

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the findings and discussions of this research as already discussed before, the researcher gives some conclusions and suggestions.

1.1 Conclusions

Related to the findings and discussions, the researcher concludes that:

- 1) The ability of the second year students of English Department at Bung Hatta University in writing sentences using comparative adverbs was moderate because 15 students (41.67%) had moderate ability.
- 2) The ability of the second year students of English Department at Bung Hatta University in writing sentences using comparative adverbs with one syllable was good because 14 students (38.89%) had good ability.
- 3) The ability of the second year students of English Department at Bung Hatta University in writing sentences using comparative adverbs with two or more syllables was low because 17 students (47.22 %) had low ability.
- 4) The ability of the second year students of English Department at Bung Hatta University in writing sentences using comparative adverbs with irregular adverbs was good because 19 students (52.78 %) had good ability.

1.2 Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher gives some suggestions to the lecturers, students, and the future researchers as follows:

- 1) The researcher suggests the lecturers to give motivation to the students to be more active in the class and give more exercises to students in writing sentences using comparative adverbs.
- 2) The researcher suggests the students to learn more about comparative form of adverb in simple sentences and pay attention to the aspects in writing skill.
- 3) The researcher suggests the next researcher to do a research on the students' difficulties in writing simple sentences using comparative adverbs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbas, M. F. F., & Asy'ari, N. F. (2019). Mixed Method: Students' Ability in Applying Writing Mechanics in Analytical Exposition Text. *ELT-Lectura*, 6(2), 147-157.
- Anner-Self. K., Schreiber. J. (2011). *Educational Research*. United States of America: acid free paper. River Street, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. (2012). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Azizah, Y. (2017). The Correlation between Students' Vocabulary Mastery and Their Writing Ability in Descriptive Text: A Study for the Seventh Grade Students of SMP Islam Sudirman 1 Bancak Semarang District in the Academic year of 2016/2017. (Doctoral Dissertation). Salatiga: IAIN Salatiga University.
- Brown, H. D. & Abeywickrama, P. (2010). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice (2nd ed.)*. New York: Pearson Education Inc.
- Djuharie, O. S. (2019). *Sentence Writing: Eksplorasi Model dan Latihan*. First Edition. Bandung: Yrama Widya.

Erliana, S., & Miftah, M. Z. (2014). The Multifaceted Dimensions of English Linguistics, Literature and Education: Proceedings of the 2nd ELITE International Conference. Proceedings of the 2nd ELITE International Conference, 1(1), 1–372.

Gulo, W. (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian, cetakan pertama*. Jakarta: PT Grasindo.

Kartinofa, S. (2017). An Analysis of the Eighth Grade Students' Ability to Write Simple Sentences Using Degree of Comparison of Adjective at SMP N 1 Padang Sago (Unpublished Thesis). Padang: Bung Hatta University.

Kurniawan, I., & Seprizanna, S. (2016). An Analysis of Students' Ability in Using Subject-Verb Agreement. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 9(2), 327-343.

Langan, J. (2010). *Exploring Writing: Sentences and Paragraphs*. Second Edition. New York, NY: McGraw Hill Companies.

Mala, K. R. (2020). Comparative Degree of Adjective & Adverbs. *Journal of International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*. No:1, Vol.8. ECRTD-UK.

Mamudi, L. S. J. (2017). Analisis Struktur Kalimat Dalam Jurnal the Popular Culture Studies Journal Volume 1. *Jurnal Elektronik Fakultas Sastra Universitas Sam Ratulangi*, 2(2).

Multon, Karen D. (2010). *Interrater Reliability, Encyclopedia Of research design*.

Peha, S. (2010). *The Writing Teacher's Strategy Guide*. New York: Teaching That Makes Sense.

Prananda, Y. A. (2016). Students' Ability in Writing Paragraphs Using Structure of The Paragraph in Argumentative Essay By The Sixth Semester of English Study Program of Muhammadiyah University of Bengkulu. *Linguists: Journal of Linguistics and Language Teaching*, 3(1).

Rahma, A. A., & Rosa, R. N. (2021). An Analysis on Students' Ability in Using Compound-Complex Sentences in Writing a Short Essay. *Journal of English Language Teaching*, 10(1), 53-60.

Rao, P. S. (2019). The Role of English as a Global Language. *Research Journal of English*, 4(1), 65-79.

Refnita, L. (2018). *Educational research: A guide for beginners*. Padang: LPPM Universitas Bung Hatta.

Rohmatillah, R. (2014). A Study on Students' Difficulties in Learning Vocabulary. *English Education: jurnal tadris bahasa Inggris*, 6(1), 75-93.

Rusticus S. (2014) *Content Validity*. In: Michalos AC, editor. Encyclopedia of quality of life and well-being research. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. p. 1261–2.

Said, I.S. (2018). Difficulties Faced by Ninth Grade EFL Students When Practicing Writing Skills: Spelling and Punctuation Marks. Thesis. Middle East University.

Semita, M. J. (2019). *Buku Grammar: Paling Mudah Sepanjang Masa*. Yogyakarta: Center for Language Studies.

Shah, J. N. (2017). How to Write 'Introduction' in Scientific Journal Article. *Journal of Patan Academy of Health Sciences*, 2(1):1-2.

Shweba, A. A. A., & Mujiyanto, Y. (2017). Errors of Spelling, Capitalization, and Punctuation Marks in Writing Encountered by First Year College Students in Al-Merghib University Libya. *English Education Journal*, 7(2), 93-103.

Suatman. (2017). *Master Pocket Grammar. Second Edition*. Sleman: Yogyakarta

Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Sukma, E. (2019). A Study of the Development of English Paragraph in Writing Argumaentative Essays at SMKN 1 Batang Hari. *Journal Education of Batanghari*, 1(1), 58-65.

St. Y. Slamet.2008. *Dasar-dasar Pembelajaran Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia di Sekolah Dasar*. Surakarta: UNS Press.

Teguh, E., Susilawati, E., & Salam, U. (2014). The Analysis of Topic Sentence in Research Background. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, 3(7).

Umriyah, S. M. (2018). The Types of Sentence Used in News Item Text: a Study at the Third Semester Students of English Language Department of UIN Walisongo Semarang in the Academic Year 2016/2017 (Doctoral Dissertation). Semarang: UIN Walisongo.

Widarinsih, I. (2015). How to Improve Students' Writing Skills: A Classroom Action Research of the Tenth Grade of SMA Muhammadiyah (Plus) Salatiga in the Academic Year of 2015/2016. (Doctoral Dissertation). Salatiga: IAIN Salatiga.

Wijaya, M. S. (2017). Students' Thesis Statement in Essay Writing Class. *English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris*, 10(2), 274-290.

Wirman, R., Tavriyanti, L., & Refnita, L. (2016). An Analysis of the Third Year Students' Ability in Writing Simple Sentences Using Phrasal Verbs at English Department of Bung Hatta University. Abstract of Undergraduate, Faculty of Education, Bung Hatta University, 6(2).

Yamin, M. (2019). Learning From Students' Experiences in Writing Paragraph. *Metathesis: Journal of English Language, Literature, and Teaching*, 3(2), 188-202.

Appendix 1



Yayasan Pendidikan Bung Hatta
UNIVERSITAS BUNG HATTA
FAKULTAS KEGURUAN DAN ILMU PENDIDIKAN

Nomor : 216/Pend-03/VIII/2021
Lamp. : -
Hal : **Permohonan Izin Penelitian**

19 Agustus 2021

Yth. Sdr. Dekan Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Bung Hatta
Kampus II Universitas Bung Hatta Jl. Maransi Air Pacah Koto Tengah Kota Padang

Dengan hormat,

Bersama surat ini disampaikan kepada Saudara bahwa mahasiswa Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Bung Hatta berikut ini :

Nama	: Maretha Azkiya
NPM	: 1610013121002
Jurusan	: Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Program Studi	: Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris
Judul Penelitian	: An Analysis of the Second Year Students' Ability in Writing Simple Sentences Using Comparative Adverbs at English Department of Bung Hatta University

Memerlukan penelitian di Prodi Bahasa Inggris Universitas Bung Hatta, untuk pengumpulan data dalam rangka penulisan skripsi. Lama penelitian/pengumpulan data tersebut dilakukan selama 1 Minggu. Oleh karena itu, kami mohon kepada Saudara untuk memberikan izin kepada mahasiswa tersebut di atas.

Demikianlah surat ini disampaikan kepada Saudara. Atas perhatian dan kerja sama Saudara kami ucapkan terima kasih.

Wassalam dan hormat
Wakil Dekan,


Dr. Syukma Netti, M.Si

Tembusan :
Yth. Ketua Prodi PING Universitas Bung Hatta

Appendix 2

Writing Test

Time : 50 Minutes

Name : _____

NPM : _____

Direction: Please write simple sentences using **comparative adverb** based on the adverb given below.

Example: a. close

Answer : I live **closer** to the campus than before.

b. carefully

Answer: He drives more carefully than a racing driver does.

c. little

Answer: Rudy talks **less** than Anne.

1. fast

Answer:

2. rapidly

Answer:

3. late

Answer:

4. high

Answer:

5. frequently

Answer:

6. regularly

Answer:

7. hard

Answer:

8. low

Answer:

9. suddenly

Answer:

10. badly

Answer:

11. recently

Answer:

12. happily

Answer:

13. far

Answer:

14. long

Answer:

15. early

Answer:

16. well

Answer:

Appendix 3

The Students' Scores in Writing Simple Sentences Using Comparative

Adverbs

Student Number	One Syllable			Two or More Syllables			Irregular Adverb		
	SI	SII	AS	SI	SII	AS	SI	SII	AS
1	15.46	13.46	14.46	13.63	13.63	13.63	9.64	10.64	10.14
2	13.13	9.64	11.39	13.96	13.96	13.96	8.98	9.98	9.48
3	16.32	13.65	14.99	6.82	10.32	8.57	13.31	11.65	12.48
4	16.64	15.64	16.14	12.97	12.63	12.80	11.64	11.31	11.48
5	9.50	11.16	10.33	12.33	9.31	10.82	9.65	8.64	9.15
6	15.46	15.96	15.71	12.63	12.96	12.80	11.64	10.98	11.31
7	12.66	13.32	12.99	13.00	9.50	11.25	8.00	7.50	7.75
8	12.30	12.13	12.22	11.98	15.64	13.81	7.81	9.65	8.73
9	18.66	17.99	18.33	10.66	13.32	11.99	10.83	10.99	10.91
10	5.48	7.99	6.74	1.00	3.00	2.00	11.99	11.00	11.50
11	10.97	9.47	10.22	10.31	10.30	10.31	5.32	4.48	4.90
12	14.99	13.48	14.24	12.66	8.50	10.58	11.50	8.50	10.00
13	9.80	12.96	11.38	11.96	10.96	11.46	9.64	7.64	8.64
14	15.98	15.98	15.98	13.31	12.98	13.15	10.32	9.32	9.82
15	16.16	15.32	15.74	12.32	15.32	13.82	9.66	11.66	10.66
16	15.63	16.14	15.89	14.96	14.80	14.88	10.64	10.98	10.81
17	15.30	15.64	15.47	13.63	14.30	13.97	12.00	12.00	12.00

18	15.96	14.63	15.30	13.96	17.96	15.96	7.81	8.98	8.40
19	7.64	10.81	9.23	6.64	5.31	5.98	4.65	6.15	5.40
20	14.64	16.30	15.47	9.64	10.98	10.31	9.31	8.32	8.82
21	21.00	19.66	20.33	20.50	22.00	21.25	11.32	13.32	12.32
22	20.00	18.16	19.08	14.32	14.32	14.32	11.66	12.00	11.83
23	13.48	14.98	14.23	14.97	15.47	15.22	8.66	6.32	7.49
24	17.50	18.00	17.75	16.50	16.00	16.25	10.66	12.00	11.33
25	16.50	18.00	17.25	15.66	17.16	16.41	12.00	12.00	12.00
26	14.97	16.96	15.97	14.63	13.30	13.97	10.31	11.31	10.81
27	18.97	19.96	19.47	18.64	20.96	19.80	11.64	12.64	12.14
28	16.32	16.66	16.49	18.32	14.32	16.32	10.66	10.66	10.66
29	16.97	15.64	16.31	14.96	18.30	16.63	11.32	11.82	11.57
30	13.64	13.48	13.56	15.64	15.31	15.48	10.33	9.33	9.83
31	11.81	14.31	13.06	6.98	11.65	9.32	9.32	8.66	8.99
32	19.00	14.99	17.00	13.98	12.14	13.06	10.32	13.32	11.82
33	17.96	18.96	18.46	21.96	21.96	21.96	11.64	11.64	11.64
34	8.13	8.82	8.48	6.97	9.64	8.31	6.48	5.32	5.90
35	11.13	11.64	11.39	14.14	12.14	13.14	11.31	10.32	10.82
36	14.82	11.99	13.41	15.32	14.00	14.66	9.66	10.65	10.16
Σ	524.88	523.88	524.38	471.86	484.35	478.11	361.63	361.68	361.66

Note:

SI: Score by Scorer One

SII: Score by Scorer Two

AS: Average Score

Appendix 4

The Reliability of Test in Writing Simple Sentences Using Comparative

Adverbs

Number of Students	Score by Scorer 1 (X)	Score by Scorer 2 (Y)	X ²	Y ²	X.Y
1	38.73	37.73	1500.01	1423.55	1461.28
2	36.07	33.58	1301.04	1127.62	1211.23
3	36.45	35.62	1328.60	1268.78	1298.35
4	41.25	39.58	1701.56	1566.58	1632.68
5	31.48	29.11	990.99	847.39	916.38
6	39.73	39.90	1578.47	1592.01	1585.23
7	33.66	30.32	1133.00	919.30	1020.57
8	32.09	37.42	1029.77	1400.26	1200.81
9	40.15	42.30	1612.02	1789.29	1698.35
10	18.47	21.99	341.14	483.56	406.16
11	26.60	24.25	707.56	588.06	645.05
12	39.15	30.48	1532.72	929.03	1193.29
13	31.40	31.56	985.96	996.03	990.98
14	39.61	38.28	1568.95	1465.36	1516.27
15	38.14	42.30	1454.66	1789.29	1613.32
16	41.23	41.92	1699.91	1757.29	1728.36

17	40.93	41.94	1675.26	1758.96	1716.60
18	37.73	41.57	1423.55	1728.06	1568.44
19	18.93	22.27	358.34	495.95	421.57
20	33.59	35.60	1128.29	1267.36	1195.80
21	52.82	54.98	2789.95	3022.80	2904.04
22	45.98	44.48	2114.16	1978.47	2045.19
23	37.11	36.77	1377.15	1352.03	1364.53
24	44.66	46.00	1994.52	2116.00	2054.36
25	44.16	47.16	1950.11	2224.07	2082.59
26	39.91	41.57	1592.81	1728.06	1659.06
27	49.25	53.56	2425.56	2868.67	2637.83
28	45.30	41.64	2052.09	1733.89	1886.29
29	43.25	45.76	1870.56	2093.98	1979.12
30	39.61	38.12	1568.95	1453.13	1509.93
31	28.11	34.62	790.17	1198.54	973.17
32	43.30	40.45	1874.89	1636.20	1751.49
33	51.56	52.56	2658.43	2762.55	2709.99
34	21.52	23.78	463.11	565.49	511.75
35	36.58	34.10	1338.10	1162.81	1247.38
36	39.80	36.64	1584.04	1342.49	1458.27
Σ	1358.31	1369.91	53496.43	54432.94	53795.71

To find out the coefficient correlation of the two sets of scorers, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment formula:

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

$$r_{xy} = \frac{36 \times (53795.71) - (1358.31 \times 1369.91)}{\sqrt{\{36 \times 53496.43 - (1358.31)^2\} \{36 \times 54432.94 - (1369.91)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{75883.11}{81892.41}$$

$$r_{xy} = .93$$

From the calculation above, the researcher found that the coefficient correlation of the two sets of the scores was .93. It means that the coefficient correlation of the test was very high, and it can be concluded that the test was reliable.

Appendix 5

The Students' Converted Score in Writing Simple Sentences Using Comparative Adverbs

Number of Students	Score by Scorer 1 (X)	Score by Scorer 2 (Y)	AS	CS	Students' Ability			
					Very Good	Good	Moderate	Low
1	38.73	37.73	38.23	59.73			√	
2	36.07	33.58	34.83	54.42				√
3	36.45	35.62	36.04	56.31			√	
4	41.25	39.58	40.42	63.16			√	
5	31.48	29.11	30.30	47.34				√
6	39.73	39.90	39.82	62.22			√	
7	33.66	30.32	31.99	49.98				√
8	32.09	37.42	34.76	54.31				√
9	40.15	42.30	41.23	64.42			√	
10	18.47	21.99	20.23	31.61				√
11	26.60	24.25	25.43	39.73				√
12	39.15	30.48	34.82	54.41				√
13	31.40	31.56	31.48	49.19				√
14	39.61	38.28	38.95	60.86			√	
15	38.14	42.30	40.22	62.84			√	

16	41.23	41.92	41.58	64.97			√	
17	40.93	41.94	41.44	64.75			√	
18	37.73	41.57	39.65	61.95			√	
19	18.93	22.27	20.60	32.19				√
20	33.59	35.60	34.60	54.06				√
21	52.82	54.98	53.90	84.22	√			
22	45.98	44.48	45.23	70.67		√		
23	37.11	36.77	36.94	57.72			√	
24	44.66	46.00	45.33	70.83		√		
25	44.16	47.16	45.66	71.34		√		
26	39.91	41.57	40.74	63.67			√	
27	49.25	53.56	51.41	80.33	√			
28	45.30	41.64	43.47	67.92		√		
29	43.25	45.76	44.51	69.55		√		
30	39.61	38.12	38.87	60.73			√	
31	28.11	34.62	31.37	49.02				√
32	43.30	40.45	41.88	65.44		√		
33	51.56	52.56	52.06	81.34	√			
34	21.52	23.78	22.65	35.39				√
35	36.58	34.10	35.34	55.22			√	
36	39.80	36.64	38.22	59.72			√	
Σ	1358.31	1369.91	1364.11	2131.58	3	6	15	12

- To get students' converted scores the researcher used the formula below:

$$\text{Students converted score} = \frac{\text{Average Score}}{\text{Maximum Score}} \times 100$$

- The percentage of students who got very good ability, good ability, moderate ability and low ability in writing simple sentences using comparative adverbs:

$$P_{\text{very good}} = \frac{3}{36} \times 100 = 8.33 \%$$

$$P_{\text{good}} = \frac{6}{36} \times 100 = 16.67 \%$$

$$P_{\text{moderate}} = \frac{15}{36} \times 100 = 41.67 \%$$

$$P_{\text{low}} = \frac{12}{36} \times 100 = 33.33 \%$$

Appendix 6

The Students' Converted Score in Writing Simple Sentences Using

Comparative Adverbs with One Syllable

Number of Students	Score by Scorer 1 (X)	Score by Scorer 2 (Y)	Average Score	Converted Score	Students' Ability			
					Very Good	Good	Moderate	Low
1	15.46	13.46	14.46	60.25			√	
2	13.13	9.64	11.39	47.46				√
3	16.32	13.65	14.99	62.46			√	
4	16.64	15.64	16.14	67.25		√		
5	9.50	11.16	10.33	43.04				√
6	15.46	15.96	15.71	65.46		√		
7	12.66	13.32	12.99	54.13				√
8	12.30	12.13	12.22	50.92				√
9	18.66	17.99	18.33	76.38		√		
10	5.48	7.99	6.74	28.08				√
11	10.97	9.47	10.22	42.58				√
12	14.99	13.48	14.24	59.33			√	
13	9.80	12.96	11.38	47.42				√
14	15.98	15.98	15.98	66.58		√		

15	16.16	15.32	15.74	65.58		√		
16	15.63	16.14	15.89	66.21		√		
17	15.30	15.64	15.47	64.46			√	
18	15.96	14.63	15.30	63.75			√	
19	7.64	10.81	9.23	38.46				√
20	14.64	16.30	15.47	64.46			√	
21	21.00	19.66	20.33	84.71	√			
22	20.00	18.16	19.08	79.50		√		
23	13.48	14.98	14.23	59.29			√	
24	17.50	18.00	17.75	73.96		√		
25	16.50	18.00	17.25	71.88		√		
26	14.97	16.96	15.97	66.54		√		
27	18.97	19.96	19.47	81.13	√			
28	16.32	16.66	16.49	68.71		√		
29	16.97	15.64	16.31	67.96		√		
30	13.64	13.48	13.56	56.50			√	
31	11.81	14.31	13.06	54.42				√
32	19.00	14.99	17.00	70.83		√		
33	17.96	18.96	18.46	76.92		√		
34	8.13	8.82	8.48	35.33				√
35	11.13	11.64	11.39	47.46			√	
36	14.82	11.99	13.41	55.88			√	

Σ	524.88	523.88	524.38	2185.24	2	14	10	10
----------	---------------	---------------	---------------	----------------	----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

- The percentage of students who got very good ability, good ability, moderate ability and low ability in writing simple sentences using comparative adverbs with one syllable:

$$P_{\text{very good}} = \frac{2}{36} \times 100 = 5.55 \%$$

$$P_{\text{good}} = \frac{14}{36} \times 100 = 38.89 \%$$

$$P_{\text{moderate}} = \frac{10}{36} \times 100 = 27.78 \%$$

$$P_{\text{low}} = \frac{10}{36} \times 100 = 27.78 \%$$

Appendix 7

The Students' Converted Score in Writing Simple Sentences Using Comparative Adverbs with Two or More Syllables

Number of Students	Comparative adverbs form with two or more than one syllable		Average Score	Converted Score	Students' Ability			
	Score by Scorer 1 (X)	Score by Scorer 2 (Y)			Very Good	Good	Moderate	Low
1	13.63	13.63	13.63	56.79			√	
2	13.96	13.96	13.96	58.17			√	
3	6.82	10.32	8.57	35.71				√
4	12.97	12.63	12.80	53.33				√
5	12.33	9.31	10.82	45.08				√
6	12.63	12.96	12.80	53.33				√
7	13.00	9.50	11.25	46.88				√
8	11.98	15.64	13.81	57.54			√	

9	10.66	13.32	11.99	49.96				√
10	1.00	3.00	2.00	8.33				√
11	10.31	10.30	10.31	42.96				√
12	12.66	8.50	10.58	44.08				√
13	11.96	10.96	11.46	47.75				√
14	13.31	12.98	13.15	54.79				√
15	12.32	15.32	13.82	57.58			√	
16	14.96	14.80	14.88	62.00			√	
17	13.63	14.30	13.97	58.21			√	
18	13.96	17.96	15.96	66.50		√		
19	6.64	5.31	5.98	24.92				√
20	9.64	10.98	10.31	42.96				√
21	20.50	22.00	21.25	88.54	√			
22	14.32	14.32	14.32	59.67			√	
23	14.97	15.47	15.22	63.42			√	
24	16.50	16.00	16.25	67.71		√		
25	15.66	17.16	16.41	68.38		√		
26	14.63	13.30	13.97	58.21			√	
27	18.64	20.96	19.80	82.50	√			
28	18.32	14.32	16.32	68.00		√		
29	14.96	18.30	16.63	69.29		√		
30	15.64	15.31	15.48	64.50			√	

31	6.98	11.65	9.32	38.83				√
32	13.98	12.14	13.06	54.42				√
33	21.96	21.96	21.96	91.50	√			
34	6.97	9.64	8.31	34.63				√
35	14.14	12.14	13.14	54.75				√
36	15.32	14.00	14.66	61.08			√	
Σ	471.86	484.35	478.11	1992.28	3	5	11	17

- The percentage of students who got very good ability, good ability, moderate ability and low ability in writing simple sentences using comparative adverbs with two or more syllables:

$$P_{\text{very good}} = \frac{3}{36} \times 100 = 8.33 \%$$

$$P_{\text{good}} = \frac{5}{36} \times 100 = 13.89 \%$$

$$P_{\text{moderate}} = \frac{11}{36} \times 100 = 30.56 \%$$

$$P_{\text{low}} = \frac{17}{36} \times 100 = 47.22 \%$$

Appendix 8

The Students' Converted Score in Writing Simple Sentences Using Irregular Comparative Adverbs

Number of Students	Comparative adverbs form with irregular adverbs		Average Score	Converted Score	Students' Ability			
	Score by Scorer 1 (X)	Score by Scorer 2 (Y)			Very Good	Good	Moderate	Low
1	9.64	10.64	10.14	63.38			√	
2	8.98	9.98	9.48	59.25			√	
3	13.31	11.65	12.48	78.00		√		
4	11.64	11.31	11.48	71.75		√		
5	9.65	8.64	9.15	57.16			√	
6	11.64	10.98	11.31	70.68		√		
7	8.00	7.50	7.75	48.44				√
8	7.81	9.65	8.73	54.56				√
9	10.83	10.99	10.91	68.19		√		

10	11.99	11.00	11.50	71.88		√		
11	5.32	4.48	4.90	30.63				√
12	11.50	8.50	10.00	62.50			√	
13	9.64	7.64	8.64	54.00				√
14	10.32	9.32	9.82	61.38			√	
15	9.66	11.66	10.66	66.63		√		
16	10.64	10.98	10.81	67.56		√		
17	12.00	12.00	12.00	75.00		√		
18	7.81	8.98	8.40	52.50				√
19	4.65	6.15	5.40	33.75				√
20	9.31	8.32	8.82	55.13			√	
21	11.32	13.32	12.32	77.00		√		
22	11.66	12.00	11.83	73.94		√		
23	8.66	6.32	7.49	46.81				√
24	10.66	12.00	11.33	70.81		√		
25	12.00	12.00	12.00	75.00		√		
26	10.31	11.31	10.81	67.56		√		
27	11.64	12.64	12.14	75.88		√		
28	10.66	10.66	10.66	66.63		√		
29	11.32	11.82	11.57	72.31		√		
30	10.33	9.33	9.83	61.44			√	
31	9.32	8.66	8.99	56.19			√	

32	10.32	13.32	11.82	73.88		√		
33	11.64	11.64	11.64	72.75		√		
34	6.48	5.32	5.90	24.58				√
35	11.31	10.32	10.82	67.63		√		
36	9.66	10.65	10.16	63.50			√	
Σ	361.63	361.68	361.66	2248.23	0	19	9	8

- The percentage of students who got very good ability, good ability, moderate ability and low ability in writing simple sentences using irregular comparative adverbs:

$$P_{\text{very good}} = \frac{0}{36} \times 100 = 0 \%$$

$$P_{\text{good}} = \frac{19}{36} \times 100 = 52.78 \%$$

$$P_{\text{moderate}} = \frac{9}{36} \times 100 = 25 \%$$

$$P_{\text{low}} = \frac{8}{36} \times 100 = 22.22 \%$$