

Research Article

Improving Scientific Argumentation in University Students Through a Training Approach

Rohayati Rohayati*, Syihabuddin Syihabuddin, Dadang Anshori, Andoyo Sastromiharjo

Indonesian Language Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Dr. Setiabudhi Street No.229, Bandung, Indonesia

ORCID

Syihabuddin Syihabuddin: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9094-3656>

Dadang Anshori: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0109-1181>

Andoyo Sastromiharjo: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2711-0328>

Abstract.

The capacity to recognize formal arguments is crucial for clinical literacy. However, college students frequently lack a structural understanding of those arguments, in particular when the arguments are extra complicated. This study used an experimental method with a pre-post-check design. A follow-up of four weeks was used to research whether courses on figuring out the structural additives of casual arguments would enhance college students' competence to recognize complicated arguments. The course was embedded in a constructivist mastering surroundings, and its content material was primarily based totally on Toulmin's argument shape model, consistent with which arguments may be deconstructed into numerous purposeful additives: claims, datums, warrants, helping evidence, and rebuttals. Being capable of discovering warrants was primary to clinical literacy due to the fact warrants decide whether an end was justified primarily based totally on data. The effects display that schooling in argument shape typically no longer enhances overall recital for all college pupils and argument kinds, however, it's miles beneficial for figuring out extra complicated arguments with much less specific systems and relational components among key additives (i.e. warrants). High-reaching college students gain maximum from this intervention, and it additionally enables college students with excessive pretest correctness scores. Our effects advocate that interferences to sell argumentation abilities need to be included in the curriculum, and those interventions need to be designed to shape the skill degree of learners.

Keywords: Scientific Argumentation, University Students, Training Approach

1. INTRODUCTION

Argument know-how abilities are very crucial for studying and choice making in regular existence [1, 2]. Ordinary humans interested by socio-medical troubles along with technology, media, vaccination, or genetically changed food are confronted with a myriad of distinctive, and frequently conflicting, arguments. Similarly, while college students take

Corresponding Author: Rohayati

Rohayati; email:

rohayati136@upi.edu

Published: 26 April 2024

Publishing services provided by
Knowledge E

© Rohayati Rohayati et al. This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the ICMScE Conference Committee.

 OPEN ACCESS

a look at approximately a systematic topic, they may be requested to examine loads of documents, a lot of which incorporate contradictory proof for distinctive theoretical claims. Being capable of recognize the claims and arguments supplied in distinctive texts is an crucial issue of medical literacy [3, 4]. Knowledge of the way an issue is established is vital for know-how medical facts and for figuring out the best of an issue [5, 6]. However, a massive wide variety of college students have insufficient abilities to recognize arguments [7, 8]. For example, effects from the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) for studying and medical literacy monitor that almost all of excessive faculty college students can use fundamental medical know-how to discover legitimate conclusions or medical proof for a claim. However, simplest a minority of them are capable of discover greater complicated arguments, use proof to assess the best of arguments, relate disparate know-how, or follow applicable know-how to surprising or real-existence situations [4, 9]. Similarly, simplest a small wide variety of college students are capin a position to differentiate among applicable and beside the point facts. Although technological know-how college students carry out better than the OECD common for literacy, those college students face the equal problem.

A formal argument continues reality due to the fact the realization should be authentic so long as the premises are authentic. On the alternative hand, in a sturdy casual argument, the realization may also comply with from the proof stated [10, 11]. Scientific claims are frequently now no longer unique facts, however interpretations of proof (typically empirical) which can be open to grievance and may be challenged with new information (for example, via way of means of imparting counter proof). Although, much like formal arguments, casual arguments include a declare and one or greater reasons, they will incorporate extra components. Toulmin (1958) proposed his version as a response to the conventional angle of formal reasoning. According to Toulmin's argumentation version, a whole argument consists of some of key components: declare, reason (or datum/records), warrant, assisting proof, and rebuttal [1, 3, 10–12]. Claims are the principle contentious statements. Claims are, via way of means of definition, controversial, and want to be supported via way of means of theoretical or empirical proof called datums (or records). Claims and records are related via way of means of a warrant. Warrants decide the electricity of the proof for the principle declare, or, in different words, imply whether or not a end may be justified on the idea of the records. Another component, known as assisting proof, affords support (empirical or theoretical) for the warrant. Finally, rebuttals incorporate counter-arguments or imply occasions wherein the argument does now no longer hold.

This take a look at investigates whether or not argument shape schooling can enhance the competence of technology college students to recognize medical argumentation. In particular, it changed into tested which sorts of arguments had been specially tough and whether or not college students in experimental situations could be capable of enhance their overall performance to apprehend the special additives of an issue, inclusive of arguments with much less exclusive systems and arguments with much less regular additives (i.e., assurance, support). This test ambitions to boom college students' familiarity with the shape of medical argumentation with the aid of using coaching them a way to discover the special additives of an issue and their relationships. The difference between this research and previous research is that the method used is a training-based approach and sees its effectiveness in improving students' argumentation skills. The contribution of this research is that a teacher is able to improve the quality of students' arguments through component training. Finally, we inspected as an examining studies query whether or not pretest accuracy could expect or mild overall performance at posttest and follow-up. The following studies questions and hypotheses had been formulated: Is argument shape schooling capable of enhance argument know-how and enhance medical argumentation skills? We anticipate contributors with inside the experimental circumstance as a way to enhance their know-how of the diverse additives of the Toulmin model, as meditated in better posttest and follow-up accuracy scores, in comparison to the manage circumstance.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This examine used an experimental technique with a pre-post-take a look at layout with a follow-up of four weeks later to analyze whether or not education in figuring out the structural additives of formal arguments can enhance college students' competence to apprehend complicated arguments [11]. The contributors on this examine had been a hundred and twenty technological know-how college students (Biology, Physics, and Chemistry) on the college level (60 boys, 60 girls) with a mean age of 24 years ($SD = 5.70$) who participated on this examine. The college students who participated on this examine had been 2nd and 0.33 semester college students.

2.1. Instruments for Pretest, Posttest, and Follow-up

The tool used on this studies is textual content cloth in every consultation and evaluation. The textual content cloth furnished to perceive the unique additives of the argument

is a brief argumentative textual content with a mean period of ninety phrases in every argument. The texts are summaries of present empirical articles from numerous fields of technological know-how with inside the domain names of biology and physics, and are tailored to healthy the shape of Toulmin's (1958) model. Each model of the cloth incorporates 5 texts and one pattern exercise. Three of the texts are entire arguments, inclusive of claims, datums, warrants, helping evidence, and rebuttals (Toulmin 1958), and certainly considered one among them incorporates handiest claims, datums, and rebuttals.

2.2. Instrument Validation

Text and assessment units for pretest, posttest, and follow-up had been normalized and verified with inside the take a look at with the aid of using [11] and with inside the pilot take a look at earlier than the take a look at with the aid of using [10]. The correlation among parallel variations on this take a look at turned into $r = .86$, $p < .01$. For argument shape schooling (ie texts utilized in academic and exercise sessions), inter-rater reliability turned into decided with the aid of using doctorates of science. There turned into excessive settlement amongst raters that each one argument additives with inside the schooling substances had been defined and described correctly, Cohen's = 0.95.

2.3. Procedure

Participants had been examined in businesses of as much as 4 human beings in keeping with institution and finished a complete of 4 sessions, consisting of pretest, schooling intervention, posttest, and follow-up. The gap among the pretest and the schooling intervention turned into five days, the posttest turned into done 20 mins after the schooling consultation, and the follow-up turned into done three weeks later. Although contributors had been allowed as an awful lot time as they wanted to finish the task, on average, the pretest took approximately 1 hour, the schooling consultation and posttest blended approximately a hundred mins (70 mins for schooling and half-hour for posttest), and follow-up turned into approximately forty mins. Apart from the argument shape take a look at or velocity analyzing take a look at, contributors finished any other task (i.e. comparing the validity of the argument) with inside the pretest, posttest, and follow-up sessions, as a way to now no longer be mentioned on this work. Data analysis to see

the effect of the training approach on students' argumentation skills was carried out through multiple regression analysis.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Both schooling corporations performed the identical accuracy rating at the pretest, $p > .05$. Atypical and entire arguments ($M = .52$, $SE = .04$) had been extra tough to pick out than normal and incomplete arguments ($M = .68$, $SE = .05$), $p < .001$. Complete arguments are extra difficult than arguments with simplest 3 components ($M = .89$, $SE = .03$), $p < .001$. Thus, complicated arguments with much less extraordinary systems are extra difficult to pick out than arguments with extra extraordinary systems.

TABLE 1: Condition of finger holes in each instrument number.

Variable	B	SEB	t (df)	F (dfh, dfe)	R2	ΔR2	Sig
Step 1				3.45 (3,45)*	.19		
Intercept	.68	.03	28.46*** (35)				
Training condition (TC)	.03	.03	1.40 (47)			.03	.06
Pretest accuracy (PA)	.05	.04	2.40** (48)			.12	.07
PA* TC	.02	.04	1.05 (47)			.04	.05
Step 2				7.08 (6,35)***	.41		
Intercept	.70	.06	40.23*** (46)				
Training condition (TC)	.06	.06	1.77 (47)			.05	.00
Posttest accuracy (PA)	.08	.06	4.76*(46)			.13	.00
PA* TC	.07	.06	2.21 (49)			.07	.00
Study performance (SP)	.08	.07	3.45** (47)			.18	.00
SP* TC	.05	.06	3.08* (47)			.07	.00

The outcomes for Model 1 (Table 1) display that standard argument shape education turned into capable of enhance overall performance at posttest or follow-up, $p > .05$. In the pretest segment observed values ($B = 0.06$, $SE = 0.04$, $Sig\ fee > 0.05$). This fee suggests that on the time of the pretest, the college students' argumentative competencies had been nevertheless low. Furthermore, there has been a full-size distinction among the education organization and the manage organization which turned into observed with inside the posttest for the cap potential to become aware of ratings ($B = 0.08$, $SE = 0.06$, $Sig\ fee < 0.05$). This suggests a full-size increase,

specifically with inside the argumentation component. In a greater precise evaluation with argument additives, a full-size impact of the education situations turned into found out for the cap potential to become aware of warrants ($B = 0.12$, $SE = 0.05$, $p < 0.001$, one-sided, $R^2 = 0.10$), with notably elevated accuracy ratings with inside the argument shape education organization ($M = .78$, $SE = .07$), as compared to the velocity studying education organization ($M = .50$, $SE = .06$). In the posttest, Model 2 found out the principle impact of the education situations for the identity of atypical, entire arguments ($B = 0.07$, $SE = 0.04$, $p < .01$, $R^2 = .08$, one-sided), with contributors with inside the experimental situation receiving a better posttest accuracy ($M = .79$, $SE = .05$), as compared to the ones with inside the manage situation ($M = .60$, $SE = .04$).

Thus, those records guide the hypothesis, contributors with inside the experimental organization had been capable of enhance their cap potential to become aware of much less standard additives and greater complicated arguments with much less standard systems. The outcomes observed in our have a look at may be interpreted in the theoretical framework of intellectual models. Whereas arguments with greater specific additives and a specific claim-first shape have a tendency to be congruent with the present day nation of the reader's intellectual model, arguments with much less specific additives and much less specific systems appear like greater challenging. We don't forget that education in figuring out the structural additives of a controversy, such as people who sign the connection among key additives (i.e. warrants), lets in for greater correct production of argument representations in reminiscence and enables college students to set off exclusive additives of a controversy concurrently whilst seeking to recognize a controversy. Not all of us advantages from education interventions to the identical extent. Students with higher educational success advantage maximum from argumentation education.

This test investigates how education with inside the cap potential to understand the exceptional structural additives of a controversy can boom college students' competence to recognize casual arguments. Results display that familiarizing college students with argument shape improves their cap potential to understand greater complicated (full) or much less ordinary instructions and arguments [7, 9]. Generally, college students felt greater ready with the Toulmin version after the intervention. Different factors of the constructivist gaining knowledge of environment, along with video-primarily based totally tutorials, exercise phases, and the presence of feedback, had been observed to be useful [13, 14]. Students with terrific grades specially benefited from the education intervention, as meditated with inside the big development in overall performance after the intervention for individuals who participated with inside the argument shape

education. In addition, college students who're to begin with capable of understand greater complicated sorts of arguments can similarly decorate this cap potential with inside the intervention [15, 16]. Our effects display that the shift in interest to relational elements among argument additives (ie warrants) indicates the finest development in college students' posttest overall performance. Thus, the purchase of conceptual and procedural understanding of casual arguments might also additionally have helped set up an correct illustration of the important thing additives of the argument, which include warrants. Students who take argument shape education are usually capable of enhance their overall performance to understand much less ordinary argument additives, along with warrants, and greater complicated (full) arguments with much less ordinary structures [17, 18].

However, contributors in each agencies have been noticeably correct of their cap potential to understand the extra usual additives, together with rebuttal (90% accuracy), and, to a lesser extent, claims (70% accuracy), and data (75% accuracy) or much less complicated argument types, together with arguments with most effective 3 additives (89% accuracy), earlier than intervention. These consequences recommend that scholars seem to have a few previous know-how of (much less complicated) argument structures, and that our consequences are probable stimulated via way of means of different effects. However, most effective a small percent of contributors in our take a look at have been capable of successfully become aware of warrants (35%). The accuracy price for warrant identity nearly doubled after the intervention for folks that participated with inside the argument shape schooling (64%), indicating that the intervention specially expanded recognition of the relational components among argument additives very strongly. Thus, schooling can be specially beneficial for much less usual additives, together with warrants, and for extra complicated and exhaustive arguments with much less usual structures [19, 20]. Our consequences are consistent with preceding studies displaying that scholars generally tend to disregard the consistency of inner arguments [19, 21], however that schooling in argument shape can powerful in overcoming this deficit [20, 22].

We expect that scholars are doing thoroughly of their present day schooling due to the fact they're extra acquainted with numerous clinical texts than college students in general [8, 21]. There is a few applicable historical past expertise approximately the shape of the argument. This expertise might also additionally permit them to extra without difficulty understand, combine and follow statistics from education interventions. Moreover, their enjoy with extraordinary clinical literatures might also additionally have facilitated their argument comprehension skills [17, 23]. In precise, college students

with very excessive instructional fulfillment have been in particular capable of enhance their competence to pick out helping proof for warrants, indicating that those college students paid precise interest to the much less normal and relational factors of argument. In our experiment, we additionally tested the impact of pretest accuracy on posttest performance.

4. CONCLUSION

It may be concluded that the purchase of epistemic competence in formal education and schooling can enhance medical argumentation competencies. loss of exercise is one of the major motives why college students discover it tough to understand (greater complex) arguments. Interventions to sell argumentation competencies have to be protected with inside the curriculum to assist college students broaden their medical argumentation competencies. A greater lively schema is wanted to manual understanding. The intervention have to additionally be designed to match the traits of the learners. Requiring college students to examine numerous medical files on a normal foundation can be step one to permit the development of a few applicable structural knowledge, that could in the long run assist them gain from similarly education in argumentation competencies. Recommendations for further research should pay attention to several variables, including paying attention to gender variables that might reveal new findings, involving a wider sample from various levels, and involving social topics.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge several parties including Prof. Syihabudin, Prof. Dadang Anshori and Dr. Andoyo Sastromiharjo, M.Pd., as well as the Indonesian University of Education. These parties have helped researchers in carrying out this research, so that it runs smoothly.

References

- [1] Hadianto D, Damaianti VS, Mulyati Y, Sastromiharjo A. Effectiveness of literacy teaching design integrating local culture discourse and activities to enhance reading skills. *Cogent Education*. 2022;9(1):0–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.2016040>.

- [2] Cinici A. Balancing the pros and cons of GMOs: socio-scientific argumentation in pre-service teacher education. *Int J Sci Educ*. 2016;38(11):1841–66.
- [3] Gilles B, Buck G. Preservice teachers' use of discourse to shape the construction of scientific arguments. *J Sci Teach Educ*. 2020;31(3):291–310.
- [4] Jönsson A. Student performance on argumentation task in the Swedish national assessment in science. *Int J Sci Educ*. 2016;38(11):1825–40.
- [5] Hadianto D, Damaianti VS, Mulyati Y, Sastromiharjo A. Enhancing scientific argumentation skill through partnership comprehensive literacy. *J Phys Conf Ser*. 2021;2098(1):012015.
- [6] Gibson K. Analogy in scientific argumentation. *Tech Commun Q*. 2008;17(2):202–19.
- [7] Heng LL, Surif J, Seng CH. Malaysian students' scientific argumentation: do groups perform better than individuals? *Int J Sci Educ*. 2015;37(3):505–28.
- [8] Infante P, Licona PR. Translanguaging as pedagogy: developing learner scientific discursive practices in a bilingual middle school science classroom. *Int J Biling Educ Biling*. 2021;24(7):913–26.
- [9] Clayton DS, Gautier C. Scientific argumentation in earth system science education. *J Geosci Educ*. 2006;54(3):374–82.
- [10] Ford MJ. A dialogic account of sense-making in scientific argumentation and reasoning. *Cogn Instr*. 2012;30(3):207–45.
- [11] Erduran S, Kaya E. Scientific argumentation and deliberative democracy: an incompatible mix in school science? *Theory Pract*. 2016;55(4):302–10.
- [12] Acar O, Turkmen L, Roychoudhury A. Student difficulties in socio-scientific argumentation and decision-making research findings: crossing the borders of two research lines. *Int J Sci Educ*. 2010;32(9):1191–206.
- [13] Bathgate M, Crowell A, Schunn C, Cannady M, Dorph R. The learning benefits of being willing and able to engage in scientific argumentation. *Int J Sci Educ*. 2015;37(10):1590–612.
- [14] Christenson N, Chang Rundgren SN. A framework for teachers assessment of socio-scientific argumentation: an example using the GMO issue. *J Biol Educ*. 2015;49(2):204–12.
- [15] Jones L. Developing deaf children's conceptual understanding and scientific argumentation skills: A literature review. *Deafness Educ Int*. 2014;16(3):146–60.
- [16] Koffman BG, Kreutz KJ, Trenbath K. Integrating scientific argumentation to improve undergraduate writing and learning in a global environmental change course. *J Geosci Educ*. 2017;65(3):231–9.

- [17] Mao L, Liu OL, Roohr K, Belur V, Mulholland M, Lee HS, et al. Validation of automated scoring for a formative assessment that employs scientific argumentation. *Educ Assess*. 2018;23(2):121–38.
- [18] McNeill KL, Marco-Bujosa LM, González-Howard M, Loper S. Teachers' enactments of curriculum: fidelity to procedure versus fidelity to goal for scientific argumentation. *Int J Sci Educ*. 2018;40(12):1455–75.
- [19] Shemwell JT, Furtak EM. Science classroom discussion as scientific argumentation: A study of conceptually rich (and poor) student talk. *Educ Assess*. 2010;15(3–4):222–50.
- [20] Stark R, Puhl T, Krause UM. Improving scientific argumentation skills by a problem-based learning environment: effects of an elaboration tool and relevance of student characteristics. *Eval Res Educ*. 2009;22(1):51–68.
- [21] Pallant A, Lee HS, Pryputniewicz S. How to support secondary school students' consideration of uncertainty in scientific argument writing: A case study of a High-Adventure Science curriculum module. *J Geosci Educ*. 2020;68(1):8–19.
- [22] Jin Q, Kim M. Supporting elementary students' scientific argumentation with Argument-focused Metacognitive Scaffolds (AMS). *Int J Sci Educ*. 2021;43(12):1984–2006.
- [23] Zhu M, Lee HS, Wang T, Liu OL, Belur V, Pallant A. Investigating the impact of automated feedback on students' scientific argumentation. *Int J Sci Educ*. 2017;39(12):1648–68.