

GENRE ANALYSIS ON ENGLISH LEARNERS' HORTATORY EXPOSITIONS

BY: KATHARINA RUSTIPA
UNISBANK SEMARANG

ABSTRACT:

Latar belakang penelitian ini adalah kecenderungan para mahasiswa untuk mentransfer unsur-unsur bahasa ibu ke dalam bahasa Inggris. Hal ini akan membuat ujaran-ujaran mereka tidak sesuai dengan budaya bahasa Inggris. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di Universitas Stikubank Semarang. Objek penelitian ini terdiri dari 6 mahasiswa jurusan bahasa Inggris. Para mahasiswa tersebut diminta untuk berpidato dalam bahasa Inggris. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa tujuan komunikasi, struktur wacana, cirri-ciri linguistik dari *Hortatory Expositions* yang diproduksi oleh mahasiswa sesuai dengan *Hortatory Expositions* yang diproduksi oleh penutur asing (sesuai dengan teori *Hortatory Expositions*). Akan tetapi mahasiswa membuat beberapa kesalahan *lexicogrammar* yang dapat diklasifikasikan ke dalam kesalahan *tense*, kesalahan kosa kata, dan kesalahan *finite*. Kesalahan-kesalahan ini akan mempunyai dampak pada makna wacana. Berdasarkan penemuan dalam penelitian ini, kami mengajukan beberapa saran sebagai berikut: (1) tujuan komunikasi, struktur wacana, ciri-ciri linguistic *Hortatory Expositions* bahasa Inggris sebaiknya diajarkan kepada mahasiswa ; (2) mahasiswa maupun dosen dapat belajar dari kesalahan-kesalahan yang dibuat oleh mahasiswa dalam penelitian ini.

KEY WORDS:

Hortatory Exposition, genre, monologue, communicative purpose, schematic structure, linguistic feature, lexicogrammar.

INTRODUCTION

One of the goals to study English is to be able to speak or communicate in English. Speaking English means negotiating meaning in an English way. A person is said to master in speaking English if he/she can carry out logico-semantic and interpersonal negotiation. Carrying out logico-semantic negotiation means exchanging information or ideas, while carrying out interpersonal negotiation means exchanging attitudes.

Speaking is classified into interaction and monologue. Speaking is called interaction when two or more participants interact and construct a text together. While speaking is called

monologue when one speaker produces the entire text with little or no interaction. Concerning interaction speaking, Eggins and Slade argue that it is differentiated into transactional / pragmatic interaction and interpersonal interaction. Transactional interaction is functionally motivated; we interact to each other in order to accomplish a wide range of tasks. For example: we talk to buy and sell, to find out information, to pass on knowledge, to make appointment, to get jobs, etc. Interpersonal interaction is motivated by interpersonal needs, to establish who we are, how we relate to others, and what we think of the world is. We talk simply for the sake of talking itself (1997: 6).

As a teacher, the writer is really concerned about the speaking mastery of the students. She wants to know the English the students use in oral communication, whether they have been able to realize meanings in the proper linguistic features / lexicogrammar. The writer chooses oral monologues as the data for her study because she is in the opinion that oral monologues reflect the students' oral communication capability.

Kaplan's idea inspired the writer to conduct genre analysis on learners' hortatory expositions. He states that every language has genres but they are realized differently across cultures. Writers or speakers are bound by the resources of the language they use. There is a tendency to bring to a second language the resources available in the first, whether or not those resources are actually available in L2 (2000: 82 – 85). The writer wants to investigate the schematic structure and the lexicogrammar of the hortatory expositions produced by the students because schematic structure and lexicogrammatical features characterize certain genre.

Learners' Hortatory Expositions are texts of Hortatory Expositions produced by students learning English. The texts produced display the English declarative as well as procedural knowledge the students have acquired. The texts of learners' Hortatory Expositions are a kind of genre. Genre is a staged, goal-oriented, purposeful activity in which speakers engage as members of our culture (Martin in Eggins, 1994). So genre is a communicative event or social activity in which language is used to exchange meanings through a number of stages, each of which is given a function. Based on this meaning of genre, the generic structure analysis was carried out.

From the data collected, the writer wanted to explain:

- (1) the communicative purposes of the learners' Hortatory Expositions.

- (2) the schematic structures of the learners' Hortatory Expositions.
- (3) the linguistic features that characterize the learners' Hortatory Expositions.

The results of the analysis may be useful for the English teaching and learning. This coincides with Swales' idea "genre analysis as a means of studying spoken and written discourse for applied ends" (1990, 1). In line with this idea, Bathia [(1983) (in Miller 1997: 134)] has reiterated the importance of linguistic analysis in the practice of language teaching.

Concerning the elements of genre (i.e. communicative purpose, schematic structure, linguistic features), some linguists explain as follows:

Schematic Structure

Schematic structure refers to text structure (Martin, 1992: 505). Text structure refers to the overall structure, the global structure of the message form (Halliday and Hasan 1989: 53). Eggins (1994: 36) states that schematic structure refers to the staged, step-by-step organization of the genre. Thus, genres employ stages or steps to achieve goals. The reason why genres have stages or steps is that we cannot make all the meanings we want to at once. Genres typically move through stages to a point of closure and are explicitly treated by speaker / listener as incomplete if closure is not attained. Each stage in a genre contributes a part of the overall meanings that must be made for the genre to be accomplished successfully. In order to accomplish a transaction in our culture, it is necessary for us to go through a number of steps or stages.

Some elements of schematic structure are obligatory and some others are optional. With regard to the obligatory and optional elements, Halliday and Hasan (1989: 62) explain that obligatory elements are the key elements in recognizing a genre, they are obliged to occur, they define the genre to which a text belongs, and the appearance of these elements in a specific order corresponds to our perception of whether the text is complete or incomplete. Optional elements are elements that are not obliged to occur.

To differentiate obligatory elements from optional elements in schematic structure, optional elements are put in parentheses, while obligatory elements are not. In the following, the generic schematic structures of monologues are presented.

| Genre | Generic structure |
|-----------|--|
| Narrative | (Abstract) ^ (Orientation) ^ Complication ^ Evaluation ^ Resolution ^ (Coda) |

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Anecdote | (Abstract) ^ (Orientation) ^ Remarkable Event ^ Reaction ^ (Coda) |
| Recount | (Abstract) ^ Orientation ^ Record of Events ^ (Coda) |
| Report | General Classification ^ Description |
| Analytical Exposition | Thesis statement ^ Argument ^ (Reiteration) |
| Explanation | Phenomenon ^ Explanation |
| Procedure | Goal ^ Materials ^ Method |
| Hortatory Exposition | Thesis Statement ^ Argument ^ Recommendation |
| Description | Identification ^ Description |

Linguistic Features Realized in Monologues

Although identifying the schematic structure of a genre is a major part of generic analysis, it cannot be performed accurately without an analysis of the lexicogrammatical realizations of each stage of schematic structure (Eggins and Slade 1997: 235). Lexicogrammatical realizations refer to the way meanings get encoded or expressed in a semiotic system.

Texts of different genres reveal different linguistic feature choices. Thus, realization patterns will differ across genres. Even the different stages of a genre will reveal different lexicogrammatical patterns.

Genres of monologues may comprise genres of Narratives, Explanation, Recounts, Analytical Exposition, Hortatory Exposition. The genre of Hortatory Exposition will be explained below.

Hortatory Exposition

The significant lexicogrammatical features of Hortatory Exposition are: Focus on generic human and non-human participants; Use of mental, material, relational processes; Use of simple present tense.

The Hortatory Exposition is aimed at persuading listeners that something should or should not be. This aim is achieved through the sub-communicative purposes such as: (1) to

introduce the topic and to indicate the speaker's position / concern, (2) to develop or support the speaker's position or concern, (3) to present what ought or ought not to happen.

The schematic structure of Hortatory Exposition is as follows: Thesis Statement ^ Argument ^ Recommendation (Gerrot and Wignell 1995; Derewianka 1995)

METHOD

The research was conducted at Faculty of Language and Culture, UNISBANK Semarang. The data were obtained by recording six students' Hortatory Expositions while the students were joining speaking V class. The data were then transcribed and analyzed.

The learners' Hortatory Expositions are analyzed qualitatively on the basis of genre analysis approach offered by Eggins (1994), Eggins and Slade (1997). The model of the analysis basically suggests that genre analysis comprise two parts, i.e. identifying the stages of the schematic structure of the text and analyzing the linguistic features used in each stage. The analysis follows the steps below:

Recognizing the segments of the text

This step is to identify the segments of the text of each learner's monologue. This is to indicate how each segment is different from the others, how the segments are interrelated and constitute a unity.

Defining the sub communicative purpose of each segment

In this step, the sub communicative purpose of each segment will be defined.

Identifying and differentiating stages within the genre

This step is to identify the constituent stages. There are two kinds of criteria in dividing a text into its constituent stages, i.e. formal criteria and functional criteria. In formal criteria, we divide the text into stages according to the form of the different constituents. In functional criteria, we divide the text into stages according to the function of the different constituents. The functional criteria will be applied in this genre analysis because this approach helps us answer the functionally-oriented question we are concerned with, i.e. how each stage in the genre contributes towards achieving the overall purpose.

Step 1. Specifying obligatory and optional stages

This step is to clarify which stage is obliged to occur, and which one is not obliged to occur. Obligatory element is the key element in recognizing a genre; it is obliged to occur. While optional element is one that can occur but it is not obliged to occur.

Step 2. Devising a structural formula

This step is to devise a structural formula to describe the genre.

Step 3. Analyzing the lexicogrammatical features of each stage

Each genre is made up of functionally related stages and this means that the different stages will reveal different lexicogrammatical patterns. The lexicogrammatical analysis reveals how each stage of a text realizes its particular purposes, how meanings are realized in linguistic features.

The unit of analysis is clause. This coincides with Eggins' idea that we should focus on clauses. "We will only focus on describing the structure of the clause. This is because the clause is generally recognized to be the pivotal unit of grammatical meaning, and also because patterns which can be identified for the clause have parallels for units of lower ranks" (1994: 139). This is also in accordance with Gerrot's and Wignell's ideas that clauses and clause complexes are equally applicable to spoken and written language, and therefore are preferred (1995: 82).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

From the data collected, the writer finds out the following.

The communicative purposes of learners' Hortatory expositions

The communicative purposes are clauses or groups of clauses and defined on the basis of functional criteria. These are the communicative purposes and sub purposes found in the learners' Hortatory Expositions.

Hortatory Exposition is to persuade readers or listeners that something should or should not be. This communicative purpose is achieved through several sub purposes. The sub purposes of Hortatory Expositions produced by the learners are as follows:

1. *To embody an interpersonal attitude of the speaker to the audience*

This is recognized from the vocative (address).

2. *To indicate personal relation of the speaker toward the audience*

This is realized by greeting such as good morning, good afternoon, assalamuallaikum wr. wb.

3. *To introduce the topic and to indicate the speaker's position / concern*

This is recognized from Thesis Statement in which the speaker reveals his / her concern. This is realized in mental processes, attitudinal lexis

4. *To develop or support the speaker's position or concern*

This is realized by reasons for concern leading to recommendation, found in Argument stage.

5. *To present what ought or ought not to happen*

This is recognized from the speaker's command to the audience, realized mostly in imperatives.

6. *To thank the audience*

This is realized by Thanking stage in which the speaker thanks the audience for listening her / him.

The Schematic Structures of Learners' Hortatory Expositions

On the basis of functional labeling, the learners' Hortatory Expositions are divided into several constituent stages, in order that the schematic structures of learners' Hortatory Expositions can be realized.

The actual schematic structures of learners' Hortatory Expositions need to be observed thoroughly and refined in order to know a more general description of the texts of learners' Hortatory Expositions. Halliday and Hasan (1989: 64) call this refined structure as Generic Structure Potential or Structure Potential. This potential structure can accommodate the actual structures of the genres of the learners' Hortatory Expositions.

After a thorough study of the actual structures of the learners' Hortatory Expositions, the Generic Structure Potential of the learners' Hortatory Expositions can be stated below:

*(Address) *(Greeting) * (Thanking) ^{Thesis Statement ^ Argument ^ Recommendation}

The Generic Structure Potential of the Hortatory Exposition can be read as follows: Address, Greeting, and Thanking are not fixed in order. Thanking stage is recursive or may occur more than once. Thesis Statement, Argument, and Recommendation are fixed in order. Thesis Statement referring to statement of issue of concern, is followed by Argument which

refers to the reasons for concern, and then it is followed by Recommendation which refers to suggestions.

The order and the obligatory stages of the learners' Hortatory Expositions are the same as those of Hortatory Exposition as stated by Eggins and Slade (1997), Derewianka (1995), Gerrot and Wignell (1995), i.e. Thesis Statement ^ Argument ^ Recommendation. The optional stages produced by the learners are Thanking, Greeting, Address.

However, some learners misplace the stages, i.e. they start their speeches with Thanking and end their speeches with Greeting. Some stages are also not realized properly. The learners translate the Indonesian expressions literally. This makes their speeches unlike the English ones.

Linguistic Features Characterizing the Learners' Hortatory Expositions

After a thorough analysis on the linguistic features used in the texts of learners' monologues, some interesting points are found out. The findings will be presented below:

The significant lexicogrammatical features of the learners' Hortatory Expositions are the same as what are mentioned by Derewianka (1995), i.e. focus on generic human and non-human participants; use of mental, material, relational processes; use of simple present tense.

From the data, the writer found out that the learners make vocabulary and finite errors. The vocabulary errors comprise: errors of word class, errors of diction. The finite errors comprise: errors of lack of finite, errors of concord, errors of double finite. The vocabulary errors will cause the speakers unable to convey some of their ideational meanings properly. The finite errors will cause the speakers unable to convey some of their interpersonal meanings properly. The finite errors will also reduce the contextual coherence of the texts because the wrong finite will not hang with the surrounding words.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the study show that the genres the communicative purposes, the schematic structures, and the linguistic features of the learners' Hortatory Expositions match those produced by the English native speakers. However, the students make a number of lexicogrammatical errors which can be classified into tense errors, vocabulary errors, finite errors. These errors will have impact on the meanings of the texts. And these problems also affect the contextual coherence of the texts. The tense and finite errors may cause the

speakers unable to convey some of their interpersonal meanings properly because tense and finite belong to the mood structure. These errors will also affect the contextual coherence of the texts because the clauses will not hang together with the neighboring clauses. The vocabulary errors may cause the speakers unable to convey some of their ideational meanings properly because the vocabulary bears the ideational meanings. Some learners also misplace some stages of the schematic structure, i.e. they start their speeches with Thanking, and end their speeches with Greeting. Some others realize some stages of the schematic structure inappropriately by translating the Indonesian expressions literally. These make their speeches unlike the English ones.

Based on the findings in this study, some suggestions are put forward, i.e. (1) The communicative purposes, the schematic structures, the linguistic features of Hortatory Expositions in the target language should be taught to the students because they characterize certain genres; (2) The teachers and the students can learn from the errors they make in this study. The teacher should give more practice to the students concerning the areas of errors that they make. They should reflect on the problems concerning their weaknesses and study harder to compensate their weaknesses.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce, Marianne and IMurcia Eite Olshtain. (2000). *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, Malcoln. (1991). *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis*. London and Newyork: Routledge.
- Crystal, D. (1992). *Introducing Linguistics*. London: Penguin
- Derewianka, Beverly. (1995). *Exploring How Text Work*. Newtown: Primary English Teaching Association.
- Egins, Suzanne. (1994). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Egins, Suzanne and Diana Slade. (1997). *Analyzing Casual Conversation*. London and Washington: Cassel.
- Ellis, Rod. (1989). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gerrot, Linda and Peter Wignell. (1995). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Gerd Stabler.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *Spoken and Written Language*. Sydney: Deakin University.

- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994.a). *Language as Social Semiotic*. Newyork: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1994.b). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Newyork: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Ruqaiya Hasan. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1989). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Sydney: Deakin University.
- Kaplan, Robert B. (2000). Contrastive Rethoric and Discourse Analysis: Who writes what to whom? When? In what circumstances? Sarangi, Srikant and Coulthart, Malcolm (Ed.). *Discourse and Social Life*. Pp. 82 – 101.
- Larsen, Diane et al. (1992). *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. New York: Longman.
- Martin, JR. (1992). *English Text*. Philadelphia /Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Martin, JR. et al. (1997). *Working with Functional Grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Martin, JR. and David Rose. (2003). *Working with Discourse*. Limited edition for: The Sate University of Semarang, Central Java, Indonesia.
- Matthiessen, Christian. (1995). *Lexicogrammatical Cartography: English System*. Tokyo: International language Sciences Publishers.
- Miller, Tom. (1997). *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Application*. Washington, DC: English Language Program United States Information Agency.
- Mulyana, Yayan G.H. (1996). *English for Public Speaking*. Jakarta: VISIPRO
- Nunan, David. (1993). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin.
- Richards, Jack et al. (1990). *Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Stubbs, Michael. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Swales, John M. (1990). *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.