AN ANALYSIS OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS' ABILITY TO IDENTIFY GERUND IN HORTATORY EXPOSITION AT THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT OF BUNG HATTA UNIVERSITY

Syofyan Anggara[1], Lely Refnita[2], Welya Roza[2]

[1] : The Student of English Department, the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Bung Hatta University

E-mail : Syofyananggara@yahoo.co.id

[2] : The Lecturers of English Department, the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Bung Hatta University

Abstract

This study was designed to describe the students` ability to identify gerund in hortatory exposition. The design of this research was descriptive. The population of this research was the second year students of English Department of Bung Hattta University in academic year 2011/2012. The total number of population members was 102 students and they were divided into three classes. The writer used cluster random sampling technique in order to select the sample. The writer used grammar test to collect the data of the second year students' ability to identify gerund in hortatory exposition. The data analysis result showed that there were 18 students able to identify gerund; it was categorized moderate. Specifically, there were 21 students able to identify gerund as subject, 22 students able to identify gerund as object of preposition, 17 students able to identify gerund as object of verb, 17 students able to identify gerund as complement; they were categorized moderate. In relation to this, the writer suggests the English lecturers to review the materials and give more exercises which focus on identifying gerund in the text as well as improve and revise their teaching material. For the students, they are suggested to learn more about how to identify gerund in the text. For further researchers, the writer suggests to do the research to find out the reason why the students had moderate ability in identifying gerund in hortatory exposition.

Key words: Analysis, Gerund, students' ability, Hortatory Exposition text.

Introduction

Learning English is very important because English is an international language which is used by most communities in the world. Many countries use English as their second language. In Indonesia, English is not considered as a second language but it is a foreign language. English is also called as the target language that has to be taught in schools in today's Indonesian curriculum. There are four integrated skills that the students should learn. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Besides that, students also should understand about structure or grammar. Grammar is one of the important subjects that must be studied by students. By understanding grammar, it is easier for students to construct a good sentence and identify the grammatical structure of English language and develop the four language skills above.

In English Department of FKIP Bung Hatta University, students also study

grammar. The purpose of it is that students should be able to use correct grammar in written and oral form. Based on the syllabus students had studied some topics in Structure I, and Structure II. In Structure I, students study *simple present tense in positive, negative, imperative form, adverb of frequency, pronoun, possessive, question word, the usage of wh-question, very, so, too, noun phrase, there is, there are, possessive form, present continuous tense, impersonal it: modal verb, time expression as simple present, present continuous tense, future tense, differences between will and be going to, nouns, simple past tense, and past continuous tense.* And in Structure II, students study *present perfect tense, present perfect continuous, present perfect vs present perfect continuous tense, gerund and infinitives, comparative, superlative, articles, past perfect tense, future perfect, and review.*

Ideally, the students should have mastered all of the topics given. Therefore, the students should be able to identify grammatical structure in the sentence or text. In fact, grammar is often re-taken by students. It means that the students still have problems in grammar. In addition, based on the writer's experience during studying grammar, some students still had the problems, especially in identifying gerund in the text. It could be proven when

the writer saw his friends' exercise. In fact, some of them still did not understand about gerund. When they identified gerund in the text, especially hortatory exposition text, it was difficult for them to understand.

There are some definitions of gerund offered by some experts. In *Merriam Webster Dictionary* (2013), gerund is a verbal noun in Latin that expresses generalized or uncompleted action. We often find verbs in English that function as nouns. Gerund can act as the subject of a main verb. According to Veit (1986:220), gerunds are verbs that functions like noun and participles are verbs that function like adjectives. In other words, not all words formed with suffix–*ing* are gerund and suffix–*ing* of verb is not always nouns. Thus, gerund is a verb –*ing* functioning as a noun. This –*ing* form is a part of noun and a part of verb since it is formed from a verb. Meanwhile, gerund phrase is composed of the gerund and any words organized with it. Like nouns, commonly, gerund may function as subjects, complements and objects. As it is said by Cook and Suter in Arjati (2007:14):

"Speakers of English will often take a verb form that has an –*ing* ending and use it as nouns instead of as a verb. When this happens, the form is called a gerund. We say that a gerund "used" as nouns perform-they act a subjects of sentences, as direct objects, and as complements. The meanings they

communicate, however, are always those of verbs, since gerunds describe actions states rather than name persons, places, things, or ideas as nouns do."

There are some definitions of gerund offered by experts. Each of them has the same opinion. Cook and Suter in Arjati (2007:16) define three functions of gerund, they are:

1. A gerund as a subject of sentence.
2. A gerund as direct object of sentence
3. A gerund as complement

According to Azar (2006:368-387), there are five functions of gerund, they are:

1. Gerunds as subjects
2. Gerunds as direct objects
3. Gerunds as subjective complements
4. Gerunds as objects of preposition
5. Gerunds used after possessive

Hortatory Exposition

Hortatory exposition is one type of the texts that belongs to argumentation type. Hortatory exposition is a type of spoken or written text that is intended to explain the listeners or readers that something should or should not happen or be done (Sriwijayanti, 2010). In *Concise Oxford Dictionary*, hortatory exposition is:

- Hortatory is adjective, it means tending or aiming to exhort.
- Exposition means a comprehensive description and explanation of a theory.

Therefore, hortatory exposition is a text that describes a theory or an issue in comprehensive manner with the aim of encouraging others to do or not to do something.

Hortatory exposition consists of thesis, arguments, and recommendation. They are explained as follows:

1. Thesis/ general statement
2. Arguments
3. Recommendation.

Besides that, hortatory has language features, they are:

1. Using simple present tense
2. Using of sentence connectors to link argument; firstly, secondly, thirdly, etc.
3. Using evaluative words: importantly, valuablly, trustworthly, etc..

As we know, gerund is a verb that ends in –*ing* and functions as a noun. In the sentence at the text, there are several functions of gerund. They are gerund as subject, gerund as object of preposition, gerund as object of verb, gerund as complement. And the text consists of some sequence sentences, so we often find gerund in sentence at the text. Actually, we can identify gerund in the sentence but we are still difficult to identify gerund in the text. One of the text which we often find gerund is hortatory exposition. It is a reason why the writer jumps hortatory to gerund.

Based on the discussion above, in this final project the writer was interested to know the second year students' ability of English Department of FKIP Bung Hatta University to identify gerund in hortatory exposition.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research was descriptive in nature. Gay (1987:189) states descriptive research involves collecting data in order to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. The purpose of this research was to describe the second year students' ability of Bung Hatta University in identifying gerund in hortatory exposition text. Population is important in conducting a research. Gay (1987:102) states population is the group of interest to the researcher or the group to which she or he would like the result of the study to be generalized. The population of this research was the second year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University Padang registered firstly in academic year 2011/2012. The total number of population of this research was 102 students. They were divided into three classes: A, B, and C. The writer chose this population because they had studied Structure I and II, and importantly they have studied gerund and hortatory exposition at senior high school. They

understood gerund and the use of gerund in the sentence or in the text.

According to Gay (1987: 101), sampling is the process of selecting a number of individuals for a study in such a way that the individuals represent the larger group from which they were selected. The sample is small part of the population. Gay (1987: 103) states a good sample is representative of the population from which it is selected.

There are some sampling techniques. And from those available sampling techniques, the writer used the cluster random sampling technique. Cluster random sampling is sampling in which groups, not individual, are randomly selected (Gay, 1987:110).

The writer chose cluster random sampling technique because of some reasons. The first, it was more difficult to collect members of population on the same time. The second, members of population had studied the same teaching materials. The last reason, the population had been grouped in three classes and all of population had the same chance to be selected as the sample of this research. In selecting the sample, the writer wrote the name of class (A, B, and C) on each piece of paper. The paper was put into the bottle. And then, the writer mixed the bottle. And last, the writer got class A as the sample of try out test and class C as sample of real

test. The total members of each class were as follow:

Table 3.1: Population and Sample

Class	Students
A	35
B	35
C	32
Total	102

The total members of each class when the writer did try out test and real test was 28 students. It means 27.45% of the population. The instrument the writer used to collect data was grammar test in the form of identifying gerund in hortatory exposition text. The criteria of the text are as follows: And then, the writer gave 2 hortatory exposition texts to the student and then the writer asked students to read both of text and identified gerund in hortatory exposition text. And then the writer asked the students to classify gerund based on the function of gerund (gerund as subject, object of preposition, object verb, and as complement). The writer gave 60 minutes for students to do the test. The writer gave 60 minutes for students because the writer thought that time was enough for students to read and understand the text and do the test. Try out test was done at 13^{00} on June 3th 2013 and the real test was done at 10^{00} on June 11st 2013. Try out test was done since the instrument was categorized non standard test (the instrument was developed by the writer himself). The purpose of conducting try out test was to make sure the students understand about the instruction of the test and the writer wanted to know whether the time allocation to do test was enough or not. Besides, it was also aimed to identify the validity and the reliability of the test.

If we want our test to be good, it should be valid and reliable. One type of test validity is content validity. Arikunto (2008:67) states a test has content validity if it is constructed based on the syllabus and teaching material, so this test was constructed based on the syllabus. The students had known several texts when they studied in senior high school. Besides, the students had studied gerund in Structure II. Then, to see the reliability of the test, the writer used two scorers (scorer 1 and 2) to minimize the subjectivity in scoring. The two scorers were one of the writer's friends (Yeni Triana) who had understanding about the test especially gerund in the text as scorer 2 and the writer as scorer 1.To calculate the coefficient of correlation of two scorers, the writer used the Pearson Product Moment Formula.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Where:
r_{xy} = the coefficient of correlation between variable x and y
N = the numbers of the students
X = the score given by scorer 1
Y = the score given by scorer 2

5

After the writer did the try-out test, the writer got the coefficient of correlation (r_{xy}) .986. Since the value of r_{table} on the degree of freedom 26 (N-2) and the level of significance 95% (α=.05) is .388, the test was considered reliable (see Appendix 3). Finally, the writer used the degree of coefficient of correlation suggested by Arikunto (2008:75), as follows:

.80 – 1.0	= very high
.60 – .80	= high
.40 – .60	= enough
.20 – .40	= low
.00 – .20	= very low

It can be concluded that this value can be categorized very high.

As the writer explained above, the writer used a test in order to collect the data. In collecting the data, the writer gave scores by using the following steps:

1. The writer checked the students' answer sheet one by one.

2. The writer gave a score to students' based on criteria focus of this research, as follow:

   - Students should identify gerund in hortatory exposition text.

   - Student should classify gerund based the function of gerund.

3. Finally, the writer calculated the average of score from both of scorers.

After counting the total score of each student from both of scorers, the writer calculated mean (M) and standard deviation (SD), as follow:

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N} \quad \text{and} \quad SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum x^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\sum x}{N}\right)^2}$$

Where:
- SD = Standard Deviation
- $\sum x$ = Sum of all scores
- N = Number of students

After calculating M and SD, the writer classified the students' ability into criteria below:

>M + SD = High

M – SD → M + SD = Moderate

< M + SD = Low

And then, the writer calculated the percentage of them by using:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where:
- P = Percentage of the students score
- F = The sum of the students who get high, moderate, or low ability.
- N = the sum of the student.

Finally, the writer found the ability of the second year students of English Department Bung Hatta University to identify gerund in hortatory exposition text.

Findings and discussion

Findings

Based on the result of this research, the writer presented the findings of this research as follow:

The Second Year Students' Ability of English Department to Identify Gerund in Hortatory Exposition

After analyzing the data, the writer found that the students' score to identify gerund in the text was various. It can be

proven by seeing the highest and the lowest score of the students. It was found that the lowest students' score was 38.5 and the highest students' score was 78.2, with mean 63.23 and standard deviation 8.99. Then, the writer classified the students' ability into three categorize, if the students' score higher than 72.22 as high, range of 53.24 until 72.22 as moderate, and lower than 53.24 as low. Finally, the writer calculated the percentage of the students who were included in each of three groups based on Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Students' ability to identify gerund in hortatory exposition

The Range of Score	Ability	Number of Students	Percentage
>72.22	High	6	21.43%
53.24 → 72.22	Moderate	18	64.28%
< 53.24	Low	4	1429%
Total		**28**	**100%**

The Second Year Students' Ability of English Department to Identify Gerund as Subject in Hortatory Exposition

After analyzing the data, the writer found that the students' score to identify gerund as subject in the text was various. It can be proven by seeing the highest and the lowest score of the students. It was found that the lowest students' score was 46 and the highest students' score was 94.5, with mean 71.1 and standard

deviation 10.34. Then, the writer classified the students' ability into three categorize, if the students' score higher than 81.44 as high, range of 60.76 until 81.44 as moderate, and lower than 60.76 as low. Finally, the writer calculated the percentage of the students who were included in each of three groups based on Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 Students' ability to identify gerund as subject in hortatory exposition.

The Range of Score	Ability	Number of Students	Percentage
>81.44	High	3	10.71%
60.76 → 81.44	Moderate	21	75%
<60.76	Low	4	14.29%
Total		**28**	**100%**

Students' Ability to Identify Gerund as Object of Preposition in Hortatory Exposition

To measure the students' ability to identify gerund as object of preposition, the writer counted the students' scores. It was found that the lowest score was 27.5 and the highest score was 98, with mean 69.36 and standard deviation 17.02. Then, the writer categorized students' ability was high if the students' score higher than 86.38, moderate if it was in range 52.34 – 86.38, and low if it was lower than 52.34. The last, the writer calculated the percentage of the students based on their ability groups .

Table 4.3 Students' ability to identify gerund as object of preposition in hortatory exposition.

The Range of Score	Ability	Number of Students	Percentage
>86.38	High	2	7.14%
52.34 → 86.38	Moderate	22	78.57%
<52.34	Low	4	14.29%
Total		**28**	**100%**

Students' Ability to Identify Gerund as Object of Verb in Hortatory Exposition

To measure the students' ability to identify gerund as object of verb, the writer counted the students' scores. It was found that the lowest score was 27.5 and the highest score was 87.8, with mean 65.15 and standard deviation 14.41. Then, the writer categorized students' ability was high if the students' score higher than 79.56, moderate if it was in range 50.74 – 79.56, and low if it was lower than 50.74. The last, the writer calculated the percentage of the students based on their ability groups.

Table 4.4 Students' ability to identify gerund as object of verb in hortatory exposition.

The Range of Score	Ability	Number of Students	Percentage
>79.56	High	6	21.43%
50.74 → 79.56	Moderate	17	60.71%
< 50.74	Low	5	17.86%
Total		**28**	**100%**

Students' Ability to Identify Gerund as Complement in Hortatory Exposition

To measure the students' ability to identify gerund as complement, the writer counted the students' scores. It was found that the lowest score was 31 and the highest score was 75, with mean 47.39 and standard deviation 8.13. Then, the writer categorized students' ability was high if the students' score higher than 55.52, moderate if it was in range 39.26 – 55.52, and low if it was lower than 39.26. The last, the writer calculated the percentage of the students based on their ability groups.

Table 4.5 Students' ability to identify gerund complement in hortatory exposition.

The Range of Score	Ability	Number of Students	Percentage
>55.52	High	4	14.29%
39.26 → 55.52	Moderate	17	60.71%
< 39.26	Low	7	25%
Total		**28**	**100%**

Discussion

After the writer analyzed the result of the test given to the students in identifying gerund at hortatory exposition, he found the students still had problem to identify gerund in the text. They knew gerund in the text but they did not understand the function of gerund in the text. It can be discussed, as follow:

1. Gerund as subject

In identifying gerund as subject, the students got problem when they found gerund like in example, as follow:

- *We know reading is very important because **reading** can give us valuable information………*

In this example, some students still had problem when they classified gerund as subject. They classified the gerund in example as complement or object of verb.

2.Gerund as object of preposition

Majority of the students had good understanding in identified gerund as object of preposition, but they still had problem when they classify gerund based on the function. For example:

- *We often hear lots of stories of **regarding** of road……………*

There are some students classified gerund as object of preposition like in example above as gerund as object of verb and gerund as complement.

3.Gerund as object of verb

Majority of the students also had good understanding in identifying gerund as object of verb, but they still had problem. They often classified gerund as object of verb as complement and object of preposition. For example:

- *People like reading in some place………*

4.Gerund as complement

Majority of the students didn't have good understanding in identifying gerund as complement. It was proven by the fact, When the students found gerund as complement, they still had problem. They should classify the function of gerund as complement, but they classified gerund at the example as object of verb. For example:

- *Valuable books in libraries and bookstores mean nothing, if we are not **reading**………*

Conclusions and Suggestions
Conclusions

Based on the result of the data analysis, the writer concludes that generally, the ability of the second year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University to identify gerund in hortatory exposition; 18 students (64.28%) with the range of score from 53.24 to 72.22 was moderate. Specifically, the writer concludes that, as follows:

- Twenty one students (75%) had moderate ability to identify gerund as subject in hortatory exposition.
- Twenty two students (78.57%) had moderate ability to identify gerund as object of preposition in hortatory exposition.
- Seventeen students (60.71%) had moderate ability to identify gerund as object of verb in hortatory exposition.

9

- Seventeen students (60.71%) had moderate ability to identify gerund as complement in hortatory exposition.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, the writer would like to propose several suggestions as follow:

1. Based on the moderate range of score study on the students' ability to identify gerund (as subject, as object of preposition, as object of verb, and as complement) in the text especially in hortatory exposition, the English lecturers are expected to motivate the students in studying, give more exercises and explain about gerund (as subject, as object of preposition, as object of verb, and as complement) in the text specifically. So, the English lecturers could improve and revise their teaching grammar especially about gerund.

2. For the students, they are suggested to do more practices about the use of gerund in the text especially in hortatory exposition so that they can improve their ability in grammar especially gerund in the text.

3. The writer suggests the further researcher to find out the reason why the students had moderate ability in identifying gerund in the text especially in hortatory exposition.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2008. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan.* (Edisi Revisi) Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Arjati, Artin Febriana. 2007. An Error Analysis on The Use of Gerund among The fourth Semester Students of English Department of UNNES in the Academic Year 2006/2007. *Unpublished Thesis.* Semarang: UNNES

Azar, Betty Schrampher. 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

_____. 2006. *Fundamental of English Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Derewianka, Beverly. 1946. *Exploring How Texts Work*. Marybough: Australian Print Group.

Gay, Lorraine Rumbel. 1987. *Educational Research. Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Third Edition. Columbus : Merril Publishing.

http;//grammar&composition.about.com/2013/3/definitionoftexts.html. Access on March, 04 2013

http://www.englishindo.com/2012/03/hortatory-exposition-penjelasan-contoh.html. Access on March, 03 2013

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/gerund. Access on March, 03 2013

http://www.coffe-net-break.com/contoh/pembuatan/ktsp2011-2012.html. Access on April, 15 2013

Matthews, Peter. H. 2007. *Concise Dictionary of Linguistics.* New York: Oxford University Press

Rahma, Guslia. 2010. An Analysis of the Third Year Students' Ability of English Department of FKIP Bung Hatta University to Use Adverb Clause in Writing sentence. *Unpublished Thesis.* Padang: Bung Hatta University

Sriwismayanti. 2010. Wordpress.com/hortatory-text/. Access on April, 07 2013