

## **CHAPTER V**

# **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

# **CHAPTER V**

## **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

As the conclusion of this study, the writer would like to summarize everything discussed in the previous chapters. Further, she would like to give some suggestions for the Argumentative Writing teachers to help their students compose argumentative essay rationally – free from logical fallacies.

### **5.1 Summary**

Argumentative Writing is the most difficult mode of writing to be learnt. Here, the students have to deal with an issue that is, something about which there is controversy and a variety of opinions, and have to be able to provide a reason to support their point of view. To this point, the students should think rationally. If the way of their thinking is based on emotion or feelings, they will make some logical fallacies in their essays and will not be able to convince their readers about their opinion.

Seeing that some students still had problems in expressing logical views in their essays, the writer was interested in doing an analysis of logical fallacies in Argumentative Writing done by the sixth-semester students of English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya. This study used to see whether the

students still made some logical fallacies in their argumentative essays, and to identify the types of logical fallacies made by them.

This study used the theory of error analysis to analyze the logic errors made by the students. For classification of the fallacies, the writer gathered some books by some experts which can be applied in classifying those logic errors.

By collecting the students' Argumentative Writing final-term test, the writer got the data needed. Then, she identified the sentences which contained logical fallacies, analyzed the errors, classified them into their types. Next, when she had finished analyzing all the errors, she counted the percentage based on the numbers of occurrences of the fallacies.

The findings showed that the sixth – semester students still made logical fallacies in their argumentative essays. Moreover, the writer also met some faulty statements which could not be comprehended at all. Therefore, she did not include such statements in her analysis. Further, those students tended to make some certain types of logical fallacies. Here are the types which are put in orderly based on the frequency of occurrences. They are Faulty or Sweeping Generalization (30.77%), Shifting Ground (23.08%), Oversimplification (15.39%), Irrelevant Reason (15.39%), Post Hoc Ergo Propter Hoc (5.13%), Black Or White Reasoning (2.56%), Hidden Assumption (2.56%), Circular Reasoning(2.56%), and False Authority(2.56%).

Through her whole research, the writer found the cause why these students still made some reasoning errors in their argumentation. It is because the way of their thinking was based on emotion. To this point, the students liked to use emotive

language in order to win their point rather than trying to convince the readers with good reasons. In this case, those students tended to exaggerate and oversimplify the issues. As a result, their rational thought was flawed and their argument lost its strength.

## **5.2 Suggestions**

After the writer found out the types of errors the students made, she would like to give some suggestions to the Argumentative Writing teachers to help their students to avoid making the logic errors in writing argumentative essay.

The Argumentative Writing teachers should give more practice to the students in composing the argumentation. Here, the students should be trained to think rationally or logically in providing the reasons – not to be emotional or use the feelings. To this point, Beardsley (1976:59) stresses that the students should also be trained to choose more neutral words to replace the emotive ones. In this case the choosing of diction played an important role to decide whether the sentences contained logical fallacies or not.

Those teachers can ask their students to rewrite and revise their compositions which have been corrected, so that the students realize their errors and are trained to revise it. Further, the teachers can also give some practice in identifying the sentences which contained logical fallacies made by the students. Then, they discuss it with the students, so that the students will also think how to revise the sentences to make them

free from logic errors. Hopefully, these kinds of practice can help the students avoid making the same mistakes in the future.

Finally, the writer realizes that this study is far from being perfect. It has a lot of shortcomings. Thus, further related studies are needed to complement it.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Beardsley, Monroe C. 1976. **Writing with Reason: Logic for Composition**. New Jersey: Prentice –Hall, Inc.
- Budiono, Davi. 1999. **An Analysis of the Structure of Argument in the Argumentative Compositions of the Sixth – Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya**. Surabaya: Unpublished S-1 Thesis of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University
- D'Angelo, Frank. 1980. **Process and Thought in Composition**. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.
- Dagher, Joseph P. 1976. **Writing: A Practical Guide**. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Dawe, Charles W. and Edward A. Dornan. 1992. **One to One: Resources for Conference – Centered Writing**. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
- Decker, Randall E. 1992. **Decker's Patterns of Expositions 13**. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
- Dixon, Carol N. and Denise Nessel. 1983. **Language Experience Approach to Reading and Writing: Language Experience Reading for Second Language Learners**. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Heffernan, James A. W. and John E. Lincoln. 1986. **Writing: A College Handbook**. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Lannon, John M. 1992. **The Writing Process**. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
- McDonald, Daniel. 1989. **The Language of Argument**. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Reid, Joy M. 1982. **The Process of Composition**. London: Prentice – Hall, Inc.
- Scull, Sharon. 1987. **Critical Reading and Writing for Advanced ESL Students**. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.
- Seale, Barbara. 1978. **Writing Efficiently: A Step By Step Composition Course**. United States of America: 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 University

Tukan, Stephanus Laga, 1989. **Written Argumentative Discourse Analysis: Rules and Procedures.** Surabaya: Unpublished Paper of the English Department of Widya Mandala University

Watkins, Linda – Goffman and Diana G. Berkowits. 1990. **Thinking to Write: A Composing – Process Approach to Writing.** Heinle and Heinle Publishers, a division of Wadsworth, Inc.

White, Ronald V.. 1986. **The Writer's Art: A Practical Rhetoric and Handbook.** New York: Wadsworth, Inc.