

## FEATURE OF HORTATORY TEXT: A SENTENCE ELEMENT PATTERN ANALYSIS

Jean Antunes Rudolf Zico Ma'u

Universitas Sanata Dharma  
jeanmau1510@gmail.com

### Abstract

*Text is an important part in learning language. In English, there are several types of texts which are considered to be complicated by readers. One of such texts is hortatory text. Hortatory text is related to the proposal of an individual's argument. For some readers, this type of text might be complicated because in one sense it might be persuading but in the other sense it might only be suggesting. Due to the complication, through the study the researcher would like to describe the hortatory text by analysing the sentence elements that a hortatory text might have. In addition, the researcher would also like to analyse the word category and the tense that a hortatory text might contain in order to provide a complete description of the hortatory text. From the results of the analysis, the researcher found that the main sentence element patterns of a hortatory text are S – P, S – P – Pre – DO, and S – P – DO. Other findings are the patterns are filled with the pronoun "we" which are mainly with the modality verb; and these patterns are also filled with the present and the present perfect tense.*

**Keywords:** *hortatory text, sentence element, word category, tense*

### Background

Text is an important part in learning language especially in learning English. In English, there are several types of texts that readers should learn. The difficulty to understand these types of texts may be caused by several reasons and one of the reasons might be the different features that a text has from one to another. As a result, these texts can be very confusing especially for the readers who have low English proficiency.

In English there are several types of text namely narrative, descriptive, process, recount, hortatory, expository, persuasion, report, and anecdote. To complicate these types of texts, they are possibly expanded into songs; consequently, the English songs such as blues, country songs, ballads, and folk songs can be included into these types of texts. From all of these

texts, the researcher would like to analyse the hortatory text further. The reason is that this hortatory text has interesting features that are different from the others. These features might not be shared by the other texts.

Apart of the features in any text, each text is definitely made up of sentences. In other words, sentences become the largest unit to which one may assign a grammatical structure within the text (Palmer, 1986). The definition provided by Palmer is rather general because in daily activity, especially in the conversation, a sentence might be incomplete or might consist of several sentences. There are several reasons that lie behind such variety. First, the incomplete sentence may occur because of interruptions or changes within the mind of a speaker. Second, the incomplete sentences may serve as a dependent part of the previous sentence. Third, the incomplete sentences might

serve as the shortened form of a complete sentence.

Apart from the variety that has been explained in the previous paragraph, the construction a sentence might be expanded. There are two ways in expanding a sentence. The first way is coordinating the two sentences with a conjunction so that the relationship between the two sentences becomes equal. For example, *I am watching television (and) my sister is reading a book*. If the conjunction is omitted, there will be two sentences namely *I am watching television* and *My sister is reading a book*. Then, the second way is embedding one sentence to the sentence with a higher level. For example, a sentence such as *John said many things* may also be uttered by saying *John said that he was coming*. It is clear that *that he was coming* is embedded into *John said* because it replaces *many things*. As a result, *that he was coming* becomes the subordination of *John said*. The clause itself becomes the part of a larger sentence (Palmer, 1986).

Up to this point, it might be apparent that defining a sentence is quite difficult because the analysis can only be conducted to orthographic sentences or the sentences that appear in the written language (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2002). Similar situation certainly applies to a hortatory text since this type of text has certain features. In order to identify the certain characteristics that a hortatory text has, the researcher would like to analyse the sentences that build up the construction of a hortatory text. The aim is to differentiate the type of sentences that comprise a hortatory text so that readers may differentiate the hortatory text from the other types of text. In conducting the analysis, the researcher will focus on the sentence elements of the hortatory text. Regarding the sentence elements, the elements of a sentence consist of subject, predicate, direct object, indirect object,

object complement, subject complement, and adverbial complements; the adverbial complements consist of predicator, adjunct, conjunct, and disjunct (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2002). In addition, the researcher will also take a closer look at the word category that can be found within the sentences and also the tense that might have been implied within these sentences. The word category is used to describe the focus of the text while the tense is used to state the time relevance.

### Finding & Discussion

In this section, the researcher will discuss the analysis of the sentence elements within the hortatory text. In conducting the analysis, the researcher selected three hortatory texts randomly from the Web. The first hortatory text was written by Annisa (Annisa, 2018), the second hortatory text was written by Nuryani (Nuryani, 2018), and the third hortatory text was written by anonym (Anonym, 2018). The analysis on the sentence elements of the three hortatory texts will be supported by other analyses on two other aspects namely the word category and the tense. The researcher will include the analysis on the word category and the tense so that a complete construction of characteristics that a hortatory text has can be described completely. In the researcher's mind, relying only on the sentence element analysis will not be sufficient since the same element pattern might be filled with different words categories and different tense. For example, the same element S – P – DO – Adjunct of Time might be filled with two different tenses that involve various word categories as follows:

- a. They conduct the examination every June.
- b. I read that book last night.

The two examples above certainly carry different meaning, and this difference can be misleading for any readers who want to

learn English, especially for those who have low English proficiency. By including the analysis on both the word category and the tense, the researcher is sure that better description on the features of a hortatory text is possibly better described.

a. Sentence Element Pattern

The sentence element is the backbone of the analysis. In other words, the main focus of the study is on the sentence element pattern. In analysing the sentence element pattern, the researcher gathered all of the patterns that appeared in the three hortatory texts that had been selected. In overall, there were 35 sentences that the researcher found within the three hortatory texts. From these 35 sentences, the researcher encoded the pattern of the sentence elements and the researcher found that there were three main patterns that a hortatory text had namely S – P (5.72%), S – P – Pre – DO (5.72%), and S – P – DO (45.72%). The three patterns might appear in their basic forms but they might also appear in their expanded form. When these patterns appeared in their expanded forms, these patterns would have combinations with other elements such as adjunct, object of complement, or alike. Each of these patterns will be explained in the following paragraphs.

First of all, the researcher discussed the S – P pattern. When the pattern S – P appeared in its basic form, the pattern would be easily understood because the elements were very easy to discern. The example of the basic form of S – P was as follows:

*Television is today a part of daily life.*  
(HT01S01)

In this sentence, readers would easily determine that *television* was the subject while *is today a part of daily life*. However, readers were possibly to have difficulties as they found the expanded form of the pattern S – P.

*What makes television even more interesting is that action is accompanied by sound, so that we can see as well as hear what on the television.* (HT01S04)

In the above example, the pattern was certainly complicated, and therefore, it would be difficult to define the subject and the predicator. The difficulties could be found in the fact that the subject and the predicator consisted of several sub-patterns. The subject of the above sentence was *what makes television even more interesting* while the predicate is *that action is accompanied by sound so that we can see as well as hear what on the television*. Certainly, readers felt confused with the expansion of each element. The subject of the above sentence itself consisted of subject (*what*), predicate (*makes*), direct object (*television*), and object of complement (*even more interesting*).

Similar case was also found in the S – P – Pre – DO pattern. When the pattern appeared in its basic form, readers would be easily able to define the elements.

*Television enables to meet important people.* (HT01S06)

Similar to the case of S – P pattern, the S – P – Pre – DO pattern would be easily understood because the elements were so clear that readers could categorize them. However, when the given pattern appeared in its expanded form readers would have difficulties in categorizing the elements.

*It is important to suggest that television should be used for socially constructive purpose for the sake of better life.*  
(HT01S12)

In the above sentence, the expansion could be found in the DO. The DO in the above example consisted of subject (*television*), predicate (*should be used*), first predicator (*for socially constructive purpose*), and

second predicator (*for the sake of better life*).

Despite the complexity in the two previous patterns, the third pattern or the S – P – DO pattern was rather unique. The S – P – DO pattern always appeared in the expanded form yet the elements of its expanded form were still easy to categorize. The reason was that the expansion was not complicated. Not to mention, the expansion itself was very simple.

*Nowadays, in modern era, I think internet is very important for students. (HT02S01)*

*Second, they can add their friends in all countries in the world by internet. (HT02S06)*

*Entrepreneurs who want to minimize their tax payments tend to do such a thing more often. (HT03S08)*

*We have to prevent the younger generations from getting a bad mentality caused by corruption. (HT03S11)*

From these sentences, it was apparent that the expansion was not complicated. Although there might be sub-patterns, such as in the sentence encoded HTS02 where the direct object (*internet is very important*) consisted of subject (*internet*), predicate (*is very important*), and predicator (*for students*), readers would still be able to identify these elements in comparison to expanded form of the previous patterns namely S – P and S – P – Pre – DO.

From the above findings, the researcher might suggest that there were three main sentence element patterns that a hortatory text had. These patterns were S – P, S – P – Pre – DO, and S – P – DO. These patterns appeared in both the basic and the expanded forms. Then, when these patterns appeared in their expanded form,

the patterns would be complicated because each element might consist of several other elements that built up the sub-patterns. In order to discern these elements, readers should pay attention closely to the build-up of the elements. However, the pattern S – P – DO was quite different because the elements of its expanded form was still easy to categorize and thus the sentence was easy to understand. The consequence from this situation is that readers might understand a hortatory text easier if the hortatory text makes use of more S – P – DO pattern.

#### b. Word category

After analysing the sentence element pattern in the selected hortatory texts, the researcher now would like to bring further the analysis by classifying the word category that had been found. The word category that had been found in the three hortatory texts consisted of nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, pronouns, determiners, and auxiliaries (Greenbaum & Nelson, 2002). The words in these three texts might not contain all of the word categories; however, the researcher would present the word category with the highest percentage in order to provide better description on the overall texts. The findings on the word category would be presented in the following table.

**Table 1. Word category with the Highest Percentage**

No	Class	Sub-Class	%
1	Pronoun	We	2.08
		It	1.46
2	Noun	Proper Noun	25.63
3	Verb	Main Verb	14.02
		Modality	2.71
		Phrasal Auxiliaries	5.42
4	Determiner	The	4.17
5	Conjunction	And	2.92

Note: the overall number of the words in the three hortatory texts is 485 words.

These findings were very unique. In terms of pronoun, the hortatory texts mostly made use of the pronoun *We* and *It*. By using the pronoun *We*, it was apparent that the authors of these texts would like to invite the readers to come into their mind. However, the use of pronoun *We* is not intended to persuade the readers' mind. This can be described in the following examples.

*As we all know internet has many function for supporting our life. (HT02S02)*

*From my arguments above, as student, we should use internet facility well to get knowledge, friends, information etc. (HT02S09)*

From these examples, the researcher might conclude that the pronoun *We* was used in order to invite the readers to see the things around them in their perspective. The author of the above sentences provided the fact that comes from the daily life and turned the fact into the basis of their arguments within the text. Although there might be a sense of imperative (presented by the modal *should*), the decision to follow the author's perspective was assumed to lie on the readers' hands. Whether the readers will admit the author's idea or not is not a problem

because the author just shares the opinions that he or she has.

The second pronoun that drew the interest of the researcher was the use of the pronoun *It*. The use of this pronoun was somehow related to the proper noun. As having been displayed, the proper nouns had been mostly benefitted in the three hortatory texts. In other words, these proper nouns became the subject in the three hortatory texts. Looking at this case, certainly the authors of the three texts shifted the focus from the human beings to the nouns. The aim was to present the daily phenomena that can easily be found as the basis of their arguments in the text. The authors seem to use these phenomena to build the arguments from their perspective. By doing so, the readers will certainly be aware of the phenomena from another perspective yet they might find these phenomena daily. In sum, through the use of the pronoun *We* and *It* the authors of the three hortatory texts try to put their position into the readers' position so that both the authors and the readers may come to the same ideas.

*Television has a great influence on our idea about what is right and what is wrong. (HT01S08)*

*It influences the way which we should behave. (HT01S09)*

*Well, corruption is common everywhere in the world, even in the United States. (HT03S03)*

*It is just a matter of intensity. (HT03S04)*

Furthermore, the researcher also found that the three hortatory texts made use of three sub-classes of verbs namely main verb, modality, and phrasal auxiliaries. The main verb tends to go along with the tense that has been used in the three hortatory texts (the tense will be discussed in the next section) and this case is related to the

subject and verb agreement. However, the case will be different for the use of modality. Modality is used in order to present intermediate degrees or various indeterminacy between “yes” and “no”; in other words, modality is the reversal of polarity, which urges the answer “yes” and “no” (Halliday and Matthiesen, 2004). In the same time, modality can also be used in order to express the attitudes of the speaker, or in this case the author; modality or modals can be used in order to express that something is necessary, advisable, permissible, possible, or probable (Azar, 2002). Paying attention to the functions here, the researcher can confirm that use of this modality is to state the possibility or the probability that the authors share in the texts. This possibility or probability is once again presented by using the daily phenomena in the readers’ surroundings so that the readers may come into the similar conclusions with the authors. The use of phrasal auxiliaries, the intermediary form between main verb and the auxiliary verb, strengthens the sense of modality that has been used. Last but not the least, the use of determiner is intended to refer to the case that has been discussed (the marked case) while the use of conjunction is intended to combine several ideas into a good sentence. Being put together, these word categories support the sentences that build up the whole hortatory texts.

c. Tense

In order to provide a better description on the features of hortatory texts, the researcher also analysed the tense that the authors of the three hortatory texts used. From the results of the analysis, the researcher found that most of the sentences in the texts are simple present and that there is only one sentence that makes use of present perfect. The findings would be provided in the following table.

**Table 2. Frequency of Tense in the Three Hortatory Texts**

No	Tense	%
1	Simple Present	97.14
2	Present Perfect	2.86

Tense is a grammatical category that refers to the time when a situation occurs; the use of grammatical category is marked by the form of the verb and, therefore, there should be an agreement between the subjects and the verb (Greenbaum, Sydney & Gerald Nelson, 2002). In terms of time, although both of the tense refers to the present time there is still an underlying difference between the simple present tense and the present perfect tense. The simple present tense states events or situations that always, usually, and habitually exist; these events or situations exist now, have existed in the past, and probably will exist in the future (Azar, 2002). From the definition, it is apparent that the phenomena that the three authors discuss in the three hortatory texts exist from the past and probably until the future. In other words, the phenomena being discussed are already in existence for such a long time and it is already habitual.

*Today we can stay at home and enjoy entertainment that once could be seen only in cinema, theaters and sport arenas. (HT01S05)*

*Students can search anything or something from internet. (HT02S04)*

On the other hand, present perfect tense does not emphasize the exact time because this tense gives the idea that one thing happens before another time or event (Azar, 2002). In other words, the definite time when a situation or an event occurs is not the main focus in this tense. So, a situation or an event happen in the past but the occurrence of this situation or event is not clear.

*The survey has made me sad, actually, because I stay and earn a living here in the capital. (HT03S06)*

The combination between the simple present tense and the present perfect tense strengthens the cases that the authors of the three hortatory texts have built in their arguments. Along with the sentence element pattern and the word category, these authors, according to the researcher's opinion, are able to present good cases. The significance of all of these aspects will be discussed in the following section.

d. The Significance of Sentence Element, Word Category, and Tense in Building the Hortatory Text

The above idea supports the fact that language construe human experience. This is related to two basic functions of a language namely make sense of experience and to act out the social relationship. These functions in a language are also known as metafunction, consisting of: ideational, interpersonal, and textual. The ideational metafunction can be divided into two categories namely experiential and logical. Ideational metafunction helps construing human experience, interpersonal metafunction enacts social relationship, and textual metafunction combines both of the previous functions (Halliday and Matthiesen, 2004). Looking at the selected hortatory text, the researcher is sure that, based on the analysis in the study, hortatory texts have textual metafunction. The reason is that the hortatory texts try to share opinions by stating the events that happen in the daily life. As a result, after reading these texts the readers might have new experiences or second opinion with regards to the topic that has been discussed. In other words, they will gain new knowledge through the social activities.

The textual metafunction here is well represented by the use of sentence elements, the word category, and the tense.

The sentence element certainly serves as the backbone of the ideas in the three hortatory texts. The two patterns, namely S – P and S – P – Pre – DO, are selected as the main pattern in order that the authors may present their ideas in a very simple manner. The use of other pattern, S – P – DO, in combination with other elements or in the expanded form, is also useful. Being put together, the sentences in the three hortatory texts become very direct and thus the sentences can be clearly understood by the readers. The selection of these patterns is well supported by the use of main verb, modality, and phrasal auxiliaries. As having been discussed in the previous section, modality is the reversal of polarity, which means that in modality there is not any exact answer. This characteristic indeed fits into the idea of hortatory text, namely presenting ideas without persuading readers to embrace it. Not to mention, the context of these hortatory texts is adjusted to the present time and with the combination of the three verb categories the readers will certainly arrive to the second opinion which the authors intend to propose. The adjustment to the present context itself is strongly supported by the use of simple present tense. With the use of simple present tense, the readers will be aware that the ideas that the authors convey in their hortatory texts happen from the past to present and the readers therefore might view it according to the authors' perspective. This situation is supported by the use of present perfect tense, which aims at defining that something happens before another thing. In other word, the use of present perfect tense strengthens the case that the authors present in terms of continuance (something exists from the past to present). This, once again, will result in the second opinion that readers might have after reading these hortatory texts in specific and other hortatory texts in general.

From the relationship among the three features namely the sentence element

pattern, the word category, and the tense, the researcher found that in general a hortatory text had underlying characteristic: to attain second opinion on the reader's mind. This characteristic is clearly shown in the case that the authors of the three hortatory texts have proposed. They propose the case that occurs in the daily life but from a different perspective. With the use of the three features, they are able to depict the case from different angle so that the readers will come into different opinion. In other words, after reading the hortatory text the readers will have a second opinion toward the case that has been proposed. To attain a second opinion certainly can be regarded as the underlying characteristic of the hortatory text. This characteristic differentiates the hortatory text from the other type of text notable the persuasion text since in persuasion text the reader will be persuaded to do something. The hortatory text may actually be intended to influence the reader but the level of the influence is not as strong as that of the persuasion text. As a result, when readers encounters a hortatory text and comes into his or her second opinion the decision to follow or to not follow the suggestion in relation to the case that has been proposed by the author will be on the reader's hand. The author only presents the case from a different point of view and the decision will be on the reader's hand.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the results and the discussions in the study, the researcher would like to draw three conclusions. The first conclusion is related to the sentence element pattern. In terms of sentence element pattern, the basic pattern that a hortatory text might have are S – P, S – P – Pre – DO, and S – P – DO. The three patterns appear in both the basic and the expanded form. The expanded form of the pattern S – P and S – P – Pre – DO is rather complicated while the expanded form of the pattern S – P – DO is rather simple. Due to the situation, readers will

easily understand a hortatory text if the hortatory text makes use of more S – P – DO pattern. The second conclusion is related to the word category. The pronoun *We* and *It* has been used quite frequent in the three hortatory texts. The aim is to invite the readers into the mind of the authors. By doing so, the authors emphasize that the readers might actually experience the same thing in the cases that the authors have presented. In order to support this statement, there are three kinds of verbs that have been used in a hortatory text namely main verb, modality, and phrasal auxiliaries. These verbs help associating the ideas in the hortatory texts to the present time and, in the same time, presenting the authors' ideas without having to force the readers to embrace these ideas. This association is mainly presented by the modality since modality presents the various indeterminacy meaning that readers may be aware of the case that the authors propose yet, they might or might not agree with the authors. Along with the determiner and the conjunction, the authors' ideas become more apparent. As a result, the readers will have some kind of second opinion after reading the texts. The third or the last conclusion is related to the tense. The tense that has been used in the hortatory texts are the simple present tense and the present perfect tense. Both tense refer to the present time although the simple present tense emphasizes exact time of occurrence while present perfect tense does not. However, both tenses are very useful to state that the cases that the authors present might have already happened from the past to the present. With this situation in mind, the authors try to present the same fact in a different view so that the readers will have different perspective. In other words, the relationship among the three aspects (the sentence element pattern, the word category, and the tense) helps the authors to present the case that occurs in the daily life from a different point of view.



Through such portrayal, the readers of the hortatory text might have a different mind or a second opinion so that they will revisit the proposed case from different angle. Under such situation, the authors of a hortatory text might also hope that the case that they have proposed will be revisited in more objective manner. Since the aim of a hortatory text is attaining a second opinion in the readers' mind, the readers will have the decision to follow or to not follow the suggestion that the author of a hortatory text has proposed. This idea is the underlying difference between the hortatory text and the other type of text, especially the persuasion text. In conclusion, all of the three aspects here have significant contribution to the construction of a good hortatory text.

Despite the findings and the discussions, the researcher understands well that the study that he has conducted still have several drawbacks. First, the number of the hortatory texts that have been selected is limited. Second, all of the hortatory texts that have been selected are written by the non-native speakers or the Indonesian people. Therefore, the researcher expect that the future researcher would like to expand the number of hortatory texts and to find the hortatory texts that are written by the native English speaker in order that the results of this findings can be expanded and enriched. Through such expansion, the results of this study might be validated further and might even be applied to the analysis of other hortatory texts. Not to mention, the results might provide better description or even full description of a hortatory text so that the reader, especially the one who learns English, might understand the hortatory text and might differentiate the hortatory text from the other type of text especially the persuasion text.

### Bibliography

Annisa. (2018). *Example of Hortatory Exposition Text*. Retrieved from

<http://annisa-saja.blogspot.co.id/2013/02/examples-of-hortatory-exposition-text-1.html>

Anonym. (2018). *Hortatory Exposition Text Penjelasan*. Retrieved from [www.belajarbahasainggris.us](http://www.belajarbahasainggris.us): <http://www.belajarbahasainggris.us/2014/02/hortatory-exposition-text-penjelasan.html>

Azar, B. S. (2002). *Understanding and Using English Grammar: Third Edition*. New York: Pearson Education.

Greenbaum, S. and Nelson, G. (2002). *An Introduction to English Grammar*. London: Pearson Education.

Halliday, M.A.K and Matthiesen, CMIM. (2004). *Introduction to Functional Grammar: Third Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Nuryani, N. (2018, March 4). *Kumpulan Tugas Analytical Exposition*. Retrieved from [nurinuryani.wordpress.com](https://nurinuryani.wordpress.com/kumpulan-tugas/analytical-exposition/): <https://nurinuryani.wordpress.com/kumpulan-tugas/analytical-exposition/>

Palmer, F. (1986). *Grammar: New Edition*. Middlesex: Penguin.