks influenced by education, personal experiences, and socio-cultural backgrounds. Thus, these works represent a manifestation of the authors' socio-cultural realities and their interpretations of the world around them. For example, writers from Yogyakarta have actively contributed to newspapers such as <i>Kedaulatan Rakyat</i>, <i>Bernas</i>, and <i>Yogya Pos</i>. Moreover, some of these writers have successfully published their works in book form, including poetry collections and short story anthologies. Prominent figures among them include Abdul Wachid B.S., Kiswando, Ngarto Februana, Angger Jati Wijaya, and Agus Noor (Supriyadi, 2000).]</p> <p>Causal Factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author prematurely advanced the assertion that "literary works, both local and national, represent the author's voice and reflect their worldview" without providing sufficient empirical support to substantiate this claim.</li> <li>There is a fundamental misunderstanding of the claim's scope, which requires comprehensive and comparative data encompassing both local and national literary outputs to convincingly demonstrate their role in reflecting authors' perspectives.</li> <li>The evidence presented is narrowly drawn from a limited selection of literary works published exclusively in Yogyakarta, thus failing to capture the diversity and representativeness necessary to underpin a robust and logically coherent argument.</li> </ol>
--

#### 4. Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies Arising from Hasty Generalizations because of Immature Conclusion

Fallacies stemming from unwarranted assumptions, particularly those resulting from hasty generalizations, frequently arise from premature conclusions drawn in the absence of comprehensive data analysis. These conclusions often neglect the complexity of pertinent variables and alternative interpretations, lacking the necessary critical scrutiny (Toulmin et al., 1979; Walton, 2013). As a result, they undermine scientific rigor and risk misleading readers and stakeholders who depend on the findings.

This phenomenon is especially pertinent within argumentation studies, notably concerning commitment-based arguments in mass media discourse. An empirical investigation into editorials published in *Bisnis Indonesia* revealed a

pervasive deficiency in the effective construction of commitment-based arguments. Analysis of ten editorials indicated that eight contained significant inconsistencies in their argumentative structure (Rusmanto, 2016; Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020b). These inconsistencies largely stemmed from editorial staff's insufficient grasp of Douglas Walton's theoretical framework on commitment-based argumentation. Consequently, authors adopted disparate and unsystematic approaches, lacking standardized methodological guidelines, which led to fragmented and logically tenuous arguments.

This scenario exemplifies the ramifications of premature conclusions leading to unwarranted assumption fallacies. When writers and editorial teams evaluate the quality and efficacy of arguments without a robust theoretical grounding and thorough analytical rigor, they commit hasty generalizations that compromise the credibility and scholarly integrity of their work. Such argumentative weaknesses not only diminish reader confidence but also impair the editorial's fundamental role as a reasoned and persuasive vehicle for influencing public discourse.

More broadly, premature conclusions frequently stem from limited conceptual understanding and inadequate methodological rigor in the argumentation process. In the context of *Bisnis Indonesia* editorials, this underscores the necessity for a more systematic framework for writer development and editorial oversight, encompassing comprehensive training in commitment-based argumentation theory alongside the adoption of standardized evaluative criteria. Such measures would not only enhance the distinctiveness and substantive quality of editorials but also foster greater reader trust through consistent and rigorous analytical practices.

Moreover, immature conclusions can be substantially mitigated through continuous quality assurance mechanisms, including internal peer review, collaborative critical discourse among authors, and the application of structured analytical frameworks to assess the validity and coherence of arguments. This iterative process of reflection and revision is essential to cultivate more nuanced and academically robust conclusions.

This study highlights that advancing the consistency and depth of editorial arguments involves more than refining writing skills; it requires cultivating a comprehensive understanding of both theoretical foundations and methodological approaches. Therefore, building editorial capacity is a strategic imperative to prevent fallacious reasoning arising from premature or underdeveloped conclusions, thereby enhancing editorial quality and reinforcing its critical role as a vehicle of rational public communication (Ketokivi & Mantere, 2021; Samosa, 2021; Walton, 2013).

For a more detailed insight, readers are encouraged to refer to Table 4, which presents a thorough analysis of commitment-based argument inconsistencies in *Bisnis Indonesia* editorials, along with representative case studies and their broader implications for public trust.

TABLE 4  
HASTY GENERALIZATIONS CAUSED BY IMMATURE CONCLUSION AS UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION FALLACIES

<p>Data 4: PLSDP</p> <p><i>Kemampuan menulis argumen berbasis komitmen manajemen redaksi Bisnis Indonesia saat ini masih tergolong rendah. Berdasarkan observasi yang dilakukan, peneliti menemukan fakta bahwa penulisan editorial Bisnis Indonesia belum memiliki satu bentuk argumen yang menjadi kekhasan Bisnis Indonesia. Setiap penulis memiliki gaya sendiri dalam menulis editorial dengan berpedoman pada pemahaman mengenai argumen yang berbeda-beda. Peneliti juga melakukan pencermatan terhadap 10 teks editorial kemudian membedah dan menganalisis editorial tersebut. Berdasarkan studi pendahuluan terhadap editorial Bisnis Indonesia, peneliti menemukan 8 teks editorial dengan argumen berbasis komitmen yang belum konsisten. Beberapa kendala yang mungkin menjadi faktor penyebab adalah kurangnya pemahaman yang mendalam dalam manajemen redaksi mengenai argumen dan argumen berbasis komitmen menurut perspektif Douglas Walton. [The ability to construct commitment-based arguments within <i>Bisnis Indonesia</i>'s editorial management remains relatively underdeveloped. Observations indicate that the editorials lack a distinctive argumentative style unique to <i>Bisnis Indonesia</i>, as each writer employs individual approaches influenced by differing conceptions of argumentation. In this study, ten editorials were selected for qualitative analysis and dissection. Preliminary results reveal inconsistencies in the use of commitment-based arguments across eight of the editorials examined. Contributing factors include a limited understanding among editorial staff regarding the theoretical foundations of arguments, particularly commitment-based arguments as defined by Douglas Walton.]</i></p> <p>Causal Factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author hastily concluded that the editorial team of <i>Bisnis Indonesia</i> exhibits a relatively low proficiency in constructing commitment-based arguments, without robust empirical substantiation.</li> <li>The assessment relied on a limited corpus of ten editorial texts, identifying inconsistencies in eight, which raises concerns about the representativeness and generalizability of the findings.</li> <li>The argument lacks explicit warrants that rigorously establish a logical and evidential connection between the claim and the presented data, thereby compromising the overall validity and persuasiveness of the conclusion.</li> </ol>
---

##### 5. Unwarranted Assumption Fallacies Arising from Hasty Generalizations because of Irrelevant Evidences

One prevalent logical fallacy encountered in argumentation is the unwarranted assumption fallacy, frequently stemming from hasty generalizations founded on irrelevant or inadequate evidence. Irrelevant evidence pertains to information that lacks a direct and logical connection to the claim or argument being posited. The reliance on such evidence can obscure the argument's core rationale, diminish the robustness of its conclusions, and potentially mislead both academic audiences and practitioners who depend on these findings for informed decision-making (Toulmin et al., 1979; Walton, 1999, 2013).

This issue is especially critical in the educational domain, particularly in the design and evaluation of instructional models aimed at enhancing writing skills. Each learner possesses distinct cognitive profiles, creative capacities, and learning preferences that must be acknowledged to optimize pedagogical efficacy. Writing, especially within creative genres such as fantasy, is an intricate, generative process that demands systematic articulation of ideas, emotions, and

imaginative constructs in written form (Ahsin, 2019; Rahardi et al., 2023). Writing transcends mere information transmission; it functions as a dynamic communicative medium capable of persuasion, engagement, and meaningful expression. Therefore, empirical evidence used to evaluate the effectiveness of learning models must be directly pertinent to the learners' characteristics and the inherent complexities of the creative writing process. Employing generalized, overly technical, or contextually irrelevant data—without due consideration of learner diversity and the multifaceted nature of creative writing—renders conclusions susceptible to unwarranted assumption fallacies. Such methodological shortcomings undermine the validity of research outcomes and hinder the development of tailored, evidence-based pedagogical interventions that genuinely foster creative writing proficiency (Jin et al., 2022; Rahardi, 2020; Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020b).

A similar fallacious pattern emerges in sociocultural research, particularly in analyses of music as a vehicle for social critique. Music—especially through its lyrical dimension—functions not only as an aesthetic form but also as a discursive medium that conveys moral messages and social criticism, with the potential to influence public attitudes and behavior (Rusmanto, 2016; Destiyani, 2016; Rahardi et al., 2024). However, when analytical frameworks prioritize formal elements such as melody, harmony, or vocal technique while overlooking the sociocultural and ideological contexts from which the music emerges, the evidence deployed becomes misaligned with the argument's core claim. Specifically, attributing music's function as a tool of social control to aesthetic qualities alone constitutes a use of irrelevant evidence and weakens the explanatory power of the analysis. Such methodological oversight risks producing conclusions that are not only logically invalid but also epistemologically disconnected from the broader sociopolitical realities that shape both musical production and reception.

In academic discourse, particularly within the realm of scientific reasoning and argumentation, the relevance of evidence constitutes a foundational criterion for validating claims. The credibility of an argument depends not merely on the presence of data, but on the extent to which such evidence is conceptually aligned with the research question and logically supports the argument being advanced (Toulmin et al., 1979; van Eemeren et al., 2013; Walton, 1999, 2013). The misuse of irrelevant evidence—data that lacks direct theoretical or contextual linkage to the claim—can lead to unwarranted assumption fallacies, thereby compromising the integrity of the reasoning process. To mitigate such fallacies, scholars are expected to employ rigorous methodological procedures, including data triangulation and theoretical framing, which ensure analytical precision and enhance the validity of their conclusions (Samosa, 2021). Furthermore, the ability to critically evaluate the epistemological weight of each data source reflects a researcher's capacity for methodological reflexivity and scholarly rigor. When irrelevant or inadequately contextualized evidence is used, the resulting claims not only become logically unsound but may also mislead audiences, weaken scholarly contributions, and erode public trust in scientific inquiry. Therefore, cultivating the competence to select and integrate relevant, context-sensitive evidence is indispensable for producing coherent, credible, and impactful academic arguments across disciplines.

To further illustrate the impact and provide concrete examples of unwarranted assumption fallacies stemming from the use of irrelevant evidence, readers are encouraged to refer to Table 5 below. This table presents detailed case studies and examples that highlight how reliance on irrelevant evidence can diminish the robustness of arguments and weaken the validity of conclusions in sociocultural and educational research.

TABLE 5  
HASTY GENERALIZATIONS CAUSED BY IRRELEVANT EVIDENCED AS UNWARRANTED ASSUMPTION FALLACIES

<p>Data 5: RMSDP</p> <p><i>Pemilihan model pembelajaran harus diperhatikan dengan baik mengingat setiap peserta didik memiliki karakter diri dan kemampuan belajar yang berbeda-beda dalam menulis khususnya cerita fantasi. Menulis dianggap sesuatu yang paling sulit dibandingkan dengan keterampilan berbahasa yang lainnya. Keterampilan menulis merupakan kegiatan produktif yang menitikberatkan seseorang untuk menuangkan ide, ekspresi, dan gagasannya dalam bentuk tulisan. Hal ini sesuai dengan pendapat Ahsin (2019) keterampilan menulis penting dilakukan karena melalui keterampilan menulis seseorang dapat menuangkan pikiran, ide, maupun perasaannya dalam bentuk tulisan. Menulis merupakan suatu kegiatan komunikasi berupa penyampaian pesan (informasi) secara tertulis kepada pihak lain dengan menggunakan bahasa tulis sebagai alat atau mediana. Menulis merupakan sebuah proses kreatif menunangkan gagasan dalam bentuk bahasa tulis dalam tujuan memberi tahu, meyakinkan, atau menghibur (Hayati Fitri &amp; Supriatna, 2020). [The selection of appropriate learning models requires careful consideration, as students exhibit diverse characteristics and varying levels of writing proficiency, especially in the context of composing fantasy narratives. Writing is widely regarded as the most challenging language skill compared to other modalities. It is a productive skill that demands the ability to articulate ideas, emotions, and thoughts coherently in written form. This view aligns with Ahsin (2019), who asserts that writing skills are essential for expressing cognitive and affective content through written communication. Writing functions as a communicative act that conveys messages or information to an audience via written language. Furthermore, writing is a creative process involving the generation and organization of ideas to inform, persuade, or entertain readers (Hayati Fitri &amp; Supriatna, 2020).]</i></p>
<p>Causal Factors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author does not provide sufficient empirical or theoretical evidence to support the claim that writing is the most challenging language skill compared to others. The evidence presented primarily elaborates on the intrinsic characteristics of writing, lacking a comparative analysis that justifies the claim.</li> <li>The author demonstrates a limited understanding of the conceptual basis of the claim, leading to unclear and unsupported statements.</li> <li>The author shows inadequate skills in developing a logically sound and well-substantiated argument, which weakens the overall credibility of the claim.</li> </ol>

## V. CONCLUSION

This study identifies five prevalent types of unwarranted assumption fallacies frequently encountered in scholarly argumentation: (a) false causality rooted in irrelevant logical connections, (b) hasty generalizations derived from inadequate and unrelated evidence, (c) premature claims lacking sufficient empirical validation, underdeveloped conclusions resulting from superficial analysis, and (d) reliance on irrelevant data as foundational support. These fallacies illustrate how improper data selection and insufficiently rigorous argumentation can yield misleading conclusions that undermine both the intellectual rigor and scientific credibility of academic work. However, the scope of this study is limited to a specific case within a narrowly defined discipline, restricting the broader applicability of its findings. Additionally, the predominantly descriptive nature of the data calls for further comprehensive investigations utilizing mixed-method approaches to generate more robust and generalizable insights. The implications of these findings are significant for the academic community and professional practitioners, emphasizing the necessity for systematic, rigorous, and empirically grounded approaches to argument evaluation. Moreover, the study advocates for enhanced critical reasoning training to equip scholars and professionals with the skills needed to identify, prevent, and remediate logical fallacies that may compromise the validity and reliability of scientific discourse. Overall, this research contributes meaningfully to strengthening the foundations of coherent and credible scientific argumentation and highlights avenues for future interdisciplinary research into the dynamics of logical fallacies within academic writing.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team extends its sincere gratitude to the Directorate of Research, Technology, and Community Service (DPPM), Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia, for the 2025 Fundamental Research Grant.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abbas, N. F., Muslah, A. F., & Najem, A. S. (2024). Fallacy as a Strategy of Argumentation in Political Debates. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(8), 2399–2407.
- [2] Abdulai, R. T., & Owusu-Ansah, A. (2014). Essential ingredients of a good research proposal for undergraduate and postgraduate students in the social sciences. *SAGE Open*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014548178>
- [3] Cusick, C., & Peter, M. (2015). The Last Straw Fallacy: Another Causal Fallacy and Its Harmful Effects. *Argumentation*, 29(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-014-9339-x>
- [4] Fitria, T. N. (2022). Analysis of EFL Students' Difficulties in Writing and Completing English Thesis. *LLT Journal: Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.24071/lt.v25i1.3607>
- [5] Garcia-Gorrostieta, J. M., & López-López, A. (2018). Argument component classification in academic writings. *Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems*, 34(5). <https://doi.org/10.3233/JIFS-169488>
- [6] Hasibuan, S. H., Yusriati, Y., & Manurung, I. D. (2020). Examining Argument Elements and Logical Fallacies of English Education Students in Oral Discussion. *Tell: Teaching of English Language and Literature Journal*, 8(2), 48–57.
- [7] Hitchcock, D. (2017). Toulmin's Warrants. In *On Reasoning and Argument* (Vol. 30, pp. 81–95). Springer.
- [8] Jin, Z., Lalwani, A., Vaidhya, T., Shen, X., Ding, Y., Lyu, Z., Sachan, M., Mihalcea, R., & Schoelkopf, B. (2022). Logical Fallacy Detection. In Y. Goldberg, Z. Kozareva, & Y. Zhang (Eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022* (pp. 7180–7198). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [9] Ketokivi, M., & Mantere, S. (2021). What Warrants Our Claims? A Methodological Evaluation of Argument Structure. *Journal of Operations Management*, 67(6), 755–776.
- [10] Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- [11] Lismay, L. (2020). Logical Fallacies on Students' Argumentative Writing. *ELP (Journal of English Language Pedagogy)*, 5(2), 21–27.
- [12] Mali, Y. C. G. (2023). EFL Students' Challenges in Writing Research Proposals. *LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching*, 26(1), 272–289.
- [13] Pardede, P. (2015). ELT Research Proposal Writing Guidelines. *EED Collegiate Forum 2015-2018*, 1–19.
- [14] Prasantham, Dr. P. (2023). Dynamics of Academic Writing and its Impact on Professional Growth. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 17–21.
- [15] Rahardi, R. (2020). Triadic Functions of Situational Context of Hate Speeches: A Cyberpragmatics Perspective. *Metalingua: Jurnal Penelitian Bahasa*, 18(1), 97–110.
- [16] Rahardi, R. K. (2022). Triadicities of Indonesian Phatic Functions. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 12(12), 2641–2650. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.1212.22>
- [17] Rahardi, R. K. (2023). Social-Societal Context Element Changes in Cyberpragmatics Perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 13(11), 2771–2779.
- [18] Rahardi, R. K., Rahmat, W., & Kurniawan, Y. (2023). Pseudo-Directive Speech Act in the Javanese Language: Culture-Specific Pragmatic Perspective. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 1–12. [https://doi.org/10.1044/2023\\_JSLHR-23-00223](https://doi.org/10.1044/2023_JSLHR-23-00223)
- [19] Rahardi, R. K., Handoko, H., Rahmat, W., & Setyaningsih, Y. (2024). Javanese Silly Gags on Daily Communication on Social Media: Pragmatic Meanings and Functions Approach. *Jurnal Arbitrer*, 11(1), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.25077/ar.11.1.49-59.2024>
- [20] Samosa, R. C. (2021). Effectiveness of Claim, Evidence and Reasoning as an Innovation to Develop Students' Scientific Argumentative Writing Skills. *Journal of Multidimensional Research & Review*, 2(1), 1–22.

- [21] Santoso, J. M. (2017). A Fallacy Analysis of the Arguments on the First U.S. Presidential Debate Between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump. *K@ta Kita*, 5(2), 65–71.
- [22] Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. K. (2019). Quality of arguments used in the first-round presidential debate: Critical pragmatics and Stephen Toulmin's perspective. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(5c), 716-625. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.E1102.0585C19>
- [23] Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. K. (2020a). Konstelasi Argumen dalam Artikel Jurnal: Perspektif Stephen Toulmin. *Jurnal Gramatika: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra Indonesia*, 6(2), 207–223.
- [24] Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. K. (2020b). Quality of arguments used in the first-round presidential debate: Critical pragmatics and Stephen Toulmin's perspective. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V24I2/PR200504>
- [25] Sri Istiningdias, D., & Argenti, G. (2019). Logical Fallacy dalam Narasi Media CNN Indonesia “Pemerintahan Boneka di Era Jokowi”. *Jurnal Akrab Juara*, 4(4), 28–42.
- [26] Srimayasandy, S. (2021). Kesesatan Logika Argumentasi pada Testimoni di Tayangan Televisi Homeshopping. *MEDIASI: Jurnal Kajian dan Terapan Media, Bahasa, Komunikasi*, 2(2), 150–162.
- [27] Sudaryanto. (2015). *Metode dan Aneka Teknik Analisis Bahasa: Pengantar Penelitian Wahana Kebudayaan Secara Linguistik* (1st ed.). Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University Press.
- [28] Suminto, E. A., & Ena, O. T. (2020). The Implementation of Reflective Pedagogy in Advanced Critical Reading and Writing Class. *Language Circle: Journal of Language and Literature*, 14(2), 203–210.
- [29] Suryatiningsih, N. (2019). EFL Students' Difficulties in Writing a Research Proposal. *International Journal of Humanities and Innovation (IJHI)*, 2(4), 96–102.
- [30] Tiwari, L. (2023). Key Elements of the Research Proposal. *Journal of Nepalese Management and Research*, 5(1), 100–108.
- [31] Toulmin, S. E. (2003). *The Uses of Argument* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- [32] Toulmin, S. E., Rieke, R., & Janik, A. (1979). *An Introduction to Reasoning* (3rd ed.). New York: Mac Millan Publishing Company.
- [33] van Eemeren, F. H., Garssen, B., Krabbe, E. C. W., Henkemans, A. F. S., Verheij, B., & Wagemans, J. H. M. (2013). Toulmin's Model of Argumentation. In *Handbook of Argumentation Theory*. Springer.
- [34] Walton, D. (1999). Rethinking the Fallacy of Hasty Generalization. *Argumentation*, 13(2), 161–182.
- [35] Walton, D. (2013). *Methods of Argumentation* (1st ed.). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [36] Walton, D. (2020). Profiles of Dialogue for Amphiboly. *Informal Logic*, 40(1), 3–45.
- [37] Wang, L. (2021). Critical Thinking Sub-Skills in English Debate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 11(12), 1630–1635.
- [38] Wang, X., & Yang, L. (2012). Problems and Strategies in Learning to Write a Thesis Proposal: A Study of Six M.A. Students in a TEFL Program. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35(3), 324–341.



**Yuliana Setyaningsih** is a lecturer at the Master's Program in Indonesian Language Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sanata Dharma University. Her academic interests focus on Indonesian language instruction, particularly the enhancement of critical thinking and argumentation skills. She earned her Ph.D. in Indonesian Language Education from Indonesia University of Education in 2008. Since 2009, she has taught Indonesian Phonology and co-authored a distinctive textbook, *Fonologi Bahasa Indonesia: Mengkaji Tata Bunyi dalam Perspektif Edukasi*, which integrates linguistic theory with pedagogical approaches. Her scholarly contributions include edited volumes such as *Bahasa, Sastra, dan Pengajaran dalam Teropong Kekiniannya* (2013) and *Butir-butir Gagasan Sastra dan Pengajarannya* (2013), as well as authored works like *Menulis Artikel Jurnal* (2018), which explores academic writing through Toulmin-based argumentation, and *Morfologi Kontekstual Berbasis Multimodalitas* (2022), co-written with Jasmine Belinda Budijanto. Her work reflects a strong commitment to bridging linguistic insight with educational innovation.



**R. Kunjana Rahardi** is a distinguished professor of linguistics at Sanata Dharma University, with a doctoral degree from Universitas Gadjah Mada (1999). His research focuses on pragmatics, sociolinguistics, cyberpragmatics, and the pragmatics of politeness in Indonesian sociocultural settings. He has also explored multimodality, cybertextuality, and ecolinguistics in digital discourse. His influential works, including *Pragmatik: Kesantunan Imperatif dalam Bahasa Indonesia* and *Fenomena Ketidaksantunan Berbahasa*, critically examine (im)politeness strategies and language variation. Prof. Rahardi is an active contributor to high-impact journals such as *AILA Review* (Q2), *Journal of Pedagogical Research* (Q1), and *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* (Q1), addressing topics from spatial cybertexts and social media pragmatics to metaphor and multimodal communication. With a strong contextual and theoretical foundation, his scholarship

has significantly shaped the development of Indonesian linguistic studies, especially in adapting to the complexities of digital-era communication.



**Dian E. C. Wardhana** Dian is a lecturer in Indonesian Language and Literature Education at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Bengkulu. She earned her Bachelor's and Master's degrees in Indonesian Language Education from IKIP Malang, and completed her Doctorate in the same field at Universitas Negeri Malang. Her expertise encompasses Indonesian language and literature education, with research interests including academic writing, discourse analysis, and applied linguistics. She has published extensively, with her works appearing in Web of Science (10 articles), Scopus (5 articles), Scopus-SCCI (3 articles), and various nationally accredited journals (Sinta 2, Sinta 3, and Sinta 5). She has also authored and contributed to five books and book chapters. Among her notable publications are *Exploring the Impact of Process-Genre Approach on Learners' Academic Writing and Higher Order Thinking Skills* (Journal of

Language and Education, 2022) and *Kajian Ujaran Kebencian* (Jurnal Ilmiah Korpus, 2018), the latter of which has been cited 118 times.



**Ignatius Dimas Adi Suarjaya** is a primary school teacher at Kinderstation Primary School, Yogyakarta, where he teaches using an international curriculum. He holds a Bachelor of Education in Primary School Teacher Education (2024) and a Master of Education in Indonesian Language Education (2025), both from Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta. His academic interests span elementary education, Indonesian language and literature education, and linguistics. He has authored several scholarly works, including *Perkembangan Kajian Membaca Pemahaman pada Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar Tahun 2014–2024* (2025), *Eksplorasi Alam-Perempuan pada Cerpen "Kehidupan di Dasar Telaga" Karya S. Prasetyo Utomo: Kajian Ekofeminisme* (2025), and *Urgensi Penggunaan Media Teknologi dalam Pembelajaran BIPA Berbasis Budaya Yogyakarta bagi Tingkat Pemula Usia Anak* (2025). His work reflects a commitment to integrating cultural and linguistic

perspectives in early childhood and language education.