

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Conclusion

Argumentative writing skill is one of the essential skills required to be mastered by the students of the English Department of UWM to be able to compose a Paper Writing or Thesis Writing. To be able to write an argumentative writing well, one is required to be able to express his/her idea clearly and systematically so that the purpose of convincing others can be achieved.

Seeing that some students still have difficulty in producing a sound and convincing argument, the writer was interested in studying this phenomenon. Thus, he decided to analyze the structure of argument contained within the argumentative compositions to be able to study the cause of the errors and offer some solutions to answer this problem.

For this purpose, the writer chose the E class of the sixth-semester students of the 1994 academic year as his subject of the study since in the time of the study, these students have already passed the Argumentative Class. The writer hoped that the findings of this study could be generalized to the sixth-semester students of the English Department of Widya Mandala

University since the subject of the study represents the characteristics of the sixth-semester students.

Based on the findings on the study, the writer was able to conclude that the seven types of argument patterns as proposed by Maccoun are used by the sixth-semester students of the English Department of UWM. Those types are the zig-zag solution pattern, the source's bias pattern, the one-sided argument pattern, the eclectic approach pattern, the pointers pattern, the other side questioned pattern, and the disagreement with no refutation pattern. The mostly used pattern is the disagreement with no refutation pattern (47.36%), followed by the zig-zag solution pattern (15.78%) and the eclectic approach pattern along with the other side questioned pattern (10.52%). Meanwhile, the least chosen patterns are the source's bias pattern, the one-sided argument pattern, and the pointers pattern (5.26%). On the types of argument errors made by the students in their argumentative compositions, the writer was able to conclude that 29.26% of the students made errors by not refuting the opposing data and 26.82% included fallacies of straw argument in their data. Moreover, 14.63% used fallacies of emotive language while another 14.63% made errors by using obscure authority in their supporting data. In addition, 4.87% included *non-sequitur* fallacies while the rest made errors by providing slippery slope fallacies, drawing hasty generalization, using *ad populum* fallacies, and concluding a shallow claim.

From the above conclusions the writer had finally come to a general conclusion that the errors of a faulty argument can be analyzed through its structural pattern. By knowing the effective and proper pattern of argument, the students are expected to have no more impediments in composing a written argument since in the art of composing an argument, one should be able to back up his argument with accurate evidence and logical reasoning. Thus, through a well-planned pattern of argument, the aims of convincing others can be achieved easily.

5.2. Suggestions

The writer here wishes to propose several suggestions to the English Department, argumentative writing lecturers, and fellow students who also wish to study the argumentative discourse in the future.

First, the writer realizes the importance of the reading subject to equip the students with necessary reading skills and information for composing a scientific paper. Thus, the writer hopes that the present English Department should expand the materials for this subject so that the students will have plenty resources in producing written compositions for academic purposes. This improvement can be done by including teaching, linguistics, or literature topics as the materials so that the students will have enough background

knowledge or information when conducting studies on these topics in the future.

Second, the writer suggests that the argumentative writing lecturers should emphasis initially on the fundamental theories of argument as also taught in Logic and Discourse Analysis subjects. They can include relevant materials, such as: deductive and inductive method of reasoning, syllogism, argumentation analysis, etc., to improve the students' knowledge to be able to compose a well argument. By doing this, the writer hopes that students will find the Writing V subject to be easier, more interesting, and challenging.

Last but not least, the writer suggests other students to conduct further studies on this topic. There are still so many aspects that the writer is still unable to cover. However, for continuing this study, the writer suggests the study of the effect of different argument patterns and refutation strategies toward the effectivity level of an argument or the study of minimizing the students' argument errors by implementing logic and discourse analysis in the argumentative writing.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Barnart, Clarence L. and Robert K. Barnart. 1982. The World Book Dictionary. Doubleday & Company Inc., Chicago.
- Beardsley, Monroe C. 1976. Thinking Straight: Principles of Reasoning for Readers and Writers. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- Cobb, Charles Miguel. 1985. Process and Pattern. Heinle & Heinle Publishers Inc., Boston.
- Copi, Irving R. 1982. An Introduction to Logic. MacMillan, New York.
- Decker, Randall E. 1992. Decker's Patterns of Exposition 13. Harper Collins Publishers Inc., New York.
- Erlinawati, Widia. 1993. An Analysis of Coherence Devices on the Argumentative Writings of the Sixth-semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya. Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala University, Surabaya.
- Glatthorn, Allan A. 1981. The English Book – A Complete Course. Science Research Associates Inc., Chicago.
- Hatch, Evelyn. 1992. Discourse and Language Education. Cambridge Language Teaching Library, Cambridge.
- Hornby, A.S. 1974. Oxford Advanced Dictionary of Current English. Oxford University Press, London.
- Indrajani, Vivi. 1995. A Study of the Expository Composition Coherence of the Fifth-semester Students of the English Department of

- Widya Mandala University. Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala University, Surabaya.
- O'Hear, Anthony. 1990. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Popper, Karl. 1962. Conjectures and Refutations. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Quinton, Anthony. 1980. Francis Bacon. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Renkema, Jan. 1993. Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Schwegler, Robert A. 1988. Patterns in Action. Scott, Foresman and Company, Illinois.
- Spurgin, Sally DeWitt. 1989. The Power to Persuade: A Rhetoric and Reader for Argumentative Writing. Prentice Hall, New Jersey.
- 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. Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala University, Surabaya.
- Tukan, Stefanus Laga. 1989. Written Argumentative Discourse Analysis: Rules and Procedures. Unpublished Paper of the English Department of Widya Mandala University, Surabaya.
- Warnick, Barbara and Edward S. Inch. 1994. Critical Thinking and Communication: The Use of Reason in Argument. Macmillan Publishing Company, New York.