

TEACHING HORTATORY EXPOSITION WRITING USING *GUIDED WH-QUESTIONS* TO THE STUDENTS OF SMA PGRI 1 PONTIANAK

Cenderato

Sekolah Tinggi Agama Katolik Negeri Pontianak
cenderato67@gmail.com

Submitted: 2020-04-14

Accepted: 2020-04-20

Abstract: This research was conducted to answer the research question: “How effective is the use of *Guided Wh-Questions* to improve the students’ hortatory exposition writing?” The method of this research was a Pre-experimental Study by applying Pretest, the treatment and Posttest. The population of this research was the students of class XI of SMA PGRI 1 Pontianak in academic year 2010 with 40 students of class XIA and Class XIB. But, 20 students of class XIB was considered as a sample of this research. The technique of data collecting was a written test. The research findings showed the total score of pretest is 1286 with the mean score 64.30 and categorized “Average”. Furthermore, the result of posttest is 1493 with the mean score 74.63 and categorized “Good”. The result of computation on the t-test with 6,99 is higher than the t-table for the degree of freedom $N-1 (20-1)=19$ is 2.093. Effect Size of the treatment is 1. 53. It is categorized “Highly Effective” because the result of 1. 53 is higher than 0.8 that is the high level of effectiveness on Effect Size criteria proposed by Burn ($ES > 0.8 = 1. 53 > 0.8$). In conclusion, the teaching hortatory exposition writing by using *Guided Wh-questions* is “highly effective”. Therefore, the null hypothesis that says “Teaching Hortatory Exposition Writing using *Guided Wh-questions* is not effective” is rejected. And the alternative hypothesis that says “Teaching Hortatory Exposition Writing using *Guided Wh-questions* is effective” is accepted.

Keywords: Teaching, writing, Hortatory Exposition, Guided-WH questions

INTRODUCTION

Exposition text is a type of composition that is usually written in a newspaper. It is one of text genres learned by the students in senior high school. The purpose of this kind of text is to share the author’s idea, point of view, and argument about a problem, a topic or phenomena (Djuharie 2007:31). On the other hand, exposition is written in order to explain the readers about something in a case.

Exposition text consists of hortatory exposition and analytical exposition. Hortatory exposition contains a persuasive idea where the author tries to influence the readers about the author’s subject. While, analytical exposition is a type of text used to express the idea that something needs to be taken care. This text is called argumentative text.

Hortatory exposition is a text that should be taught in a classroom especially in writing. Writing hortatory exposition text refers to the activity of the students to write the organization and the language features of the text. The students may write articles such as those which are in a newspaper; for example: writing about complaining, advertisement and suggestions.

In relation to English subject, based on the school curriculum, that is “Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan” (KTSP), one of the purposes of teaching is to enable students in improving their abilities in writing. The standard of competence of writing in syllabus of senior high school is “*Mengungkapkan makna dalam text fungsional pendek dan esai sederhana berbentuk Narrative, Spoof dan Hortatory Exposition dalam konteks kehidupan sehari-hari*”, which is applied in the second semester of Grade XI Senior High School. In relation to the syllabus, the writer teaches one of the genres in order to improve the students’ writing skill that is hortatory exposition writing.

Teaching hortatory exposition writing is one of writing skills that should be acquired by senior high school students on even semester. The generic structures of this text are thesis,

argument and recommendation. Thesis refers to the students' ideas or statements about a case or phenomena. Arguments consist of points or core of problem or discussion. On the other words, the argument is the reason for concern that will lead to recommendation. Meanwhile, the recommendation is written based on the given arguments, which is stated to persuade the readers or listeners that something should or should not be done or happen.

Writing hortatory exposition is not as easy as the students think. The students have to figure out the conventions of the hortatory exposition writing. However, the teacher is intended to be able to explain the students all conventions in detail. In order to increase the students' abilities in writing, it is important to teach hortatory exposition writing by using appropriate technique. Actually, many techniques can be used to teach writing, but the writer uses Guided Questions, namely *Wh-questions* in the effort to improve the students' hortatory exposition writing. In this case, the students are given a certain topic that is followed by some *Wh-questions* to help them to understand what the topic is about. It is meaningful practice in improving the students' abilities in writing because it stimulates their mind in sharing ideas in their writing..

Furthermore, students are difficult in constructing the structures of hortatory exposition such as thesis, argument and recommendation becoming a good paragraph where all structures related to one and other. And even, when the students start writing from thesis, the idea or opinion that they want to express is sometimes unrelated to the topic, so it is hard to go to the next structures. In other words, the thesis is very important when the students begin to write, and it determines the argument and recommendation.

Relating to what the writer has explained above, it is necessary to conduct a pre-experimental study on teaching hortatory exposition writing by using *Guided Wh-questions* to the students of SMA PGRI 1 Pontianak, especially class XI. Based on the writer's experience when the writer did his teaching practice; the students in this school were very weak at writing hortatory exposition text. It is because of some factors such that they were difficult to start with thesis statement or to share their ideas and linked the thesis with the arguments and recommendation. Therefore, in order to improve the students' abilities in writing, the writer implements the pre-test, treatment and post-test in three time meetings. This study focuses on the qualification of the items analysis of hortatory exposition such as Thesis, Arguments and Recommendation, choice of words, language use and mechanics.

METHOD

Research methodology involves the systematic procedures by which the researcher starts from the initial identification of the problem to its final conclusions. The role of the methodology is to carry on the research work in a scientific and valid manner. The method of research provides the tools and techniques by which the research problem is attacked. The methodology consists of procedures and techniques for conducting a study. According to Singh (2006:79) "Research methodology involves such general activities as identifying problems, review of the literature, formulating hypotheses, procedure for testing hypotheses, measurement, data collection analysis of data, interpreting results and drawing conclusions. Thus, research methodology consists of all general and specific activities of research"

Singh (2006) also states that the purpose of experimentation is to identify functional relationships, among phenomena through staging the occurrence of certain outcomes under controlled conditions designed to prevent the confusing effects of the operation of extraneous factors. Experimentation can be considered a technique of deliberately staging a situation designed to force nature to provide a "yes" or "no" answer to a specific hypothesis concerning the phenomena under discussion.

Pre-Experimental design refers to a single group pre-test and posttest design. The Pre-Experimental design is a single experimental group is used. In this form of research, the sample group is observed using particular set of tools of data collecting called pretest. Then the treatment is conducted to the sample group using the particular technique or strategy. Finally, the posttest (the same test used in pretest) is administered.

Obviously, it can be seen as follows:

Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
T1	X	T2

Note:

T1 : Pretest (to know the ability of the students' achievement in writing Hortatory Exposition text before treatment)

X : The treatment is given three times to the student.

T2 : Posttest (to know the ability of students' achievement in writing Hortatory Exposition text after the treatment)

In conducting this research, the writer gives a pretest to the students. The function of the pretest (T1) is to find out the basic acquisition of the students on understanding the hortatory exposition text. Then the writer gives three times treatment (X) to help the students understanding about hortatory exposition text itself. And the last, the writer gives a posttest (T2) to find out the effect of the treatment on improving the students' writing of the hortatory exposition text.

The population of this research is the Grade XI of students of SMA PGRI I Pontianak that consists of 40 students. However, the sample of this research was class XI B with 20 students.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

1. The students' individual score
 - a. Pre-Test

Table 6
The Students Pretest Score

No	Students in codes	Content	Vocabulary	Grammar	Mechanics	Total
1.	B1	30	27	21	8	86
2.	B2	31	25	20	7	83
3.	B3	25	26	19	10	80
4.	B4	26	23	17	7	73
5.	B5	26	23	20	4	72
6.	B6	25	21	19	5	69
7.	B7	25	21	17	5	68
8.	B8	22	18	17	8	65
9.	B9	23	17	17	8	65
10.	B10	25	22	13	4	62
11.	B11	19	17	12	4	52
12.	B12	24	16	16	4	60
13.	B13	25	21	10	4	60

14.	B14	19	17	11	4	51
15.	B15	23	18	13	5	59
16.	B16	25	21	10	3	59
17.	B17	25	19	10	5	59
18.	B18	20	16	10	7	53
19.	B19	24	17	11	4	56
20.	B20	20	18	11	4	53
						$\Sigma 1286$

As the score findings above, the highest score of pretest is 86 and the lowest one is 51. The total score is 1286.

b. Post-Test

Table 7
The Post-Test score

No	Students in codes	Content	Vocabulary	Grammar	Mechanics	Total
1.	B1	34	29	25	10	98
2.	B2	32	27	24	8	91
3.	B3	32	26	21	10	89
4.	B4	29	26	22	8	85
5.	B5	28	26	19	4	77
6.	B6	26	26	17	7	76
7.	B7	30	26	21	6	83
8.	B8	29	21	20	7	77
9.	B9	29	21	21	7	78
10.	B10	25	26	21	7	79
11.	B11	24	22	13	3	62
12.	B12	24	17	16	4	61

13.	B13	30	26	22	7	85
14.	B14	20	20	12	7	59
15.	B15	26	19	17	4	66
16.	B16	28	21	17	4	70
17.	B17	27	19	10	5	61
18.	B18	23	17	11	5	56
19.	B19	25	19	13	4	61
20.	B20	30	24	21	4	79
						$\Sigma 1493$

The highest score of Posttest is 98, while the lowest score is 56. The total score of the students' Posttest is 1493.

2. The students' mean score of Pre-test and Posttest

a. The mean score of Pretest and Posttest

1). The mean score of Pretest

The pretest was given to the students before the treatment. The students wrote hortatory exposition writing by using Guided Wh-questions. The result of pretest showed the total score of the students. The total score was 1286 and the mean score was 64.30 and it is qualified as Average. The computation of the students' mean scores of pretest can be seen as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &= \frac{\sum X}{N} \\ &= \frac{\sum 1286}{20} \\ &= 64.30 \end{aligned}$$

2). The mean score of Posttest

The posttest was given after the treatment. This was conducted to evaluate how the students' ability in writing hortatory exposition by using *Guided Wh-questions*. The total score of the students in this test was 1493. The mean score was 74.65. To be clear, it is shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_2 &= \frac{\sum X}{N} \\ &= \frac{\sum 1493}{20} = 74.65 \end{aligned}$$

3. The analysis of the students' individual score of pretest and posttest

Table 8
Individual Score of Pretest And Posttest

No	Students in codes	X_1 (pretest)	X_2 (posttest)	$D(X_2 - X_1)$	D^2
1.	B1	86	98	12	144
2.	B2	83	91	8	64
3.	B3	80	89	9	81
4.	B4	73	85	12	144
5.	B5	72	77	5	25
6.	B6	69	76	7	49
7.	B7	68	83	15	225
8.	B8	65	77	12	144
9.	B9	65	78	13	169
10.	B10	62	79	17	289
11.	B11	52	62	10	100
12.	B12	60	61	1	1
13.	B13	60	85	25	625
14.	B14	51	59	8	64
15.	B15	59	66	7	49
16.	B16	59	70	11	121
17.	B17	59	61	2	4
18.	B18	53	56	3	9
19.	B19	56	61	5	25
20.	B20	53	79	26	676
		$\sum X_1 = 1286$	$\sum X_2 = 1493$	$\sum D = 208$	$\sum D^2 = 3008$

4. The analysis of significance of the teaching Hortatory Exposition writing by using Guided Wh-question.

The significance of the interval score of Pretest and Posttest

The significance of the different score of pretest and posttest was calculated by using t-test formula is as follows:

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{10,35}{\sqrt{\frac{3008 - \frac{(208)^2}{20}}{20(20-1)}}}$$

$$t = \frac{10,35}{\sqrt{\frac{3008 - 2163,2}{380}}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \frac{10,35}{\sqrt{\frac{844,8}{380}}} \\
 &= \frac{10,35}{\sqrt{2,22}} \\
 &= \frac{10,35}{1,48} \\
 &= 6,99
 \end{aligned}$$

T-value (t_0) interpretation is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 df &= N-1 \\
 &= 20 - 1 \\
 &= 19
 \end{aligned}$$

It means that the degree of freedom (df) = 19, which is obtained from the t-table (t) for the level of significance. Based on the result of the computation above, it can be concluded that the value of t-observation is higher than t-table as the standard of significance in this research. As a matter of fact, the calculation of t-test indicates that “6,99” is higher than the t-table for the degree of freedom 19 that is 2.093. Briefly, there is a significance difference between the mean score of pretest and posttest. Therefore, this research can be stated as a successful or effective research since there is a good significant difference between the result of pretest and posttest.

5. The Effect Size of the treatment

After gaining the significant score of the pretest and posttest, the writer will describe the finding of the Effect Size of the treatment in order to know how significant the effect of the teaching hortatory exposition writing by using Guided Wh-question. The effect size of the treatment was computed as bellow:

$$\begin{aligned}
 ES &= t \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}} \\
 ES &= 6,99 \sqrt{\frac{1}{20}} \\
 &= 6,99 \sqrt{0,05} \\
 &= 6,99 (0,22) \\
 &= 1,53
 \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation:

Related to the result of computing the effect size above, the significant score is categorized as “Highly effective” with $ES > 0.8$ ($1,53 > 0.8$). It means the teaching of hortatory exposition writing by using *Guided Wh-question* gave a significant effect to increase the students’ achievement.

6. Testing Hypothesis

It was obviously obtained that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest on the teaching hortatory exposition by using *Guided Wh-questions* to the Grade Eleven students of SMA PGRI 1 Pontianak. It was seen by the mean score of pretest that was 64.30 and became 74.65 at the posttest. Next, the result of the treatment which had been counted by using t-test formula was 6,99 and based on the t-value, it was higher than the value in the t-table about 2.093 with the significance of 5% (0.05). Furthermore, the effect size of the treatment was 1,53. It was used to answer the problem how effective the use of *Guided Wh-question* technique in teaching

hortatory exposition writing. Based on the result that was $ES > 0.8$ ($1, 53 > 0.8$), it was categorized as highly effective. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis which stated that “Teaching hortatory exposition writing using *Guided Wh-question* is effective’ is accepted. While, the null hypothesis that stated “Teaching hortatory exposition writing using *Guided Wh-question* is not effective” is rejected. The writer conducted this research for five meetings where the two meetings were for test namely the Pretest and the Posttest and the three meetings were for implementing the treatment.

The first meeting of this research was for Pretest. In this meeting, the writer greeted the students and explained the aims of the meeting which was planned in this research. After that, the students were given the pretest to know the students’ achievement before the teaching of hortatory exposition by using Guided Wh-questions was conducted.

The Experimental Group was class XI B that consisted of 20 students. This group was given treatment or the teaching of hortatory exposition writing by using Guided Wh-questions. At the first meeting of treatment, the writer greeted the students and explained the lesson material. The material was about hortatory exposition text and the purpose of writing it. The writer also explained the generic structures and gave the example of hortatory exposition text. Then, he explained Wh-question as a guide to write hortatory exposition text. The next, the writer implemented the cooperative learning method, that was STAD (Students Team Achievement Division) type. This method was aimed to encourage the students to work together during the treatment. The writer divided the students into several groups that composed of 4 until 5 students in one group. After that, the writer distributed the material to each group and the students were asked to learn it together. And then the students were instructed to write hortatory exposition by the help of question.

The first treatment was different from the second one. On the first meeting of treatment, the students were seen little bit difficult to use *Wh-question* in writing hortatory exposition text because they were lack at vocabulary, structure and grammar as basic skill that should be mastered by the students before beginning to write. However, in the second meeting of the treatment, the students began to be able to write hortatory exposition by using question technique as well. And even, in the end of the treatment showed that the students were much better improvement than the previous meetings.

In the last meeting of this research, the writer gave the posttest to the students in order to know their mastery or knowledge about hortatory exposition during the treatment. The writer found that there was a significant difference between the pretest and the posttest score. Accordingly, from the data analysis, it was found that before the treatment was given, the students’ mean score of experimental group was 64.30. Then after the treatment process, the mean score was 74.65. This finding indicates that the teaching using *Guided Wh-questions* during the treatment process influences the achievement of the students. It means that teaching hortatory exposition by using Wh-questions is significantly effective.

CONCLUSION

With regard to the discussion in the previous chapter, the writer puts forward some points to conclude about teaching hortatory exposition text by using *Guided Wh-Questions* to the students of SMA PGRI 1 Pontianak grade XI. The writer concluded : firstly, the result of the students’ mean score of writing hortatory exposition text using *Guided Wh-questions* to the experimental group before and after the treatment is 64.30 and 74.65. It means there is qualified significant increase between the pretest and the posttest. This criteria is included average to good. Secondly, the different score of pretest and posttest is highly significant. It can be proven by the result of computing the t-test. It indicates that the t-test with “6, 99” is higher than the t-

table with 2.093 for the degree of freedom of 19. Thirdly, the use of *Guided Wh-question* to teach hortatory exposition writing is considered as an effective technique. It is shown from the result effect of the treatment. The computation of effect size of the treatment is 1, 53. based on the criteria proposed by Burn (2000:167) it is categorized high effective where 1,53 is higher than 0.8 or $ES > 0.8$ ($1,53 > 0.8$). lastly, guided Wh-questions could help the students to write hortatory exposition text easily. Even, they can develop their writing creatively by using their own ideas.

REFERENCES

- Angelina. 1979. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics*. Amganad Influgao. Madrid.
- Azar S, Betty. 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*, The Second Edition. Prentice Hall Regents, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Blerkom Van Malcolm L. 2009. *Measurement and Statistics*. New York. Routledge.
- Boekaerts Monique. 2002. *Motivation to Learn*. America. International Bureau of Education
- Brown, H. Douglas, 2000. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Burns Robert B. 2000. *Introduction to Research Methods*, the fourth edition. Person Education Australia. Longman
- Carroll Todd Robert, 1990. *Student Success Guide-Writing Skill*. Retrieved on November 17th, 2009 from: <http://www.skepdic.com>
- Cohen Luis, Manion Lawrence and Morrison Keith. 2000. *Research Methods in Education, Fifth Edition*. London and New York. Routledge Falmer, Taylor and Francis Group
- Corbett, John. 2003. *An Intercultural Approach to English Language Teaching (Languages for Intercultural Communication and Education)*. Sydney. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Coulmas Florian. 2008. *Introduction to Linguistic Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cummins Jim and Davison Chris. 2007. *International Handbook of English Language Teaching*. Springer. USA
- Djuharie, O. S. 2008. *Genre Text*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Ghith Ghazi. 2003. *The Nature of Writing Process*. American University of Beirut. American. Retrieved on October 7th, 2009 from: <http://www.nadasisland.com/ghaith-writing.html#nature>.
- Grondlund, E. Norman. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Test, the Second addition* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Hadi Sutrisno. 2004. *Methodology Research, Fourth edition*. Yogyakarta: ANDI OFFSET
- Harmer J. 1998. *How to Teach English*. England and Associated Company: Longman
- Harmer J. 2001. *The Practical of English Language Teaching*, Third Addition. England and Associated Company: Longman.
- Hutchinson Tom and Allan Waters. 1991. *English for Specific Purpose, Learning Center-approach*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Heaton, J. B. 1988. *Writing English Language Test: a Practical Guide for Teachers of English as a second or Foreign Language*. Singapore: Ban Wah Press Limited.
- Hughes A.G. (1995). *Learning and Teaching: An Introduction to Psychology and Education*. Longmans.
- James Hartley. 2008. *Academic Writing and Publishing*. New York. Rutledge.
- Kane Thomas S. 2000. *The Essential Guide to Writing*. Oxford University Press inc. New York: Berkley Books
- Kothari C.R. 2004. *Research Methodology_ methods and techniques*. Jaipur (India). New Age International Publishers Ltd.
- Lavid Julia. 1995. *Toward Text Type Taxonomy*. Procesamiento Lenguaje Natural Revista. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

- Loughran, John. 2007. *International Handbook of Self-study and Teachers Education Practices*. Springer. USA
- Mas'ud Fuad. 2005. *Essentials of English Grammar, a practical guide*, the Third Edition. BPFE- Jakarta.
- Muriel, Troike Saville. 2006. *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge. University of Arizona
- Nawawi, Hadi. 1983. *Metodologi Penelitian Bidang sosial*. Yogyakarta. Gajah Mada University Press.
- Perry Jr. Fred L. 2005. *Research in Applied Linguistics*. New Jersey London Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers