

THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMA KARTIKA 1-5 PADANG TO COMPREHEND HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT

Desti Anggraini¹ , Dra. Fatimah Tanjung, M.Hum¹, Dr. H. Welya Roza, M.Pd² ,
English Department, The Faculty of Teacher Training And Education of Bung Hatta
University

E-mail : destianggrainii@yahoo.co.id

² English Department, The Faculty of Teacher Training And Education, Bung Hatta
University

Abstract

This study was designed to describe the second year students' ability of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend hortatory exposition text. To be more specific it was aimed to describe the students' ability to comprehend the contents or messages in hortatory exposition text. This research used descriptive method. The population of this research was the second year students at SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang. The members of the population were 386 students. The researcher took 85 students as the sample. In selecting the sample, the researcher used stratified cluster random sampling technique since the population grouped into two class and they were in two strata (IPA and IPS). To collect the data the researcher used reading test. The result of the data analysis showed that the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text was moderate. Based on the findings above, the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text was moderate. Based on this conclusion it is suggested to the English teacher to give more exercise for students to improve their ability to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text. Besides that, are suggested to the students should learn more about generic structure of hortatory exposition text and do some exercises in relating to generic structure of hortatory exposition text.

Key words: Hortatory Exposition Text, Generic Structure,

Introduction

Language is one of the most important things in communication and it is as a tool of communication among the nations in almost over the world. As an international language, English is very important and has many interrelationship with various aspects of life owned by human being.

In English, there are four language skills that should be mastered, they are: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The reading skill becomes very important in the education field, students need excercises in order to have a good reading skill.

Soedarso (2002:4) says that reading is a complex activity that includes understanding, imagining, observing and remembering. It means that reading is not only to understand what we read but it is also thinking process. For example, when we read something like magazine or novel, we can imagine and interpret based on the text. Reading means reacting or process of communication between readers and text. It means between the readers will understand the text or what they read.

According to the curriculum 2013 at senior high school especially at SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang, there are some kinds of texts that are studied by students, one of the text is Hortatory exposition text. Hortatory exposition text is taught to the second year students at semester two.

Based on the researcher informal interview with English teacher at SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang Feeby Marisa, S.Pd on February 10, 2014, she found that students were still confused to comprehend hortatory exposition text. It is proved when the teacher taught about hortatory and gave students the exercise, the students were still confused to comprehend thesis, arguments, and recommendation of hortatory exposition text.

Due to phenomena that is discussed above, the researcher was interested in

conducting a research about the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend hortatory exposition text.

There are many texts that is taught to the second year students at SMA. They are narrative text, analytical exposition, spoof, and hortatory exposition. Narrative text is aimed to amuse, entertain and to deal with actual or various experience in different ways. Spoof text aims at telling an event with a humorous twist. Hortatory exposition deals with how to persuade the readers or listeners that something should or should not be the case. Analytical exposition concerns to persuade the readers by presenting arguments to analyze or explain how and why of topic.

In reading hortatory exposition text, there are three elements that must be understood by the students. They are social function (purpose of text), generic structure (text organization), and language features.

Based on the identification of the problem above, the researcher limited her research to analyze the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text. It deals with thesis, argument, and recommendation.

In general, the purpose of this research was to investigate the ability of second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text. Specifically, the purposes of the research were as follows:

1. To describe the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text.
2. To describe the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend argument of hortatory exposition text.
3. To describe the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend recommendation of hortatory exposition text.

Research Method

The design of this research was descriptive research. Gay (1987:189) says that descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. Descriptive research was aimed at describing an accurate, factual, and systematic nature of a certain condition. In this research, the researcher described and analyzed the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to

comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text.

The population was the group of interest to the researcher, the group to which she or he would like the result of the study to be generalizable (Gay, 1987:102).

Population of this research was the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang in academic year 2013/2014. Total number of them was 386 students who are group into nine classes. They were five classes for science class (IPA) and four classes for social class (IPS).

They were classified as shown in table below:

Table 3.1 The Population of the Research

| No | Classes | Number of Students |
|----|-----------|--------------------|
| 1 | XI A1 | 42 |
| | XI A2 | 43 |
| | XI A3 | 40 |
| | XIA 4 | 40 |
| | XI A5 | 40 |
| | Sub Total | 205 |
| 2 | XI S1 | 46 |
| | XI S2 | 44 |
| | XI S3 | 45 |
| | XI S4 | 46 |
| | Sub Total | 181 |
| | Total | 386 |

In choosing the sample of this research, the researcher used stratified cluster random sampling. The researcher used stratified cluster random sampling because the population was divided into two strata, science class (IPA) and social class (IPS). According to Gay (1987:107), stratified cluster random sampling is the process of selecting a sample in such a way that identified subgroups in the population are represented in the sample in the same proportion that they exist in the population. the researcher wrote names of each class (IPA and IPS) on small pieces of papers and then put them into two boxes. After shaking the box, she took one of the papers out of each box with close eyes. All members of two selected classes were the sample of this research. The selected classes were IPA 4 and IPS3 as the sample. There were 85 students. It means 22% of population to be a sample.

The instrument used to collect the data in this research was reading test. The researcher took the test items from English book for Senior High School and from internet that discussed about hortatory exposition text. The type of the test was in the form of multiple choice forms. The test consisted of 30 items from six hortatory exposition texts. The students were given 60 minutes to do the test.

The researcher firstly gave the try out test to the students out of samples. The selected class for try out was IPS 4. There were 46 students. The researcher did the try out test to make sure the students understand the direction and got enough time to didtest or not, whether the test was reliable or not.

A good test must be valid and reliable. A test valid if it measures what it supposed to be measured. One of the types of test validity is content validity (Arikunto 2012:80). It means that the researcher constructed the test based on syllabus and teaching material SMA Kartika 1-5. The test should be tried out to the students to know the reability of the test. Then, to find out the reability of reading test, the researcher used split half method. According to Gay (1987:138), split half method refers to be divided into two groups; odd item and even item. To calculate the coefficient correlation between the score of the two groups, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment formula as follows (Arikunto 2012:87).

$$= \frac{n \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{\{n \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2\} \{n \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2\}}}$$

Where:

= the correlation coefficient of variable x and y (odd and even item)

$\sum x$ = the odd item scores

$\sum y$ = the even item scores

$\sum xy$ = the total scores of cross product xy

n = number of students

Furthermore, to know the coefficient correlation of the whole test, the result was analyzed by using Spearman Brown formula (Gay, 1987:139) as follows:

—

Where:

the reliability coefficient of the test.

the coefficient correlation between odd and even item.

According to Arikunto (2012:89), the interpretation of the correlation coefficient as follows:

- 0.81-1.00 = very high
- 0.61-0.80 = high
- 0.41-0.60 = enough
- 0.21-0.40 = low
- 0.00-0.20 = very low (no correlation)

In selecting good items of the test, the researcher analyzed the item difficulties and item discrimination of the test. The researcher used the following

formula suggested by Arikunto (2012:219):

1. Item difficulties

$$P = \frac{B}{JS}$$

Where:

P = item difficulties

B = sum of students who answer correctly

JS = sum of the students who follow the test

The item difficulties ranges between 0.00-1.00 and it is symbolized as “P” that refers to “Proportion” in the evaluation term.

Then, the researcher classifies the item difficulty into three categories suggested by Arikunto (2012:225) as follow:

- $P = 0.00-0.30$ → difficult
- $P = 0.31-0.70$ → moderate
- $P = 0.71-1.00$ → easy

The researcher used range between 0.31-0.70 for item difficulty.

2. Item discrimination

Item discrimination is the ability of test items to differentiate between high ability students and low ability students. To find out item discrimination, the writer

used the following formula by Arikunto (2012:228):

$$D = \frac{H - L}{N}$$

Where:

D= item discrimination

H = sum of students in the high group

L = sum of students in the low group

N = sum of students in the high group who answer correctly

n = sum of students in the low group who answer correctly

In the evaluation term, item discrimination is symbolized as “D” that refers to “Discrimination”. The result of the item discrimination is classified as follows:

D= 0.00- 0.19 = poor

D= 0.20- 0.39 = satisfactory

D= 0.40- 0.69 = good

D= 0.70- 1.00 = excellent

The researcher used range between 0.20-0.80 for item discrimination. The result of try out, the researcher found that the correlation coefficient for the test was 0.72 (see Appendix 3). It means the test was reliable.

The researcher got 24 good items for the real test, they are 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,13,14,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,23,25,26,27,28,30. There were six items (number 1,9,12,17,24, and 29) that should be discarded (see Appendix 7). So, the real test had 5 items for thesis, 13 items for argument, and 6 items for recommendation.

To analyze data, the researcher used the descriptive analysis. In this technique, there are some procedures:

- a. The researcher presents the raw scores of each sample.
- b. Calculating Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) by using following formula (Arikunto, 2012:229):

$$M = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where:

M = mean

$\sum X$ = total score of the students

N = number of students

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\sum X}{N}\right)^2}$$

Where:

SD = standard deviation

$\sum X$ = total of x

$\sum X^2$ = total of x squared

N = total number of students

c. The researcher classifies the students' ability into high, moderate, and low ability based on criteria below:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &> M + 1 \text{ SD} \\
 &= \text{High} \\
 (M - 1 \text{ SD}) &\longrightarrow (M + 1 \text{ SD}) \\
 &= \text{Moderate} \\
 &< M - 1 \text{ SD} \\
 &= \text{Low}
 \end{aligned}$$

d. The last step, the researcher calculates the percentage of the students who get high, moderate, and low by using the following formula:

$$P = \frac{R}{T} \times 100\%$$

Where:

P= Percentage of the students' score

R= The sum of the students who get high, moderate, and low ability

T= Total sum of students

Findings

1. The Students' Ability to Comprehend Hortatory Exposition Text

In general, the data on the students' ability to comprehend hortatory exposition text that the lowest score was 10 and the highest was 23. The mean was 16.37 and standard deviation was 3.84. Students' ability was categorized high if their scores were higher than 20. It was categorized moderate if their scores were in the range between 12.53 until 20.21. It was

categorized as low if their scores were lower than 12.53. The researcher calculated the presentage of students who got high, moderate and low ability to comprehend hortatory exposition in three groups as shown in Table 4.1.1

Table 4.1.1

The Classification of Percentage of Students Ability to Comprehend Thesis of Hortatory Exposition Text

| Classification | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------|-----------|------------|
| High | 13 | 15.29% |
| Moderate | 56 | 65.88% |
| Low | 16 | 18.82% |

From the table above, the students' ability to comprehend hortatory exposition text was moderate. It is indicated by percentage of students whose ability was included in moderate category 65.88%.

2. The Students' Ability to Comprehend Thesis of Hortatory Exposition Text

The data on the students' ability to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text that the lowest score was 1 and the highest was 5. The mean was 3.51 and standard deviation was 1.29. Students' ability was categorized high if their scores were higher than 4.8. It was categorized moderate if their scores were in the range

between 2.22 until 4.8. It was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 2.22. The researcher calculated the presentage of students who got high, moderate and low ability to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition in three groups as shown in Table 4.1.2

Table 4.1.2

The Classification of Percentage of Students Ability to Comprehend Thesis of Hortatory Exposition Text

| Classific ation | Frequ ency | Percen tage |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| High | 22 | 25.88 % |
| Moderat e | 45 | 52.94 % |
| Low | 18 | 21.17 % |

From the table above, the students' ability to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text was moderate. It is indicated by percentage of students whose ability was included in moderate category 52.94%.

3. The Students' Ability to Comprehend Argument of Hortatory Exposition Text

The data on the students' ability to comprehend argument of hortatory exposition text that the lowest score was 4 and the highest was 13. The mean was 9.61 and standard deviation was 2.46. Students' ability was categorized high if their scores were higher than 12.07. It was categorized moderate if their scores were in the range between 7.15 until 12.07. It was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 7.15. The researcher calculated the presentage of students who got high, moderate and low ability to comprehend argument of hortatory exposition in three groups as shown in Table 4.1.3

Table 4.1.3

The Classification of Percentage of Students Ability to Comprehend Argument of Hortatory Exposition Text

| Classific ation | Frequ ency | Percen tage |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| High | 10 | 11.76 % |
| Moderat e | 57 | 67.05 % |
| Low | 18 | 21.17 % |

From the table above, the students' ability to comprehend argument of

hortatory exposition text was moderate. It was indicated by percentage of students whose ability was included in moderate category 67.05%.

The Students’ Ability to Comprehend Recommendation of Hortatory Exposition Text

The data on the students’ ability to comprehend recommendation of hortatory exposition text that the lowest score was 1 and the highest was 5. The mean was 3.24 and standard deviation was 1.26. Students’ ability was categorized high if their scores were higher than 4.5. It was categorized moderate if their scores were in the range between 1.98 until 4.5. It was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 1.98. The researcher calculated the presentage of students who got high, moderate and low ability to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition in three groups as shown in Table 4.1.4

**Table 4.1.4
The Classification of Percentage of Students Ability to Comprehend Recommendation of Hortatory Exposition Text**

| Classific ation | Frequ ency | Percen tage |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|

| | | |
|----------|----|-------|
| High | 19 | 22.35 |
| Moderate | 57 | 68.41 |
| Low | 7 | 8.23 |

From the table above, the students’ ability to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text was moderate. It was indicated by percentage of students whose ability was included in moderate category 68.41%.

Discussion

1. Students’ Ability to Comprehend Thesis of Hortatory Exposition Text

Based on the result of the data analysis it was indicated that the majority of the students 51.76 % had moderate ability. The researcher assumed that the problem may be caused by lack knowledge of what the thesis statement tell about and by the lack of the students’ vocabulary. It was indicated by students’ answer on some questions. For example, question “what is the text about?” can be answered correctly by 27% students. In order, the students have difficulties to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text. So, the students need to increase their vocabulary and comprehending the thesis of hortatory exposition text.

2. Students' Ability to Comprehend Argument of Hortatory Exposition Text

The researcher found the students' ability of the second year of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend argument of hortatory exposition text was in moderate category (67.05%). The researcher assumed that the problem may be caused by lack knowledge about the argument of hortatory exposition text and by lack of students' vocabulary. It was indicated by students' answer on some questions. For example, question "how to keep the skin elasticity?" with the topic "Water Makes Beautiful" can be answered correctly by 11% students. In other words the students have difficulties to comprehend the argument of hortatory exposition text and the students must increase their comprehending about argument of hortatory exposition text.

3. Students' Ability to Comprehend Recommendation of Hortatory Exposition Text

The researcher found the students' ability of the second year of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend recommendation of hortatory exposition text was in moderate category (68.41%).

Conclusions

After interpreting the result of data analysis, it can be concluded as follows:

1. In general, the ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text was moderate. It was proven by the fact that there were 56 students classified into moderate ability or in percentage 65.88%. It can be concluded that students still do not understand and were still confused in comprehending the generic structure of hortatory exposition text.
2. The ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text was moderate. It was proven by the fact that there were 45 students classified into moderate ability or in percentage 52.94%. It can be concluded that the students also still do not understand and were still confused to comprehend thesis of hortatory exposition text.
3. The ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend argument of hortatory exposition text was moderate. It was proven by the fact that there were 57 students classified into moderate ability or in percentage 67.05%. It can be concluded that the students also still do not understand and were still confused

to comprehend argument of hortatory exposition text.

4. The ability of the second year students of SMA Kartika 1-5 Padang to comprehend recommendation of hortatory exposition text was moderate. It was proven by the fact that there were 57 students classified into moderate ability or in percentage 68.41%. It can be concluded that the students also still do not understand and were still confused to comprehend recommendation of hortatory exposition text.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher purposes several suggestion as follows:

1. Based on the result of data analysis of the students' ability to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text was moderate, the teachers are suggested to give more exercise for students to improve their ability to comprehend generic structure of hortatory exposition text.
2. The student should learn more about generic structure of hortatory exposition text and do some exercises in relating to generic structure of hortatory exposition text.
3. And the last, the researcher suggests to the next researcher to conduct the

follow up research. Such as find the difficulties of the students in reading hortatory exposition text, in other hand to get different finding.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2012. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
- Gay, L.R. 1987. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Ohio: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Gerot, L & P. Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney : Gerd Stabler.
- Soedarso. 2002. *Speed Reading Sistem Membaca Cepat dan Effective*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.

