A STUDY ON THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 15 PEKANBARU IN COMPREHENDING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXTS

Ikke Oktavia S, Effendy Gultom, Masyhur
ikkeoktavia6@gmail.com, effendygultom@gmail.com, masyhurr20@yahoo.com
phone : 081378297909

Student of English Study Program
Language and Arts Department
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education
Universitas Riau

Abstract : The students have to learn the four language skills. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Reading plays an important role in learning. Reading is a communication process which requires a series of skills. Reading is actually a very complex process that requires a great deal of active participation on the part of the reader. The second year students of the senior high schools have learned some genres of reading texts From the researcher's observation during her teaching practice, it was difficult for the students to comprehend English text. the researcher chose hortatory exposition as the text that is used for this research because they should learn hortatory exposition text. This research uses a quantitative method. The data for this research were obtained using an objective test. The result of the students scores in comprehending hortatory exposition texts can be described as follows : 6 students (13,95) were in excellent level, 24 students (55,81) were in good level, 10 students (23,25) were in medicore level, 2 students (4,65) were in poor level and 1 student (2,32) was in very poor level. The mean score of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts is 67,44. It can be stated that the students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts was in good level. Considering that the students' ability level in terms of comprehending hortatory exposition text is classified into good level, but the students should learn more because only few of them achieve the standard minimum criteria (75,00) of their school.

Keyword: Reading, Comprehension, Text, Hortatory Exposition Text

KAJIAN TENTANG KEMAMPUAN SISWA TAHUN KEDUA DI SMAN 15 PEKANBARU DALAM MEMAHAMI TEKS HORTATORI EKSPOSISI

Ikke Oktavia S, Effendy Gultom, Masyhur
ikkeoktavia6@gmail.com, effendygultom@gmail.com, masyhurr20@yahoo.com
phone : 081378297909

Mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa Inggris
Jurusan Bahasa dan Seni
Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan
Universitas Riau

Abstrak : *Siswa mempelajari empat kemampuan berbahasa. Mereka adalah mendengarkan, berbicara, membaca, dan menulis. Membaca memegang peranan penting dalam proses belajar. Membaca adalah sebuah proses komunikasi dengan berbagai macam keahlian. Membaca adalah proses dengan hasil pemikiran dari pembaca aktif. Siswa sekolah menengah atas pada tahun kedua belajar beberapa jenis teks membaca. Berdasarkan penelitian penulis saat melakukan praktek mengajar, siswa sulit dalam memahami teks bahasa inggris. Penulis memilih hortatori exposisi sebagai teks yang digunakan untuk penelitian ini karena mereka harus belajar hortatori exposisi. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kuantitatif. Data penelitian ini menggunakan objektif tes. Hasil nilai siswa dalam memahami teks hortatori ekposisi dijelaskan sebagai berikut : 6 siswa berada pada level cerdas, 24 siswa berada pada level baik, 10 siswa berada pada level cukup, 2 siswa berada pada level rendah, dan 1 siswa berada pada level sangat rendah. Nilai rata-rata siswa dalam memahami teks hortatori eksposisi adalah 67,44. Dapat disimpulkan bahwa kemampuan siswa dalam memahami teks hortatori ekposisi dalam level baik. Meskipun kemampuan siswa dalam memahami teks hortatori ekposisi dalam level baik tapi hanya sedikit siswa yang mampu mencapai nilai KKM (75,00) sekolah mereka.*

Kata Kunci : *Membaca, Memahami, Teks, Teks Hortatori Exposisi.*

INTRODUCTION

English is an international language. It is used by many people of the world to communicate to each other. It plays an important role in the process of modernization. Almost all countries have adopted English as a compulsory subject in schools. English as a foreign language is taught in Indonesian schools starting from primary schools up to the university level. People realize that English teaching from primary schools up to university level is very important. English teachers need to explore effective techniques, methods, and approaches.

The students have to learn the four language skills. They are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Reading plays an important role in learning. Reading is a communication process which requires a series of skills.

Reading is actually a very complex process that requires a great deal of active participation on the part of the reader. We need to understand not only the structure but also the meaning of the text. There are several reading techniques that can be used to understand the meaning of texts such as:

1. Scanning is a quickly searching for some particular piece of information in a text. Scanning exercises may ask students to look for names or dates, to find a definition of a key concept, or to list a certain number of supporting details (Brown , 2001). The purpose of scanning is to extract specific information without reading through the whole text.
2. Skimming consists of quickly running one's eyes across a whole text (such as an essay, article, or chapter) for its gist (Brown, 2001). It gives readers the advantages of being able to predict the purpose of the passage, the main topic, or message, and possibly some of the developing or supporting ideas.
3. Intensive reading "calls attention to grammatical forms, discourse markers, and other surface structure details for the purpose of understanding literal meaning, implications, rhetorical relationships, and the like (Brown, 1980)." He draws an analogy to intensive reading as a "zoom lens" strategy .
4. Extensive reading is carried out "to achieve a general understanding of a text Brown (1980). The aim of extensive reading is to build reader's confidence and enjoyment.

According to Shepherd (1997), effective reading requires a logical sequence of thought patterns, and these thought patterns require practice to set them into the mind. It can be implied that reading is a thinking process. Reading is useful for language acquisition. Provided that students more or less understand what they read, the more they read, the better they get at it. Reading also has a positive effect on students' vocabulary knowledge, on their spelling and on their writing. Practically, it is not easy for students to read materials in a foreign language because they have to face new vocabulary and structure that are different from their own language.

The second year students of the senior high schools have learned some genres of reading texts such as narrative text, descriptive text, recount text, report text, procedure text, explanation text, discussion text, news item text, spoof text, anecdote text, review text, analytical exposition text, and hortatory exposition text. From the researcher's

observation during her teaching practice, it was difficult for the students to comprehend English texts. The researcher chose hortatory exposition text for this research because the students should learn hortatory exposition text. Hortatory exposition text requires the students to have critical thinking, scientific ideas, and argumentative expressions. Those characteristics cause a lot of students to get confused to comprehend the text. From the explanation above, the researcher is interested in carrying out a research entitled A Study on the Ability of the Second Year Students of SMAN 15 Pekanbaru in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This is a descriptive research with one variable. Descriptive research is a research that collecting numerical data to answer a quesation (Kritsonis: 2006). This research describes systematically the facts and the characteristics of a given population. This descriptive research is designed to find out the ability of the second year students of SMAN 15 Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition texts.

The data that is used in this research was quantitative data. The data for this research were obtained using an objective test. In order to answer the question of this research, the writer distributed test to the students. They were asked to answer the questions of reading comprehension test of hortatory exposition texts.

The test consists of 25 multiple choices questions in 5 different hortatory exposition texts. The time allocation was 60 minutes. The sources of the texts instrument are text books of second year students.

According to King and Stanley (1989) there are five components that may help the readers to read carefully, they are : finding main ideas, finding factual information, identifying references, finding the meaning of vocabulary in context, and making inferences.

The population of this research was science classes and social classes of the second year students of SMAN 15 Pekanbaru in academic year 2016 - 2017. The population were 174 students that consist of four classes.

Since the number of the population is quite large and has the same characteristics, the researcher does not investigate all the members of the population . Arikunto (2010) states that if the number of population is less than 100, the samples taken is everything, but if the number of population is more than 100, the samples taken is between 10% - 25% or more. In this research, the researcher takes 25% of the population as the sample, that is one class. The researcher chose the sample by using cluster sampling, that is taking sample of the population by pulling the lottery in order to get satisfactory result. Gay (1987) cluster sampling is a sampling in groups (not individuals) are randomly selected. The researcher used this cluster sampling because it is easier to get the desired sample.

To analyze the data, the researcher describes the current condition with collects numeral data to answer the question about the current status of the objective of this research. To classify scores obtained by students, the researcher established some categories.

According to Haris (1974) students' scores can be put in range of level as follows : the scores from 0–20 are classified into very poor level, 21-40 are classified

into poor level, 41-60 are classified into medicore level, 61-80 are classified into good level and 81-100 are classified into excellent level.

The students' scores were analyzed by using the formula. The students' scores were taken based on the number of their correct answers divided by the number of the items, then multiplied by 100. The formula is as follows:

$$M = \frac{X}{n} \times 100$$

Where :
M = individual scores
X = correct answers
n = total number of the items

Wayan and Sumartana (1986)

To find out the students' mean scores in reading comprehension, the researcher used this following formula :

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

Where :
M = the mean scores of each topic
$.\sum fx$ = the sum of the respondents' scores
N = the number of the respondents

Hatch and Farhady (1982)

The last, to know the percentage of the classification of the students' ability in aswering question, the following formula can be used :

$$P = \frac{\sum x}{N} \times 100\%$$

Where :
P = percentage of the students pergroup or level
x = the number of frequency in one level
N = the number of students

Hatch & Farhady (1982)

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The Presentation of the Data Analysis

The sample of this research is XI IPA 1 Class. The number of the students that is used as the sample are 43 students. This research focuses on the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts with 5 aspects of reading as the references, they are : finding main ideas, finding factual information, identifying references, finding the meaning of vocabulary in context, and making inferences. The students' scores were taken from individual correct answer. The students who answer the question correctly got one (1) point. But, the students who answer the question incorrectly got zero (0) point. Then, the total scores calculated by dividing the correct answer with the total number of the items and then it is multiplied by 100. Below is the detail of the research findings :

Students' Individual Scores in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts.

The formula that the writer used to calculated the students' individual scores is by dividing the correct answer with the total number of the items and then it is multiplied by 100. The formula is as follows:

$$M = \frac{X}{n} \times 100$$

Where :
M   = individual scores
X = correct answers
n   = total number of the items

Wayan and Sumartana (1986)

The result of the students' individual scores shows that 6 students (13,95) were in excellent level, 24 students (55,81) were in good level, 10 students (23,25) were in medicore level, 2 students (4,65) were in poor level, and 1 student (2,32) was in very poor level.

The mean score of the students in comprehending hortatory exposition texts was 67,44. It can be stated that the ability of the second year students of SMAN 15 Pekanbaru in comprehending hortatory exposition texts was in good level. The result itself became the indicator about the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts.

The Classification of the Students' Ability in Reading Comprehension

There are 5 components that are described in the blueprint of the instrument, they are : finding main ideas, finding factual information, identifying references, finding

the meaning of vocabulary in context, and making inferences. The researcher would like to present the students' ability in terms of each component as in the following :

The Students' Ability in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts in Terms of Finding Main Ideas

The students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas can be seen from the students' scores for questions number 1, 6, 11, 16, and 21.

The result of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas shows that 4 students (9,30%) are classified into excellent level, 15 students (34,88%) are classified into good level, 19 students (44,18%) are classified into medicore level, 4 students (9,30%) are classified into poor level, and 1 student (2,32%) is classified into very poor level.

The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas is 67,90 . It can be stated that the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas was in good level. However, they still need to improve their grades because the score range for good category is between 61 – 80.

The Students' Ability in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts in Terms of Finding Factual Information

The students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information can be seen from the students' scores for questions number 2, 7, 12, 17, and 22.

The result of students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information shows that 8 students (18,60%) are classified into excellent level, 14 students (32,55%) are classified into good level, 16 students (37,20%) are classified into medicore level, 3 students (6,97%) are classified into poor level, and 2 students (4,65%) are classified into very poor level.

The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information is 70,69 . It can be stated that the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information was in good level. However, they still need to improve their grades because the score range for good category is between 61 – 80.

The Students' Ability in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts in Terms of Identifying References

The students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references can be seen from the students' scores for questions number 3, 8, 13, 18, and 23.

The result of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references shows that 8 students (18,60%) are classified into

excellent level, 15 students (34,88%) are classified into good level, 12 students (27,90%) are classified into medicore level, 6 students (13,95%) are classified into poor level, and 2 students (4,65%) are classified into very poor level.

The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references is 69,76 . It can be stated that the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references was in good level. However, they still need to improve their grades because the score range for good category is between 61 – 80.

The Students' Ability in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts in Terms of Finding the Meaning of Vocabulary in Context

The students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context can be seen from students' scores for questions number 4, 9, 14, 19, and 24.

The result of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context shows that 7 students (16,27%) are classified into excellent level, 12 students (27,90%) are classified into good level, 10 students (23,25%) are classified into medicore level, 5 students (11,62%) are classified into poor level, and 9 students (20,93%) are classified into very poor level.

The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context is 60,93. It can be stated that the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context was in medicore level. It means that the students still need to improve their grades to achieve good level.

The Students' Ability in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts in Terms of Making Inferences

The students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences can be seen from the students' scores for questions number 5, 10, 15, 20, and 25.

The result of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences shows that 7 students (16,27%) are classified into excellent level, 16 students (37,20%) are classified into good level, 11 students (25,58%) are classified into medicore level, 7 students (16,27%) are classified into poor level, and 2 students (4,65%) are classified into very poor level.

The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences is 68,83 . It can be stated that the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences was in good level. However, they still need to improve their grades because the score range for good category is between 61 – 80.

The Mean Scores of the Students' Ability in Comprehending Hortatory Exposition Texts

After finding the mean scores for every aspect of the reading, the researcher would like to show the mean scores of the students' in comprehending hortatory exposition texts as whole.

The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas is 67,90 and the students' level of ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas is in good level. The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information is 70,69 and the students' level of ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information is in good level. The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references is 69,76 and the students' level of ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references is in good level. The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context is 60,93 and the students' level of ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context is in medicore level. The students' mean score in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences is 68,83 and the students' level of ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences is in good level.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

Based on the research finding in terms of comprehending hortatory exposition texts can be described as follows : 6 students (13,95) were in excellent level, 24 students (55,81) were in good level, 10 students (23,25) were in medicore level, 2 tudents (4,65) were in poor level and 1 student (2,32) was in very poor level. The mean score of the students' ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts is 67,44. It can be stated that the students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts was in good level.

There are 5 components that are described in the blueprint of the instrument, they are : finding main ideas, finding factual information, identifying references, finding the meaning of vocabulary in context, and making inferences. The following is the result of the students' ability in terms of each component. The students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding main ideas, 4 students (9,30) were in excellent level, 15 students (34,88) were in good level, 19 students (44,18) were in medicore level, 4 students (9,30) were in poor level, and 1 student (2,32) was in very poor level. The students' mean score in terms of finding main ideas was 67,90. The students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding factual information, 8 students (18,60) were in excellent level, 14 students (32,55) were in good level, 16 students (37,20) were in medicore level, 3 students (6,97) were in poor level, and 2 students (4,65) were in very poor level. The students' mean

score in terms of finding factual information was 70,69. The students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of identifying references, 8 students (18,60) were in excellent level, 15 students (34,88) were in good level, 12 students (27,90) were in medicore level, 6 students (13,95) were in poor level, and 2 students (4,65) were in very poor level. The students' mean score in terms of identifying references was 69,76. The students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context, 7 students (16,27) were in excellent level, 12 students (27,90) were in good level, 10 students (23,25) were in medicore level, 5 students (11,62) were in poor level, and 9 students (20,93) were in very poor level. The students' mean score in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context was 60,93. The students ability in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in terms of making inferences, 7 students (16,27) were in excellent level, 16 students (37,20) were in good level, 11 students (25,58) were in medicore level, 7 students (16,27) were in poor level, and 2 students (4,65) were in very poor level. The students' mean score in terms of making inferences was 68,83.

From the 5 aspect that becoming the indicators, the highest mean score is in terms of finding factual information (70,69) and the lowest mean score is in terms of finding the meaning of vocabulary in context (60,93).

Recommendations

From the conclusion above, the researcher would like to give recommendations. Considering that the students' ability level in terms of comprehending hortatory exposition text is classified into good level, but the students should learn more because only few of them achieve the standard minimum criteria (75,00) of their school. For english teacher, the English teacher should have more effort to develop the students' motivation and encourage them to practice in comprehending hortatory exposition texts in order to make the students familiar with reading materials in terms of five indicators of reading comprehension. The last one, the researcher recommended other researcher to conduct another research design about hortatory exposition texts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arikunto, S. 2009. *Dasar – Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan.* Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.

Arikunto, S. 2010. *Prosedur Penelitian : Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* (Edisi Revisi). Rineka Cipta. Jakarta.

Bond, Guy L and Eva *Bond* Wagner. 1969. *Teaching The Child to Read.* The Macmillan Company. New York.

Brown, Douglas, H .1980. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching.* Prentice Hall International Inc. London.

Brown, Douglas, H. 2001. *Teaching by principles : An active approach to language pedagogy*. (2^{nd}ed). Addison Wesley Publishing Company. San Francisco.

F. Dublin, Eskey, D. E & Grabe W (eds.) 1986. *Teaching Second Language Reading for Academic Purposes*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company. USA.

Gall, Joyce P, M.D. Gall, & Borg, Walter R. 2005. *Applying Educational Research A Practical Guide Fifth Edition*. Pearson Education, Inc. Boston.

Gay, L. R. 1987. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Third Edition. Merry Publishing Company. Colombus, Ohio.

Gay, L. R. 2003. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. Seventh Edition. Merry Publishing Company. Colombus, Ohio.

Harris, David, P. 1974. *Testing English as a Second Language*. McGraw-Hill Book Company. New York.

Hatch, Evelyn and Hossein Farhady. 1982. *Reseach and Design and Statistic for Applied Linguisticts*. Longman Inc. London.

Heaton, J.B. 1975. *Writing English Language Test : A Principal Guide for Teacher of English as a Second Foreign Language*. Longman Group Limited. London.

Heaton, J.B. 1991. Writing English Language Test. Longman. Handbook for Language Teacher.

Hornby, A.S. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. New York.

Kerlinger, Fred, N. 2007, *Asas-asas Penelitian Behavioral Edisi Ketiga*. Terjemahan Drs.Landung R.Simatupang. Gadjah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta.

King, Carol and Stanley, Nancy. 1989. *Building for the TOEFL Test*. Bina Aksara. Jakarta.

Klingner, Janette. K, Sharon Vaughn and Alison Boardman. 2007. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Diffculties*. The Guildford Press. New York.

Kristonis, W, A and Edgerson, David, E. 2006. *Analysis of the Influence of Principal – Teacher Relationships on Student Academic Achievement: A National Focus*. Doctoral Forum National Journal For Publishing And Mentoring Doctoral Student Research.

Margono, S. 2004. *Metodologi Penelitian Pendidikan.* Rineka Cipta. Jakarta.

Ramelan. 1992. *Introduction to Linguistic Analysis*. Semarang Press. Semarang IKIP.

Robbins, Stephen. P., 2006. *Perilaku Organisasi* (alih bahasa Drs. Benjamin Molan), Edisi Bahasa Indonesia. PT.Intan Sejati. Klaten.

Rubin, Dorothy. 1991. *Vocabulary Expansion Second Edition*. A Viacom Company. United States.

Shepherd, Peter. 1997. *The Speed Reading Course*. BookBaby. New York.

Sudarti and Grace. 2007. *Look Ahead: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year XI, Science and Social Study Program*. Erlangga. Jakarta.

Sugiyono. 2008. *Metode Penelitian Kunatitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta. Bandung

Sugiyono., 2012. *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. Cetakan Ke-20. Alfabeta. Bandung.

Tinambunan, Wilmar. 1988. *Evaluation of Student Achievement*. Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. Jakarta.

Wayan and Sumartana. 1986. *Evalusi Pendidikan Usaha Nasional.* Usaha Nasional. Surabaya.

Wijayanti Ira. 2015. *Be Smart in English*. Tiga Serangkai. Solo.

http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/study.

http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/ability.

http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/comprehendingbm.

https://pakpuguh.wordpress.com/2011/08/15/