CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter presents the summary of the previous chapters and some suggestions for further studies.

5.1 Summary

An argument originates from claims, which are statements that need defending. It is a product of an imaginary conversation between the writer and the reader using proofs/ evidences and assumptions. Taking writing D (now Writing III), the students of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, were taught argumentative compositions in which they had to argue logically and soundly on an issue. In an argumentative composition, the presence of an argument is usually signaled by the use of logical indicators: premise indicators and conclusion indicators. Being aware of the importance of logical indicators in signaling the presence of an argument, and realizing that there are many logical indicators that students might choose to construct their arguments coherently and convincingly, the writer carried out the study under report. She analyzed the argumentative compositions of the fifth semester students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University to see what logical indicators are mostly encountered in their compositions. The underlying concept used in this study is the concept of argumentative writing with special reference to argument logical indicators. To help her describe the logical indicators, the writer made used of a table of logical indicators (see table 3.1 in Appendix 1).

Analyzing the argumentative compositions of 30 students, the writer found six premise indicators i.e. *because, firstly, secondly, the third reason is, the last is, for* and seven conclusion indicators i.e. *so, as a result, therefore, for this reason, which shows that, that is why, hence* are used by the subjects under study. All in all there were 13 logical indicators found in the subjects' argumentative compositions. After counting the percentage of the logical indicators, she found out that in terms of logical indicators, **because** was appeared the most in the subjects' compositions (49, 81%) and **hence** was occupied the least (0, 41%). In the premise indicator, *because* was used the most by the subjects (66, 85%) and *for* (1, 09%) was the least. The conclusion indicator used the most is *so* (76, 19%) and *hence* is the least (1, 59%).

The certain limited types of logical indicators found in the subjects' essays lead to two possible reasons; first, it might happen because the Argumentative Writing teachers and the previous Writing teachers only taught their students the most common logical indicators as found in their essays. Second, the subjects under study have not mastered other logical indicators except those ones because they did not have enough practice or they did not read enough argumentative essays where they can find various types of logical indicators used in context. The most used of because as premise indicator and so as conclusion indicator, indicate that probably those two words are so familiar and seemed to be the easiest and the most effective ones to be applied by the subjects in their arguments, whereas the fact that for as premise indicator and hence as conclusion indicator were used the

least shows that those words were not too familiar to the subjects and not easy to apply in their arguments.

5.2 Suggestions

In line with the findings discussed in chapter 4; in this section, the writer would like to give the following suggestions to the Writing teachers and students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University especially those who are taking Argumentative Writing subject.

First, the teachers of Argumentative Writing are highly expected to teach their students various types of logical indicators and how to use them in shaping their arguments. Using various sources of argumentative writing and their own experiences, they expose their students to various types of logical indicators consisting of words, phrases, and clauses. Besides training their students using these indicators in constructing argumentative sentences, paragraphs, and essays regularly and step by step to make them get the habit of using the logical indicators appropriately. These suggestions are due to the findings of this study which show that the students taking the Argumentative Writing used only a limited number of logical indicators. Whereas actually, as shown in Chapter 2, there are quite a number of logical indicators that might be used.

Secondly, the students of the English Department who are taking the Argumentative Writing (Writing III) must be more active in doing a lot of practices given by the teachers so that they will be able to produce better

argumentative compositions using appropriate but not only limited logical indicators.

Last, this study only focused on the logical indicators encountered in the students' argumentative compositions. There are still many aspects of logical reasoning that the writer was unable to cover. For further study, she suggests that the students of the English Department who are going to conduct researches on discourse analysis, particularly on the field of arguments and logical indicators, investigate the reasons of the Argumentative Writing teachers and also their students for using only a certain limited types of logical indicators in their argumentative compositions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anker, Susan. 1998. *Real Writing. With Readings.* Boston, N. Y: Bedford/ St. Martin, Inc.

Bassham, Greg. 2002. *Critical Thinking: A Students' Introduction.* USA: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Beardsley, Monroe C. 1975. *Thinking Straight. Principles of reasoning for Readers and Writers.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Beardsley, Monroe C. 1976. *Writing with Reason: Logic for Compositions.* New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs.

Bono, Yuliana. 2001. *The Types of Logical Fallacies in an Argumentative Writing Made by the Sixth Semester Students of Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya.* Surabaya: Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University.

Budiono, Davy. 1999. *An Analysis of the Structure of Argument in the Argumentative Compositions of the Sixth-Semester Students of the English Department of WM University, Surabaya.* Surabaya: Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University.

Copi, Irving M. 1982. *Introduction to Logic.* USA: MacMillan Publishing Co. Inc.

Facione, Peter A. and Donal Scherer. 1978. *Logic and Logical Thinking: A Modular Approach.* USA: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Fisher, Alec. 1990. *The Logic of Real Arguments.* Great Britain: Cambridge University, Press 1998.

Heffernan, James A. W. and John E. Lincoln. 1986. *Writing: A College Handbook.* USA: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.

Jones, Michael T. Carlsen. 1983. *Introduction to Logic.* USA: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Lannon, John M. 1992. *The Writing Process.* New York: Harper Collins Publisher, Inc.

Mayberry, Katherine. 1990. *For Argument's Sake.* USA: Harper Collins Publishers.

Mayberry, Katherine. 2005. *Everyday Arguments.* USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Mc. Donald, Daniel. 1989. *The Language of Argument*. New York: Harper and Row, Publisher, Inc.

Ramage, John D. 2004. *Writing Arguments. A Rhetoric with Readings*. USA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Reid, Joy M. 1982. *The Process of Composition*. Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632.

Reid, Stephen. 1989. *The Prentice Hall Guide for College Writers*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Teopilus, Susana. 1986. *The Correlation between the Logic Achievement and the Writing Achievement of the Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala University Along with Its Manifestation in Their Compositions*. Surabaya: Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University.

Tukan, Stefanus Laga. 1989. *Written Argumentative Discourse Analysis: Rules and Procedures*. Surabaya: Unpublished research paper of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University.

Tukan, Stefanus Laga. 1991. *A Study on the Reasoning of the S-1 Students of the English Department As Manifested in Their Argumentative Compositions*. Surabaya: Unpublished S-2 Thesis of IKIP Malang, Fakultas Pasca Sarjana.