

Argumentative Speak Ability In Oral Assessment For Students In Indonesian Language Education Study Program At Muhammadiyah University Of Purwokerto 2010

¹Eko Suroso
Universitas Negeri Sebelas Maret
Central Java, Indonesia
ekosuroso36@gmail.com

³Muhammad Rohmadi
Universitas Negeri Sebelas Maret
Central Java, Indonesia
rohmedi_dbe@yahoo.com

²Sumarlam,
Universitas Negeri Sebelas Maret
Central Java, Indonesia
sumarlamwd@gmail.com

⁴Sumarwati
Universitas Negeri Sebelas Maret
Central Java, Indonesia
watik_uns@ymail.com

ABSTRACT: The phenomenon that occurs among PBSI college student is that there are many students who are not skilled at speaking argumentatively. There are four abilities that must be done by someone so that the conversation's him argumentative, namely the ability to make opinions, compose evidence, reason, and be convincing. The problem that then arises in relation to the ability of students to speak argumentatively is how is the ability of students in (1) making of opinions ?, (2) compiling evidence ?, (3) doing reasoning ?, and (4) convincing? on the oral assessment. This research uses a qualitative approach. The instrument used to determine argumentative speaking ability is the observation sheet. Observations were carried out by three lecturers namely researchers and two other lecturers. The situation chosen is an oral assessment situation because it is more formal and natural. Data analysis was done by evaluative descriptive techniques and mixing analysis. The results of the study showed that in general the argumentative speaking abilities of college students on oral assessment were quite good with a value of 6.05. This value is obtained from the average value of the ability to make opinions 6.52, the value of the ability to compile evidence 5.76, the value of reasoning ability 6.15, and the value of convincing abilities 5.78. Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that the learning program should better emphasize argumentative communicative aspects with improvements in all aspects of argumentative speaking.

Keywords: speaking, argumentative, and oral assessment

I. INTRODUCTION

The symptom that looked among PBSI / FKIP college student at Muhammadiyah University in Purwokerto was that their inability speak argumentatively. When they answer the lecturers' questions, their answers just only answers (not answers question). When they discuss, they are more much silent. If there are one or two

college students who argue, they generally express their opinions without accurate data. If they using data in their opinion, in general they not doing reasoning to relate data to opinions that have been stated

When researchers conduct Pragmatic learning the researcher asked the college students as follows:

Researchers	: What is presupposition?
College Student	: presupposition is the presumption of others
Researchers	: what is an example?
College Student	: ... (unable to give an example)

college Student A's answer impressed just only answers because it was unclear what other people's presumption meant in that matter; whether the speaker's presumption with the other person speech or the presumption of opposing speech to the speaker. In addition, college student A's answer was not accompanied by an example. Therefore, this answer is categorized as a less argumentative answer

Different answers are given by other college students. College student B gives the following answer:

Presupposition is a person's presumption of an opposing speech, for example: How many times have you changed shoes in this week?

That college student answers contain opinions *Presupposition is a person's presumption of an opposing speech* and data in the form of examples. However, the answer does not express what reasoning and how the relationship of the example with the opinion that has been expressed. Therefore, too this answer is categorized as a less argumentative answer.

In the academic world, argumentative speaking skills were very necessary. Based on this phenomenon, the researcher assumed that there were probably many college students of PBSI FKIP UMP Purwokerto 2010 whose argumentative speaking skills were very lacking. However,

this is still the assumption of the researcher. To prove whether the researchers' assumptions are true or false, an empirical study needs to be done. Therefore, research in title of *Argumentative Speech Ability in the PBSI / FKIP Student Oral assessment in Muhammadiyah Purwokerto University 2010* is very important to do.

The problem that then arise in relation on this title there are two, namely general problems and special problems. The general problem is How is argumentative speaking ability in the oral assessment of PBSI / FKIP Study Program students at Muhammadiyah University of Purwokerto 2010? In particular, this study seeks to answer four problems. The first problem is how is the ability of college students in make opinions / establishments on oral assessment? The second problem is how is the ability of college students in compile evidence at oral assessment? The third problem is how is the ability of college students in the do reasoning at oral assessment? The fourth problem is What is the ability of students in convincing / influencing efforts on oral assessment?

Speaking is the most efficient and effective communication tool (Gazdar, Gerald. 1979: 31). Definitely a speaking is essentially ability to produce the current of the articulation sound system to convey at will, needs, feelings, and desires to others (Grice, H. P. 1975: 34). An oral communication often fails simply because the method his use is not right. Someone often misunderstands because of miscommunication in speaking (Ardiana, I. L. dkk. 2003). Therefore, speaking skills are needed so that someone's life becomes more useful.

Argumentative is a form of the nature of an argument. In everyday language, the argument has different meanings in different contexts (Cassirer, E. 1987: 71). The first meaning, the argument refers to a certain interaction, namely a fight between two or more people that occurs because there is a disagreement between them. The argument in the second meaning is to propose an opinion or opinion accompanied by evidence, reasoning and convincing efforts (Sampson, Geoffrey. 1980: 72). In this study used arguments in the second meaning, namely opinions or opinions accompanied by evidence, reasoning and convincing efforts. Thus, what is meant by argumentative speaking is a communication activity to express opinions (opinions) accompanied by evidence, reasoning, and convincing efforts.

II. METHOD

The approach used in this study is a qualitative approach, namely the description the ability to speak argumentative the college student's (Ary D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavieh, A. 1982: 53). There are four main ability factors (Smith, R. 2016.: 53) and 35 points of observation that will be described in relation to college students' argumentative speaking skills. The four main that factors are (1) the ability of college students to make opinions / establishment (eight points of observation), (2) the ability of college students to compile evidence (nine points of observation), (3) the ability of college students to do reasoning (ten

points of observation), and (4) the ability of college students in convincing efforts (eight points of observation).

The data of this study are the ability of college students to speak argumentatively during oral assessment. The data sources of this study are college students of PBSI in the sixth semester of 2010, totaling 44 of college students. This number is a sample of 37% of 120 college students. Data is taken by observation techniques. To minimize subjectivity, this observation technique was carried out by three lecturers namely researchers and two other lecturers. The situation chosen is an oral assessment situation because it is more formal and natural. The instrument used to find out argumentative speaking skills is the observation sheet with previous tests of validity and reliability. Data analysis was done by evaluative descriptive techniques and mixing analysis.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Students' Ability of Expressing Argument

The data of this study are the ability of college students to speak argumentatively during oral assessment. The data sources of this study are college students of PBSI in the sixth semester of 2010, totaling 44 of college students. This number is a sample of 37% of 120 college students. Data is taken by observation techniques. To minimize subjectivity, this observation technique was carried out by three lecturers namely researchers and two other lecturers. The situation chosen is an oral assessment situation because it is more formal and natural. The instrument used to find out argumentative speaking skills is the observation sheet with previous tests of validity and reliability. Data analysis was done by evaluative descriptive techniques and mixing analysis.

There are two possibilities why college students get enough grades. The first possibility is because the basic ability (IQ) of students is below the standard (based on IQ tests by the UM Purwokerto Psychology Consultation Bureau) (Bonwell, C. C., Eison, J. A. 1991: 27). The second possibility is due to lack of practice. Lack of practice in this case includes being insecure or nervous when dealing with examiners. This attitude is also very decisive so that someone becomes skilled or becomes able to speak argumentatively (Gage, N.L., dan David C. Berliner. 2014: 99). Therefore, so that this nervous or inferior attitude can be eliminated or minimized, it is necessary to practice regularly.

If the first possibility is due to the low ability to think, it is very unlikely that the students' argumentative speaking skills can be improved (Gagne, R. M. 1977: 55). If it can be improved, the increase will not be maximal (Santrock, J. W. 2010). If the second possibility is that the low results of argumentative speaking skills are caused by a lack of training, then there is still an opportunity to improve the argumentative speaking abilities of students by increasing the practice of argumentative speaking (Sibarani. B. 2006: 33).

There are four factors that can determine whether a conversation is argumentative categorized or not: the ability to make an opinion, the ability to show evidence, the ability to do reasoning, and the ability to influence (Smith, R. 2016.: 53). Based on the results of the study, it can be seen that of the four factors that get the highest score is the ability to make opinions (6.52). Even though the value is highest among the other 3 abilities, the ability to make opinions is still in the sufficient category. This ability gets the highest score compared to the other three supporting abilities because this ability is easier to make than making three other abilities.

To make an opinion it only takes courage to express (Spector1, B., Sudo, Y. 2017: 37). There is a habit among college's students when they get the task to express an opinion, namely in origin of opinion. The problem of how later the accountability of his opinion is usually unthinkable. Moreover, who argued have the ability to think below the standard, the accountability of opinion will be difficult to think about beforehand. Craw & Craw (1984: 212) says that one of the characteristics of low thinking ability is the lack of ability to concentrate on something except in easy things. Kemampuan pendukung kedua adalah kempuan menunjukkan bukti. Kemampuan ini menduduki ranking ke empat dengan nilai 5,76.

This ability to show evidence seems more difficult than the ability of reasoning and ability to influence. From the results of the study it was stated that the ability to compile evidence get it a lower value (5.76) than the value of reasoning ability (6.15) and ability to influence (5.78). The ability to compile evidence becomes more difficult because the evidence requires facts or conditions that can be observed objectively, convincingly, and can be accepted as truth by many people (Haugh, M. 2010: 133). To be able to show objective evidence a person cannot just say something as is someone express opinions, reasoning, and / or influence that all three only need speaking skills (Kistner S., et al. 2015: 19).

The third supporting ability is reasoning ability. Based on the results of the study, this reasoning ability was ranked second with a value of 6.15. Actually the ability to reason with the ability to compile evidence is an inseparable ability. The collected evidence must be logically connected so that it can be an argument. The ability to connect evidence logically is what is then called reasoning. It seems that students are more skilled at speaking than having to look for evidence or facts. It is seen that the results of the ability to make opinions (speaking) and the ability to connect (speak) facts and the ability to influence (speak) get ranks one, two, and three rather than the ability to present evidence or facts that are ranked fourth. To be able to present evidence or facts a person cannot act as blindly as making an opinion, looking for a relationship of facts with opinion (reasoning), and / or influencing (Thomas, Linda & Wareing, Shan. 2006: 123)

The fourth supporting ability is the ability to influence. This ability to influence gets the third rank with a value of 5.78. This ability also requires plus skills than

the ability to make opinion or reasoning abilities. Besides being able to show accurate evidence, this ability to influence requires the ability of convincing delivery techniques (Phillips, T. C. S. 2017: 147). The average college student lacks confidence in speaking so it seems less convincing. However this ability to influence is still better than the ability to show evidence.

B. Mixing Analysis

This mixing analysis is done by asking for comments and / or opinions from the other partners besides the researcher about college students' argumentative speaking skills. In this case, the partner besides the researcher was asked for his opinion about the speaker who got the highest value, the middle value, and the lowest value. The results observation partner said that the way to spoke college students who got the highest value (8.83) was quite good because it was supported by good expressions and attitudes. The answers to several questions about things related to the topic are appropriate, but the answers about students psychological differences the elementary, middle, and high school less argumentative. In general, the ability of college students who get the highest value in argumentative speaking is quite convincing even though it has not arrived at the ability to influence (change) the concepts or thoughts of the speech partner. One speaker who get a middle value (6.29) showed that his argumentative ability was quite good, but he was unable to provide evidence. Speakers are quite sure of the truth of the arguments that have been put forward. Speakers who get the lowest value (4.13) indicate that the way to himspeak is fluent but not focused. To explain a subject, speakers must use long, convoluted sentences. His argumentative ability is actually quite convincing but because the sentences used to explain are too long, then the reasoning is not clear. The evidence shown was less accurate. Speakers feel less confident about what they say.

IV. CONCLUSION

In general, this study concluded that the argumentative speaking ability of college students at oral examinations was categorized enough sufficient. This category can be seen from the results obtained with a value of 6.05. There are two possibilities that cause college students to lack skill in speaking argumentatively. The first possibility is the low thinking ability of college students (with the results of the IQ test proving conducted by the UM Purwokerto Psychology Consultation Bureau). The second possibility is the lack of intensive training. The results of this study also inform that these college students are categorized as lacking in terms of the ability to compile evidence and the ability to convince or influence. However, in the ability to make opinions and the ability to do reasoning, these college students are categorized enough.

REFERENCES

- Ardiana, I. L. dkk. 2003. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas. Pelatihan Terintegrasi Berbasis Kompetensi Guru*

- mata pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ditjen Dikdasmen.
- Ary D., Jacobs, L.C. & Razavieh, A. 1982. *Pengantar Penelitian Pendidikan*. Terjemahan Oleh Arief Furchan.. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.
- Bonwell, C. C., Eison, J. A. 1991. *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Cassirer, E. 1987. *Manusia dan Kebudayaan*. Terjemahan oleh Alois A. Nugroho. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Crow, L. D & Crow, A. 1984. *Psikologi Pendidikan*. Terjemahan oleh Z. Kasijan. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.
- Gage, N.L., dan David C. Berliner. 2014. *Educational Psychology*. Chicago: Rand Mc Nally Collage Publishing Company.
- Gagne, R. M. 1977. *The conditions of learning*. New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. *Pragmatics, Implicature, Presupposition, and Logical Form*. England: Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and Conversation. *Syntax and Semantics*, 3 (2) 41–58.
- Haugh, M. 2010. When is an email really offensive? Argumentativity and variability in evaluations of impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 6(1), 7–31.
- Kistner S., Rakoczy, K., Otto, B., Klieme, E., & Büttner, G. 2015. Teaching learning strategies: The role of instructional context and teacher beliefs. *Educational Research Online*, 7 (1), 176-197.
- Phillips, T. C. S. 2017. Pragmatics and the aims of language evolution. *Psychon Bull Rev*, 24:186–189
- Sampson, Geoffrey. 1980. *Schools of Linguistics*. London: Hutchinso & Co.
- Santrock, J. W. 2010. *Child Development*. McGraw: Hill Education,
- Sibarani. B. 2006. Metode Pengajaran Bahasa Berbasis Kompetensi. *Englonesian*, 2 (1), 60-64.
- Spector1, B., Sudo, Y. 2017. Presupposed ignorance and exhaustification: How scalar implicatures and presuppositions interact?. *Linguist and Philos*, 12 (2), 1-45.
- Smith, R. 2016. Building ‘Applied Linguistic Historiography’: Rationale, Scope, and Methods. *Applied Linguistics*, 37(1), 71–87
- Thomas, Linda & Wareing, Shan. 2006. *Language, Society and Power. An Introduction*. New York: Routledge.