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ABSTRACT

Ahmad Khoirur Rohman. 2015. Error Analysis of Students’ Test result on the Use of Degrees of Comparison (A Study at the Second Years of SMP N II Jumapolo in the academic year of 2014/2015). Graduating Paper. English Department of Educationonal Faculty. IAIN Salatiga


The aim of this study is to describe the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery on the use of degrees of comparison of the second year. This study is descriptive quantitative research. The writer had chosen the second year students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo in the academic year 2014/2015 and the subject were 30 students. Based on the research, there is dominant error in the students’ test result, 18 students errors in answering question number 24. In addition, based on the five various level achievements there were varieties of students’ mastery. According to the result of the study, the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery of degrees of comparison were no one who got outstanding achievements, 4 students got very good achievements, 10 student got satisfactory achievement, 15 students got below very weak achievements and 1 students got fail achievements. In addition, there are many errors in the students’ paper assignments were due to several factors. Meanwhile, the dominant factor was the students’ lack understanding of English grammar. From the result above, the writer concludes that the students were still making a lot of grammatical errors that were mainly influenced by the students’ lack understanding of English grammar.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

This Chapter presents about background of the study, limitation of the study, statement of the problems, objectives of the study, significances of the study, Clarification of the key terms, review of the previous study, graduating paper’s outline.

I. Background of the Study

Language has important roles in intellectual, emotional and social life time in human life. Language becomes the tool of communication. Everyday, every one uses the language to make communication. Every one needs language to share ideas, opinions, and feelings to each other.

Roger T bell (1991) stated that “Language, for the linguist, is form; sounds, letters, their combinations into larger units such as words, sentences, and so forth. Such a set of forms would also be expected to have meaning and the elements and sequences, by virtue of having meaning, would naturally be expected to be used for communication between individuals who shared the same rules”. This means that in transforming any information to others, every one need a language.

In addition, it is undeniable that English is an international language. As an International language, English is used by many people all over of the world as the first or second language. Many kinds of
information, books, news, magazines which are internationally published in English. This make every country needs to learn this language.

In Indonesia, English has been introduced in many levels of education. It starts from play group, elementary school, junior high school, senior high school and up to university.

Since this language learned in Indonesian school, there are many problems found that must be solved by teachers and students too. There are many factors that influences the result of study. They are the students themselves, surrounding, equipment, etc.

Understanding and learning English is not easy, because it is foreign language which has different structure compared our own language. There are two aspects that must be mastered by the students in learning English, they are; Language skills which are involve actual production such as speaking and writing and reception such as listening and reading. In supporting those skills the students have also master Component skill or language competence such as grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, spelling and semantics.

According to the writer, grammar is one of important part that is important in the process of acquiring language. Consequently, the students have to master the structure of this foreign language well in order to understand and use the foreign language fluently. By mastering grammatical features, the students can understand and practice English in communication.
Grammar has a lot of language elements, one of them is degrees of comparison of an adjective or adverb describing different level of quality, quantity, or relation. From the explanation above, it is very important for students to comprehend and express the fact that two things or people are similar or different.

In the process of learning degrees of comparison, many students find difficulties in understanding of positive, comparative and superlative forms degrees of comparison. A proverb saying “learning is a process of trial and error”. It gives a description that learning is a fundamental process which implies errors.

For that reason, the writer intend to study a problem dealing with the students entitled “Error Analysis of Students’ Test result on the Use of Degrees of Comparison (A Study at the Eight grade students of SMP N II Jumapolo in the academic year of 2014/20015)”.

J. Limitation of the Study

There are many kinds degrees of comparison, so it is impossible for the writer to investigate all of them at the same time. Therefore, he wants to limit his study in order that the problems to be analyzed are not to broad.

This study is limited to error analysis in using adjective of degrees of comparison at second years students of SMP N jumapolo, Karanganyar 2014.
K. Statement of the problems

The problems that are going to be discussed in this research paper can be stated as follows:

1. What are the dominant error of the second year students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo in using degrees of comparison?
2. What are the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery in using degrees of comparison?

L. Objectives of the Study

Dealing with statement described above, the objective of the research are to find out and identity the dominant error of the second year students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo in using degrees of comparison and the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery in using degrees of comparison.

M. Significances of the Study

1. Theoretical Benefit

This research is conducted as the support of grammatical theory especially of degrees of comparison in the developing of linguistic theories. In addition, hopefully this study will be beneficial for the other researchers in organizing a research of degrees of comparison.

2. Practical benefit

From this study, the writer hopes that it will have significant relation to the aspect of teaching and learning English.

The result of the study are contributed to;
a. The teachers

Hopefully, this research would be meaningful for the teachers to pay more attention in teaching degrees of comparison and to help the students reduce their errors in using degrees of comparison.

b. The students

From this research, the students must be understand kinds of degrees of comparison and must do examination correctly.

c. The readers

For each educator who read this research, hopefully it can brings enlightenment and information concerning in students’ errors on the use of degrees of comparison.

N. Clarification of Key Terms

To understand the meaning of the topic is very important in other that the writer can achieve the desired aims in this research. He wants to clarify the terms of the topic as follows:

1. Error Analysis

   a. Analysis

   According to Purwodarminto (1984 : 39), analysis is an observation of event (composition, action, etc) to know the cause, the problem, etc. Analysis means dividing (a sentence) into its grammatical parts or separation into part possibly with comment and judgement (Hornby and Ruse, 1990 : 23).
While Paul Procter (1978: 30) in Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, states that Analysis is separation of substance into parts, the result of such a separation, an examination of something with thoughts and judgements about it.

b. Error

Error as something done wrong (Hornby, 1990: 290). Error is the state of being wrong in belief or behaviour (Hornby and Ruse, 1990: 214).

While Thomson and Martinet (1980: 298) says that the word error is unintentional deviation from the truth or what is right; a mistake; misapprehension; a mistake made in writing, printing, or other performance, an inaccuracy, transgression law or duty; fault a sin.

Error analysis in this research is an analysis of an unintentional deviation from the truth, make it clear and right about using degrees of comparison.

2. Degrees of comparison

Degrees of comparison is something compared with the others. Comparison indicated degrees of difference with adjective and adverbs and may be equal or unequal. In this study, the writer classifies the comparison into;

a. Positive degree that compare two things that are equal.
b. Comparative degree that entities are comparable in a greater or lesser degree.

c. Superlative degree that three or more entities are compared, one of them is superior or inferior to the others.

O. Review of Previous Study

In this study the writer takes two previous studies. The first study had been done by Nunung Khurriyati (2013), entitled “An Error Analysis of the Use of Preposition of Place of the Eight Year Students in SMP N 3 Ampel in the Academic Year of 2012/2013”. In her study, she described the varieties of SMP N 3 Ampel students’ mastery in using preposition of place, the dominant sources of errors made by the students in using preposition of place.

The second previous study had been done by Siswanto (2001), entitled “Error Analysis on the Application of Adverb Degrees of Comparison Done By the Third Year Students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo Karanganyar in 2001”. In his study, he described kinds of errors the students make in using single-syllable adverb degrees of comparison and the solution to minimize student’s errors in using single-syllable adverb degrees of comparison.

In this research, the writer explain about error analysis of students at SMP N 2 Jumapolo in the use of degrees of comparison. The writer focus on adjective of degrees of comparison.
P. Graduating Paper’s Outline

In this section, the writer will discuss several parts of Graduating Paper’s Organization that consist of Chapter I, Chapter II, Chapter III, Chapter IV, and Chapter V as follows:

Chapter I presents the introduction of the paper that consist of background of the study, limitation of the study, statement of the problem, objectives of the study, significant of the study, clarification of key terms, the review of previous study and graduating paper’s outline.

Chapter II is the theories underlying the study. It deals with the notion of error analysis, the differences of error and mistakes, differences of adverb and adjective and the explanation about degrees of comparison.

Chapter III is the method of the study. It consist of, source of data, subject of the study, data collecting technique and technique of data analysis.

Chapter IV is the data presentation and data analysis of this research. It consists of the respondents’ error in using degrees of comparison, data analysis, and result of analysis.

Chapter V is conclusion and suggestion. In this study the researcher gives some conclusion and suggestion for English teaching and learning.

For the attachment there are bibliography and appendices.
CHAPTER II
THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, the writer is going to explain briefly the theoretical framework which includes the notion of error analysis, the differences of error and mistakes, the Interference, differences of adverb and adjective and the explanation about degrees of comparison.

A. Error analysis

1. The Concept of Error Analysis

In the course of learning and using foreign language, one of the most inhibiting factors in appears of making mistakes and errors. The making of errors is a sign that the students have not mastered the rules of the language being learned.

Language learning as any other human learning involves making errors and mistakes. Brown (1992:164) states that the mistakes, misjudgement, miscalculation and erroneous assumption from an important aspect of learning of skill and acquiring information.

Anyone attempts to acquire something by making mistakes and errors. The child who learns his native language makes countless mistake with his linguistic knowledge. However, he gradually manages to produce acceptable spec hand justify it after a series of errors.
Since language is process that involves the making of mistakes and errors, errors are considered as the product of learning. It is important for the English teacher to realize that errors made by learned need to be analyzed correctly in order to arranging learning strategy effectively. In addition, it is important to discuss error analysis to under score the relevance of such analysis for teaching English as a foreign language. Such an analysis becomes the key for foreign language acquisition.

According to Brown (2007:597), error analysis is a study to identify, to describe and systematically to explain the learners’ error by using any of the principles and techniques provided by linguistics. It can be said that error analysis as a process based on analysis of the students’ errors. Whereas, Brown (2007:598) asserts that error analysis is the activity to observe, to analyze and to classify the students’ errors for conveying something of the system operating.

Practically, error analysis can be a very useful device of a foreign language teaching program. Errors provides feedback, they tell the lecturers something about the effectiveness of their teaching materials and their teaching techniques.

2. The Differences of Errors and Mistakes

An error is noticeable deviation from the adult grammar of a native speaker, reflecting the inter language competence of the learner (Burt and Kiparsky, 1972 : 1). An error refers to competence. The
learner makes error because their knowledge of the foreign or second language is still in transitional process.

An error is different from mistake, so it is crucial differentiate both of them. Corder as quotes by Kinsela (1978 : 63) states that “an error is typically produced by people who do not yet fully command some institution a listed language system”. Based on Corder (1973 : 257), errors are breaking the role, due to lack of competence such as knowledge of the language, which may or may not be conscious. As they are due to lack of competence they tend to be not correctable.

According to Erdogan, (2005:263), a learner makes a mistake when writing or speaking because of lack of attention, fatigue, carelessness, or some other aspects of performance. Mistake can be self corrected when attention is called.

In other words, a mistake is a slip that the learner can self correct whereas an error is what a learner can not self correct. From those definitions above, the writer can also conclude that a mistake is just a slip that the learner forgets the right form. While, an error is a deviation made by the learner because he/she does not know the rule and will make it repetitively.

To distinguish between an error and mistake, Ellis as mentioned by Erdogan (2005:263) also suggest two ways. The first one is to check the consistency of learner’s writing, if he sometimes uses the correct form and sometimes the wrong one, it is a mistake.
However, if he always uses it incorrectly, it is an error. The second way is to ask learner to try to correct his own deviant utterance. When he is unable too, the deviations are errors, while he is successful, they are mistake.

Indeed, learners often make mistakes in the process of foreign language learning. Thus, it is still not a big deal when the learners commit the mistake either in speaking or writing since they are capable to correct the mistake. However, learning other language becomes difficult since the target language has different system from the native language. This difference sometimes makes the learners make errors especially in applying grammar. This is why analyzing learner’s errors in learning other language would be interesting instead of mistake analysis.

3. The Interference

   English is a second language for Indonesian students in learning English is a second language. There is grammatically difference in both of them. For example, there is differences about the use of degrees of comparison in English and Indonesian. The Indonesian sentence, “Anita membeli cincin yang paling mahal di toko emas” is translated into English, “Anita buy the most expensive ring in the jewelry store”. They often make an error in the use of degrees of comparison in to English. The first language will hinder the learner in learning the new one. This how a case of negative transfer or in the
most common terminology is called *interference*. In this way, the differences between the two language lead to interference, this is cause of learning difficulties and errors.

Richard (1974:102) defines interferences as those instance of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language in contact.

In order to be able to decide weather it is error or not is needed to understand fully the source of errors. Errors are state by Brown (1992 : 166), arise from several possible general causes or sources. The sources of error could be interlingual error of the interference from the native language, interlingual errors within the target language or and the sociolinguistic context of communication, psycholinguistics or cognitive strategies and no doubt countless affective variable.

1. Interlingual Error

This source of error can be called errors by negative transfer. Richard (1974 : 173) states if the learners of a foreign language make mistake in the target language by effect of his mother tongue that is called as interlingual. For example, any Indonesian writer learning English may write “Ahmad dan Tika menikah” in his mother tongue and he may transfer his old habit to the target language. The result would be “Ahmad and Tika is marry”, which is not acceptable in English,
Chainstain (1976 : 61) states that it is understood that interlingual errors are due to the interference from the mother tongue. They have something to do with constructive analysis as pointed out by Brown (1992 : 148):

This hypothesis claimed that principal barrier to second language acquisition is the interference of the first language system with the second language system, and that scientific, structural analysis of the two language would yield a taxonomy of linguistic contrasts between them which is turn would enable the linguist to predict the difficulties a learner would encounter.

It is clear that constructive analysis aim at describing the differences and similarities of language with a view of predicting the possible learning problems. Elements of target language that are similar to the native language may be simple and easy for the learner and those are different may difficult. Predicting error using constructive analysis can be carried out in term of hierarchy of difficulty. Therefore, a teacher or linguist can make prediction of the relative difficulty of a given aspect of the second language. And they will help students to solve the student’s error problems.

Brown (1992 : 152), categorizes the essence of the grammatical hierarchy in six categories. The categories, in ascending order of difficulty are as follow:

a. Level 0 – Transfer

There is no difference or contras between the two languages. Here students can easily transfer (positively)
linguistic items from the native language to the target language. Such transfer is societies to be of difficulty. Hence the capable is level zero.

Example:

A lot of water (banyak air)

Much money (banyak uang)

b. Level 1 – Coalesce

Two or more items in the native language become coalesced into essentially on item in the target language. The first person singular “I” has some counter parts in Indonesia such as “saya, beta, aku, hamba”. However, neither those differences cause any problems for Indonesian learning process.

c. Level 2 – Under differentiation

Two different items in the target language may sometimes be considered the same, due to such lack of differential in the native language. The differentiation has grammatical consequences and therefore. Students often fail to use or supply the required structural items “many” and “much” are considered the same, due to such lack of differentiation in Bahasa Indonesia, which is “banyak” for either forms. For example, the sentence “there is many water” instead of “there is much water”
Brown (1992: 153) pointed that “under differentiation might also refer to items in the native language which were absent in the target language”. Therefore, the items should be avoided.

Example :

The boy entered into the room

Students discuss about holidays

In this case, students often supply the unnecessary structural items due to the influence of the mother tongue.

d. Level 3 – Reinterpretation

An items existing in the native language in given a new snap distribution in the target language. English active construction, such as it happens may be interpreted as passive construction, resulting the fact that those are semantically passive in Bahasa Indonesia.

e. Level 4 – Over divergence

An entirely new items bearing a little, if any, similarity to the native language must be learned. It may have something to do with forms and meaning. For example, students often use “badder” in replacing “worse” which mean “lebih buruk” in Bahasa Indonesia.
f. Level 5 – Split

On item in the native language, become two or more items in the target language, requiring students to a new distinction. Verb inflection in English may cause some problems. An Indonesian verb “menulis” has no inflection namely “writes”, “wrote” and “writing”. It may result in errors such as “she write”.

2. Intralingual Errors

Interference from the student’s own language is not the only reason for committing errors. Students may make mistakes in the target language, since they do not know the target language very well, they have difficulties in using it. Richard (1976 : 6) writes, “intralingual interference refers to items produced by learner, which reflect not the structure of the mother tongue, but generalization based on partial exposure of the target language”. Thus, intralingual errors are the direct result of the learner’s attempt to create language system he is learning. Richard (1974 : 6) classifies the intralingual errors into four categories, namely:
a. Over generalization

Richard (1974 : 47) says, “this group of error is the result of the use previously available strategies is new situation”. In other words, it occurs when a learner creates a defiant structure based on his experience of other structure in the target language. Furthermore, over generalization is associated with redundancy reduction it may occur, for instance with items which are constructed in the grammar of the language but do not carry significant and obvious contrast for the learner.

The –ed marker, in the native of in other past contexts, often appears to carry no meaning since past ness is usually indicated lexically in stories and the essential notion of sequence in narrative can be expressed equally well in the present Yesterday I look an actress and I take a photo with her.

b. Ignorance of the rule restriction

In this type of error, the learner fails to observe the restriction of existing structure. Some rule restriction errors may be accounted for in term of analogy and may result from the role learning rules. For example, a learner may use infinitive after verb like “tell” in “tell him to return the book” or “ask” in “I ask you to go there”. He, then produces
an utterance “I make him to do it”. In this sentence, the learner ignores the rule of restrictions of the verb “make” i.e. the verb “make” is always followed by infinitive without “to”. The learner mostly tends to generalize syntactic rules; he has previously learned, ignoring the rule.

c. Incomplete of the rule restriction

Intralingual error of this type may occur when the learner fails to apply the rules completely due to the stimulus sentences. It shows an utterance of structures whose deviancy represents the degree of development of the rules required producing acceptable utterances.

d. False concept hyphotized

It derived from the faulty comprehension of destinations in the target language. The learner fails to use the correct concepts. These errors are sometimes due to the poor gradation of teaching items. The form “it’s” may be interpreted as “its” such as in It’s pleasant in the garden instead of It’s pleasant in the garden.

B. Differences of Adverb and Adjectives

Adverb is word that answer the questions with how, where and modified verb, adjective and other adverb In other definition, adverb is word expressing manner or degree and used to modify adjective or verb or other adverb.
According to A.J Thomson and A. V Martinet in their book, "Practical English Grammar" (1986:47), there are eight kinds of adverb, there are:

a. Adverb of manner: quickly, bravely, happily, fastly
b. Adverb of time: here, there, up, down, near, by
c. Adverb of time: now, soon, yet, still, then, today
d. Adverb of certainly: certainly, surely, definitely
e. Adverb of frequency: twice, often, never, always
f. Adverb of degree: very, fairly, rather, too
g. Adverb of interrogative: when, where, why
h. Adverb of relative: when, where, why

Adjective are words that describe or modify another person or thing in the sentence. Adjective is a word expressing a quality of substance. Unlike adverb, which often seem capable of popping up almost anywhere in a sentence, adjective nearly appear immediately before the noun or noun phrase that they modify. Sometimes they appear in a string of adjectives, and when they do, they appear in a set order to category.

For example:

- She is a beautiful girl.
- Marta is more attractive than her sister.
- Monkeys is more intelegen than cats.
- Andi is a handsome boy.
Ari is **bigger** than Rudy.

- Anita buy the most **expensive** ring in the jewelry store, etc.

### C. Degrees of Comparison

Before discussing the kinds and the forms of degrees of comparison, firstly it is better to know about the definition of degrees of comparison. There are some definition about degrees of comparison according to some experts of English language which are stated in their books.

The term of degrees of comparison is derived from latin word “comparaso” meaning action of comparing, capacity for being compared. According to the Doubleday Dictionary “comparison is that inflection of adjectives or adverbs which indicates the positive, comparative and superlative degree”. Based on the two statements above, it can be concluded that Degrees of comparison is the way to compare things or people in the term of capacity, quality and quantity. It is through the inflection of adjectives or adverbs which indicates the positive, comparative and superlative degree. A.J Thomson and A. V Martinet in their book, *a Practical English Grammar (1986:36)* state that there are three degrees of comparison as follows:

1. **Positive Degree**

   As it is said before that positive degree implies no comparison. It means that positive degree is used to compare two people or things which have no difference each other. According to Martin Hewing “we used as + adjective/adverb + as to say
something or someone like something like something or someone else, or that one situation like another situation, and negative forms of sentence can use either not as or not so.

For example:

Ahmad is as tall as Andi in the class.

He worked as slowly as he dared

Andi is as clever as Annie

2. Comparative Degree

The comparative form of degree is used to compare the quality or quantity of two persons or things on condition that one exceeds another. Regular adjectives and adverbs make their comparative form in one of two ways:

a. By addition suffix – er (sometimes with modification in the spelling of stem): bigger, larger, earlier, sillier, etc.

b. By the use word of – more : more quickly, more happily, more expensive, more beautiful.

For example:

Ari is bigger than Reza

Her bag is more expensive than my bag

He eats more quickly than i do

He played better than he had ever played
3. Superlative degree

Superlative degree is used to stress the highest degree of quality or quantity of group of persons or things on condition that excluded from the group.

Regular adjectives and adverbs make their superlative form in two ways:

a. By adding the suffix – est for on or some of two syllables adjective or adverb: highest, shortest, longest, tallest, etc.

b. By adding word – most for three or some of two syllable adjective or adverb: most beautiful, most expensive, most generously, most accurately, etc.

For example:

Tika is the most beautiful student in her class

He buys the most expensive shoes in Ramayana

She behaved most generously

Table 2.1 Irregular form of adjective and adverb in comparison degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Comparative</th>
<th>Superlative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Better</td>
<td>Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Least</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Most</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far</td>
<td>Farther</td>
<td>Farthest (of distance only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the writer presents the methodology of this research. In this research, the writer conducted the test to collect the data to find a descriptive quantitative study about the student’s error of using degrees of comparison. It consists of source of data, subject of the study, method of collecting data and technique of data analysis.

E. Sources of The Data

In the effort to find the solution to the problem, the writer needs some data. The data of this was collected from student’s errors in test result of using degrees of comparison. This research was conducted at SMP N 2 Jumapolo. From those data the writer had analyzed.

F. Subject of The Study

1. Population

Population is all of subject research. Population is a set of all elements processing one or more attribute of interest. The statement confirms that the writer should take the population whose characteristics are closely related to the subject of his research and he should take great interest to the object of research. In this study the writer take the second years students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo as a
population. The second year of student of SMP N jumapolo had Six classes.

2. Sample

Sample is part of subject research. A chosen sample must really represent the population because the result of research would be generated toward entired population. Representative sample would be influence the validity to the result. As Arikunto (1996 : 120) says that if the population is more than 100 subject, the researcher can take about 10-15% or 20-25% or more out of the population. SMP N 2 Jumapolo had 186 students, so the writer took 30 students or ± 15 % from 186 students of the second year student of SMP N 2 Jumapolo.

3. Sampling

Sampling is the way of taking of sample. In this research the writer uses simple random sampling. Simple random sampling adalah teknik pengambilan sample secara acak dari polupasi tnpa memperhatikan strata dalam populasi (Kharisma,2013, Populasi dan Sample dalam penelitian Kuantitatif. Retreived on April 2015 from http://www.penalaran-unm.org/artikel/penelitian/342-populasi-dan-sampel-dalam-penelitian-kuantitatif.html)

Some consideration to take the sample that the researcher used as follow:
a. The subject which taken as the sample in this research should be the eight year students. The researcher chooses this qualification because the students had been taught about degrees of comparison in the first semester.

b. The writer took 30 students from six class of second year students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo. The writer took this sampling because there are many students of six class, so the writer could not take all of students as sample.

G. Data Collecting Technique

The technique of collecting data in one important aspects of research. There are some technique of collecting data. There are test, questionnaire, interview, observation, etc. There is no the best method of collecting data. Every method has its own strengths and weakness. In this research, the writer take a test about degrees of comparison to collect the data. He needs instruments to find the students errors in using degrees of comparison. An instrument plays an important role to collect data. Arikunto (1996 : 135) states that an instrument is a mean, which plays an important role to collect data in a research.

In this research, The writer choose multiple test choice because the there are many variation or style of key answers and it is be more easy to the in test scoring.
In addition, the writer make research procedure as follows:

1. Preparation of Test
   a. Test items
      
The writer classified the possible errors in using degrees of comparison into three categories:
      
      1. Errors in the use of positive degree
      2. Errors in the use of comparative degree
      3. Errors in the use of superlative degree
   
   b. Arrangements of the test items
      
The writer classified the errors into three catagories because there are three kinds of degrees of comparison. In addition, it make easy in scoring and analize the data. After classifying the errors into those categories, the writer arranges the test items into the following number.

   1. Test on the use of positive degree, number 1, 6, 9, 12, 14, 17, 20, 23
   2. Test on the use of comparative degree, number 3, 4, 7, 10, 11, 15, 18, 22, 24
   3. Test on the use of superlative degree, number 2, 5, 8, 13, 16, 19, 21, 25
H. **Technique of Data Analysis**

To analyzed the student’s error i using degrees of omparison, the writer uses both quantitative (statistical) and descriptive analysis (non statistical analysis).

1. **Statistical Analysis**

The writer gives the test to the students and from this test, there will be data collection. When the data are collected, they are classified into five groups: outstanding, very good, satisfactory, very week and fail grade. To know the student’s error, the writer will group the wrong answer they made. From that five data, the writer will analyze and there will be data analysis to come to conclusion. Anas Sudjono (1991 : 41), count the student’s error in percentage with the formula:

\[
P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\
\]

By which:

\[P : \text{Percentage of error}\]

\[F : \text{Frequency is looking for percentage}\]

\[N : \text{Number of cases (Number of Frequency/number of individuals)}\]
The writer also looks the average of the percentage of error by using formula:

\[
M = \frac{\sum X}{N}
\]

- **M**: the average of the score (percentage)
- **\(\sum X\)**: the number of score (percentage)
- **N**: The number of cases

2. Non-statistical analysis

In the non-statistical analysis, the writer classifies the student’s achievement using factor analysis by the use of five letter; A, B, C, D, E, which expressed various levels of achievements. In addition, it was relatively easy to translate from letter grading to percentage grading by Suharsimi arikunto (1995).
### Table 3.1 Various of Levels Achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Correct Answer</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100% correct</td>
<td>A. Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-79% correct</td>
<td>B. Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65% correct</td>
<td>C. Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-55% correct</td>
<td>D. Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39% correct</td>
<td>E. Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the writer presents data presentation and data analysis of this research. It consists of respondents’ error in using degrees of comparison, data analysis, and result of analysis.

D. Respondents’ Error in Using Degrees of Comparison

In order to get primary data the writer presents the respondents’ error in using degrees of comparison as follow:

Table 4.1 percentage of respondents’ error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>NIS</th>
<th>Name of Student</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Sum of Errors</th>
<th>Percentage of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6061</td>
<td>Abdul Adi Prasetyo</td>
<td>VIIIA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6062</td>
<td>Aditya Firmansyah</td>
<td>VIIIA</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6063</td>
<td>Agil dwiyanto</td>
<td>VIIIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6064</td>
<td>Alvyanti</td>
<td>VIIIA</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6065</td>
<td>Andi Rohman</td>
<td>VIIIA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6096</td>
<td>Bagus setyadi</td>
<td>VIIIB</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6097</td>
<td>Ayu Ipa Herawati</td>
<td>VIIIB</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6099</td>
<td>Dwi Puspita sari</td>
<td>VIIIB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6099</td>
<td>Elsa wulandari</td>
<td>VIIIB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Grd</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6100</td>
<td>Enggi Eria Ningrum</td>
<td>VIII B</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6137</td>
<td>Fajar Fitrianti</td>
<td>VIII C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6138</td>
<td>Ferbrina Anjani Putri</td>
<td>VIII C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6139</td>
<td>Fitalia sukmaawati Putri</td>
<td>VIII C</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6140</td>
<td>Julita Dea rahmawati</td>
<td>VIII C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6141</td>
<td>Linda Widya astute</td>
<td>VIII C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6174</td>
<td>Novita Wulan suci</td>
<td>VIII D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6175</td>
<td>Oktaviani Rahma Pertiwi</td>
<td>VIII D</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6176</td>
<td>Redhika Nuswantoro</td>
<td>VIII D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6177</td>
<td>Riki Dwi Purnomo Aji</td>
<td>VIII D</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6178</td>
<td>Rizki Nugroho</td>
<td>VIII D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6207</td>
<td>Rizky Rahmatdani</td>
<td>VIII E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6208</td>
<td>Sabrina valery Ariesta P</td>
<td>VIII E</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>6209</td>
<td>Septivian Esa Nur R</td>
<td>VIII E</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6210</td>
<td>Siti Aisah Nuryani</td>
<td>VIII E</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6211</td>
<td>Sukimin</td>
<td>VIII E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>6243</td>
<td>Topo Marsudeng Budi</td>
<td>VIII F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>6244</td>
<td>Untung Saputra</td>
<td>VIII F</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6245</td>
<td>Windi Nurwulandari</td>
<td>VIII F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6246</td>
<td>Yulia Revia Mega putri</td>
<td>VIII F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6247</td>
<td>Yustina Anis Febry W</td>
<td>VIII F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the table above, The table show about percentage of respondents’ error, example NIM 6245 – Windi Nurwulandari from VIII group who has 6 errors of 25 questions.

Her percentage of errors is \( \frac{6}{25} \times 100\% = 24\% \)

**E. Data Analysis**

1. Total Error percentage in using degrees of comparison

Table 4.2 the total error percentage in using degrees of comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Errors</th>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Sum of Errors</th>
<th>Sum of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Errors</th>
<th>Average of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
<td>39,16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51,85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56,67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56,67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46,67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superlative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data presentation above, the writer explains that the result of the analysis of all respondents shows that the average of the errors made by students are 44.08%. Where the average of the errors in using positive degree by students are 39.16%, comparative degree are 51.85%, and superlative degree are 41.25%.
2. Analysis per item

To get the percentage of student’s errors in using degrees of comparison, the writer analyze by used formula as follows:

\[ P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\% \]

\( P \) = Percentage of Errors

\( F \) = Frequency is looking for percentage

\( N \) = Number of cases (Number of Frequency/number of individuals)

a. Analysis of the Wrong Answers of Positive degree

Table 4.3 the error percentage per item of positive degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Sum of Errors</th>
<th>Sum of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36,67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Errors 39,16%
Error Analysis percentage per item based on table above.

(1) Andy drives his motorcycle fast. Tono drives motorcycle fast, too. Tono drives his motorcycle ... Andi does.

11 students answered incorrect and 19 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ P = \frac{11}{30} \times 100\% = 36,67\% \]

(6) Suzana sings a song well and Rini sing a song well, too.

Suzana sings a song ... Rini.

11 students answered incorrect and 19 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{11}{30} \times 100\% = 36,67\% \]

(9) Ira got four in English test and Ari did, too.

Ari got score ... Ira.

16 students answered incorrect and 14 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{16}{30} \times 100\% = 53,33\% \]

(12) The planes flies 5.000 feet and helicopter does, too.

The plane flies as ... as the helicopter

16 students answered incorrect and 14 students answered correct.
The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{16}{30} \times 100\% = 53.33\% \]

(14) Hendra works from 8 a.m. up to 6 p.m.

Andri works from 8 a.m. up to 4 p.m.

Andra works from 8 a.m. up to 6 p.m.

Andra works ... Hendra.

16 students answered incorrect and 14 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{16}{30} \times 100\% = 53.33\% \]

(17) Bicycle runs 10 km per hour and so does the horse.

The horse runs ... bicycle.

12 students answered incorrect and 18 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{12}{30} \times 100\% = 40\% \]

(20) Andi speaks English for thirty minutes and Andra does, too.

Andra speaks English ... Andi.

16 students answered incorrect and 14 students answered correct.

\[ \frac{16}{30} \times 100\% = 53.33\% \]

(23) Ahmad swims 100 meters. Ari swims 80 meters. Ali swims 100 meters
Ahmad swims ... Ali.

12 students answered incorrect and 18 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[
\frac{12}{30} \times 100 = 40\%
\]

b. Analysis of Comparative Degree

Table 4.4 the error percentage per item of comparative degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Sum of Errors</th>
<th>Sum of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Error Analysis percentage per item based on table above.

(3) She lives two miles a way from school.

I lives a mile a way from school.

She lives ... than me from school.

15 students answered incorrect and 15 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{15}{30} \times 100\% = 50\%
\]

(4) The man swims 100 meters.

The girl swims 50 meters.

It means that the girl swims ... than the man.

17 students answered incorrect and 13 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{17}{30} \times 100\% = 56,67\%
\]

(7) Blood is ... than water.

17 students answered incorrect and 13 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{17}{30} \times 100\% = 56,67\%
\]

(10) Gold is ... than silver.

14 students answered incorrect and 16 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{14}{30} \times 100\% = 46,67\%
\]

(11) James is two years ... than me.
17 students answered incorrect and 13 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{17}{30} \times 100\% = 56.67\% \]

(15) She is ... than her sister.

14 students answered incorrect and 16 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{14}{30} \times 100\% = 46.67\% \]

(18) The climate of Chennai is ... than the climate of Bangalore.

15 students answered incorrect and 15 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{15}{30} \times 100\% = 50\% \]

(22) Mr. Harto finished his works three hours but Mr. Hasan finished his works five hours. Mr. Harto finished his works ... than Mr. Hasan.

13 students answered incorrect and 17 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[ \frac{13}{30} \times 100\% = 43.33\% \]

(24) The modern farmer prefers using tractor to plow the ground because tractor can work ... than animal.

18 students answered incorrect and 12 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:
\[
\frac{18}{30} \times 100\% = 60\%
\]

c. Analysis of Superlative Degree

Table 4.5 the error percentage per item of superlative degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Sum of Errors</th>
<th>Sum of Students</th>
<th>Percentage of Errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Error Analysis percentage per item based on table above.

(2) Budi runs at 70 m a minute.

Endang runs at 80 m a minute.

Anto runs at 90 m a minute.

Anto runs the ... of them.

12 students answered incorrect and 18 students answered correct.
The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{12}{30} \times 100\% = 40\%
\]

(5) Dewi take a bath for thirty minutes. Atik take a bath for twenty minutes. Ani take a bath for fifteen minutes. Dewi take a bath ... among of them.

13 students answered incorrect and 17 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{13}{30} \times 100\% = 43,33\%
\]

(8) Elephant is the... animal in the world.

11 students answered incorrect and 19 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{11}{30} \times 100\% = 36,67\%
\]

(13) Andi is the ... boy in the class.

12 students answered incorrect and 18 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{12}{30} \times 100\% = 40\%
\]

(16) He is the ... man in the town.

13 students answered incorrect and 17 students answered correct.

The percentage of wrong answer is :

\[
\frac{13}{30} \times 100\% = 43,33\%
\]

(19) Jane is the ... student in the class.
14 students answered incorrect and 16 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[
\frac{14}{30} \times 100\% = 46.67\%
\]

(21) Mr. George won the games three times.

Mr. Bob won twice and Mr. James won once.

Mr. George played the ... among of all.

15 students answered incorrect and 16 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[
\frac{15}{30} \times 100\% = 50\%
\]

(25). Annie is the ... friend I have.

9 students answered incorrect and 21 students answered correct. The percentage of wrong answer is:

\[
\frac{9}{30} \times 100\% = 30\%
\]

F. Result of Analysis

From the data presentation and the analysis of the instruments, the writer will analysis about how are the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students mastery in using degrees of comparison and the dominant sources causing the student’s errors in the use of degrees of comparison.

1. The Dominant Errors in Using Degrees of Comparison.

There are many students who made errors in answering the question number 24. The result of test shows that 18
students or 60 % students gave errors answer and 12 students or 40 % students gave the right answer. The question number 24 is “The modern farmer prefers using tractor to plow the ground because tractor can work ... than animal”.

2. The varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery of using degrees of comparison

To know the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery in using degrees of comparison, the writer used five levels of student’s achievements as follow:

Table 4.6 the levels of student’s achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Correct Answer</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100% correct</td>
<td>A. Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-79% correct</td>
<td>B. Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65% correct</td>
<td>C. Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-55% correct</td>
<td>D. Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39% correct</td>
<td>E. Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 the varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo student’s mastery in using degrees of comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Correct Answer</th>
<th>Sum Of Students</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80-100% correct</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A. Outstanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-79% correct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>B. Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-65% correct</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>C. Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-55% correct</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>D. Very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39% correct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>E. Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based from Arikunto in her book (Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan, 1995:251), the writer would explain about the table above. 15 students got D (very weak), 10 students got C (satisfactory), 4 students got B (very good), and only 1 student got E (Fail).
CHAPTER V

CLOSURE

In this chapter, the writer present the conclusion and suggestion

A. Conclusion

The writer can say that English is very important in the effect to bring this Indonesian Country into the modern age. So English then must be learned as an obligatory subject at school. This language is taught from the SLTP up to Universities in Indonesia.

In this chapter, the writer can make a conclusion that the students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo Karanganyar in the academic year of 2014/2015 in using Degrees of Comparison are getting of errors as follows:

1. The dominant errors

Based on the analysis, there are many students who made wrong in answering the question number 24. The result of test shows that 18 students or 60 % students gave wrong answered and 12 students or 40 % students gave the right answer.

2. The varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery

The varieties of SMP N 2 Jumapolo students’ mastery in using degrees of comparison still fail, because 16 of 30 students get percentage of correct answer below 56 %. It can be concluded that
the teaching learning process of degrees of comparison at the second year students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo should be increased.

B. Suggestion

Suggestions that the writer can deliver on the analysis of errors in using Degrees of comparison made by second year students of SMP N 2 Jumapolo in academic year 2014/2015 are as follows:

1. To the teacher
   
   a. In the teaching learning process, teacher must explain the use of degrees of comparison to the students clearly together with their examples and they must give many exercises which must be done by the students.
   
   b. Since most of students still make errors in using of degrees of comparison, so the teacher should give remedial teaching about them and pay more attention in teaching.

2. To the students

   a. The students must study more intensively about the use of degrees of comparison from the teachers and some other sources.
   
   b. The students should have appropriate knowledge about degrees of comparison and be able to reduce or avoid their same errors at any other time.
3. To the readers or the other researcher

The writer realizes that this study is not final and complete. There are still many weaknesses dealing with the theory, methodology, or perhaps the idea because of the writer’s limited skill. He is also conscious that this study just gives a little contribution in teaching English, but the writer is sure that it will be useful. And this study can be used as a basic step or starting point to investigate the topic more completely and comprehensively.
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General Description of SMP N 2 Jumapolo

1. The History of SMP N 2 Jumapolo

SMP N 2 Jumapolo was built on 22 November 1985, Jumapolo, Karanganyar. There is some headmasters who guided in SMP N 2 Jumapolo from 1986 until now, that is:

a. 1986 until 1993: Siti Rezeki
b. 1993 until 1996: Soewardo, E.W
c. 1996 until 1998: Watono
d. 1998 until 2003: Margana, S.Pd
e. 2003 until 2005: Drs. Sutrisno, M. Hum
f. 2005 until 2005: Soegito, S.Pd, M.Pd
g. 2005 until 2006: Supardi, S.Pd
h. 2006 until 2007: Drs. H. Sarjino
i. 2007 until 2009: Drajad sri Widodo, M.M
j. 2009 until 2011: Umar Faruk, S.pd
k. 2011 until 2012: Drajad Sri Widodo, M.M
l. 2012 until 2013: Sri Wiyanto, S.Pd, M.Or
m. 2013 until now: Nuk Budiayastuti, S.Pd, M.Pd

2. General Situation of SMP N 2 Jumapolo

SMP N 2 Jumapolo is located on Jalan Raya Jumapolo, Kecamatan Jumapolo, exactly in Ngambang Village. Area of land owned is 18.115 m² and building wide is 3.388 m².

The available mediums and instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Medium And Instrument</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principal/Headmaster room</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher room</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The description of teacher, staff and students

In this formal education, it needs qualified people as teacher and staff as administration to run teaching and learning process well.

Table 4.2 the teachers and staffs in SMP N 2 Jumapolo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Job position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nuk Budiastuti, S.Pd, M.Pd</td>
<td>Headmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bambang Gunarjo, S.Pd</td>
<td>Vice principle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Seno, S.Ag</td>
<td>The chief of school commite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nardi, Spd., M.Pd</td>
<td>Sekretaris of school commite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarmodo</td>
<td>Treasurer of school commite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sukasno</td>
<td>Operational staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shinto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Dayani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yeni Tri Astutik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kardo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giyarti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sriyadi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fitriyani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endang Widayati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sertiyoowati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heni Ernawati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Edi Suparno, S.Pd</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setiyowati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heni Ernawati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giyarti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nardi, S.Pd, M.Pd</td>
<td>Laboratorium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teguh suryadi, s.Pd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dra. Nurweni Astuti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Heri setyowati, S.Pd</td>
<td>Vice teacher of Class :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Sulistyani, S.Pd</td>
<td>Class VII A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muhammad Abduh, S.S</td>
<td>Class VII B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pariyani Solikah, S.pd</td>
<td>Class VII C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dian Dwiyani A D, S.Sn</td>
<td>Class VII D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teguh Suryadi, S.Pd</td>
<td>Class VII E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sri Wahyuningsih, S.Pd</td>
<td>Class VIII A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siti kiptiyah, S.Pd</td>
<td>Class VIII B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ali Sofyan, S.Pd.I</td>
<td>Class VIII C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teguh Suharto, S.Kom</td>
<td>Class VIII D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dra. Nurweni Astuti</td>
<td>Class VIII E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Nardi, S.Pd, M.Pd</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tatik Winantiti, S.Pd</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Siti Kiptiyah, S.Pd</td>
<td>Civic Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hery Setyowati, S.Pd</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Muhammad Syafrudin, S.Sn</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Bambang Gunarjo, S.Pd</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tugino, S.Pd</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sabtunus Subagyo, S.Pd</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ali Sofyan, S.Pd.I</td>
<td>Islamic Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teguh Suryadi, S.Pd</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Anik Sumarti, S.Pd</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Siswanta, S.Pd</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sri Sulistyani, S.Pd</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Edi Suparno, S.Pd</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Hari Margiatno, S.Pd</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Drs. Ngadiyo</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Drs. Muhtar Suhaji</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Suwardi, S.Pd</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Tugino, S.Pd</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Pariyani Solihah, S.Pd</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Siti Indiyarti, S.Pd</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Bambang Triyono, S.Pd</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Tarmin, S.Pd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Sri Lestari Yuliyani, S.Psi</td>
<td>Sport Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Yahman, S.Pd</td>
<td>Counseling Guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Drs. Totok Ariaji</td>
<td>Counseling Guidance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Dian Dwiyani A D, S.Sn</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Rahayuningsih, S.Pd</td>
<td>Dancing Art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Nining Sulistyani, S.Pd</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Subagyo, S.Pd</td>
<td>Physics/Computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Mustofa Hidayat, S.Ag</td>
<td>Sport Education/music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Sri Wahyuningsih, S.Pd</td>
<td>Islamic Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Tugiman, S.Pd</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Soni Aryanto, S.Pd</td>
<td>Sport Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Sumatini, S.Pd</td>
<td>Sport Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Allip Mardani, S.Pd</td>
<td>Computer/ biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Muhammad Abduh, S.S</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Sunardi, S.Pd</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specialties:**
- Sport Education
- Counseling Guidance
- History
- Dancing Art
- Indonesian
- Physics/Computer
- Sport Education/music
- Islamic Education
- Javanese
- Sport Education
- Computer/ biology
- English
- English
- Counseling Guidance
Choose the correct answer by crossing a, b, c or d

1. Andy drives his motorcycle fast. Tono drives motorcycle fast, too.
   Tono drives his motorcycle ... Andi does.
   a. Slow
   b. Slowly
   c. As fast as
   d. Faster
2. Budi runs at 70 m a minute.
   Endang runs at 80 m a minute.
   Anto runs at 90 m a minute.
   Anto runs the ... of them.
   a. Fast
   b. As fast as
   c. Farther
   d. Fastest

3. She lives two miles a way from school.
   I lives a mile a way from school.
   She lives ... than me from school.
   a. Close
   b. Closer
   c. Far
   d. Farther

4. The man swims 100 meters.
   The girl swims 50 meters.
   It means that the girl swims ... than the man.
   a. Faster
   b. Longer
   c. Nearer
   d. Harder
5. Dewi take a bath for thirty minutes. Atik take a bath for twenty minutes.
   Ani take a bath for fifteen minutes.
   Dewi take a bath ... among of them.
   a. Longer
   b. Longest
   c. fastest
   d. faster

6. Suzana sings a song well and Rini sing a song well, too.
   Suzana sings a song ... Rini.
   a. Bad
   b. As well as
   c. Low
   d. Faster

7. Blood is ... than water.
   a. Thick
   b. Thickest
   c. Thicker
   d. More thick

8. Elephant is the... animal in the world.
   a. Large
   b. Largerer
   c. More large
   d. Largest
9. Ira got four in English test and Ari did, too.
   Ari got score ... Ira.
   a. As bad as
   b. Worse
   c. Well
   d. Better

10. Gold is ... than silver.
    a. Expensive
    b. More expensive
    c. Cheap
    d. Most expensive

11. James is two years ... than me.
    a. Old
    b. More old
    c. Oldest
    d. Older

12. The planes flies 5.000 feet and helicopter does, too.
    The plane flies ... as the helicopter
    a. Fast
    b. High
    c. Fall
    d. Shortly
13. Andi is the ... boy in the class.
   a. Handsome  
   b. More handsome  
   c. Most handsome  
   d. Handsomer

14. Hendra works from 8 a.m. up to 6 p.m.
   Andri works from 8 a.m. up to 4 p.m.
   Andra works from 8 a.m. up to 6 p.m.
   Andra works ... Hendra.
   a. Fast  
   b. Long  
   c. Highest  
   d. As long as

15. She is ... than her sister.
   a. Pretty  
   b. Prettier  
   c. More pretty  
   d. Prettiest

16. He is the ... man in the town.
   a. Rich  
   b. Richer  
   c. Richest  
   d. More rich
17. Bicycle runs 10 km per hour and so does the horse.

The horse runs ... bicycle.

a. Slowly
b. More slowly
c. As fast as
d. Faster

18. The climate of Chennai is ... than the climate of Bangalore.

a. Hot
b. Hotter
c. Hottest
d. More hot

19. Jane is the ... student in the class.

a. Tall
b. More tallest
c. Taller
d. Tallest

20. Andi speaks English for thirty minutes and Andra does, too.

Andra speaks English ... Andi.

a. As well as
b. Farther
c. Well
d. Better
21. Mr. George won the games three times.
   Mr. Bob won twice and Mr. James won once.
   Mr. George played the ... among of all.
   a. Best
   b. Better
   c. Well
   d. Worst

22. Mr. Harto finished his works three hours but Mr. Hasan finished his works
   five hours.
   Mr. Harto finished his works ... than Mr. Hasan.
   a. Fast
   b. Faster
   c. The fastest
   d. Hard

23. Ahmad swims 100 meters
   Ari swims 80 meters
   Ali swims 100 meters
   Ahmad swims ... Ali
   a. As long as
   b. Longer
   c. Longest
   d. Nearer
24. The modern farmer prefers using tractor to plow the ground because tractor can work ... than animal.
   a. Slowly
   b. More slowly
   c. Fast
   d. Faster

25. Annie is the ... friend I have.
   a. Best
   b. Good
   c. Better
   d. More good
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Kunci Jawaban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LEMBAR KONSULTASI SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : AHMAD KHOIRUR ROHMAN
NIM : 11308157
Pembimbing : Faizal Risdianto, S.S, M. Hum
Judul Skripsi : "ERROR ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS' TEST RESULT ON THE USE OF DEGREES OF COMPARISON (A STUDY AT THE SECOND YEARS OF SMP N II JUMAPOLO IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2014/2015)"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Tanggal</th>
<th>Isi Konsultasi</th>
<th>Catatan Pembimbing</th>
<th>Paraf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Perbedaan dengan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>penelitian sebelumnya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rumusan masalah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. tata tulis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/9 2014</td>
<td>Bab I</td>
<td>2. Grammar</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rumusan masalah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26/10 2019</td>
<td>Bab I - II</td>
<td>1. Jumlahkan data dan hasil buku dalam bab</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Kurangi teori yang tidak ada hubungan dengan penelitian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15/12 2019</td>
<td>Bab I - II</td>
<td>1. Latar belakang terlihat jelas</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Research design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Alasan ilmiah kompeten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catatan: Setiap konsultasi Lembar ini harus dibawa

Pembimbing,

Faizal Risdianto, S. S, M. Hum
LEMBAR KONSULTASI SKRIPSI

Nama Mahasiswa : AHMAD KHOIRUR ROHMAN
NIM : 11308157
Pembimbing : Faizal Risdianto, S.S, M. Hum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Tanggal</th>
<th>Isi Konsultasi</th>
<th>Catatan Pembimbing</th>
<th>Paraf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14/03/2015</td>
<td>Bab I - IV</td>
<td>monilih multiple choice test.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. tambahkan instrumen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. tambahkan keterangan dari tabel analisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22/03/2015</td>
<td>Bab I - V</td>
<td>1. Bab III optional</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Bab III rombongan analisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Bab IV presentasi dari - memandu proses ringkasan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Bab V menganomi ringkasan untuk abstract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tambahkan kaud pengantar dsb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>29/03/2015</td>
<td>Bab V - Y</td>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31/03/2015</td>
<td>Bab</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Catatan : Setiap konsultasi Lembar ini harus dibawa

Pembimbing,

Faizal Risdianto, S. S, M. Hum
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Nama Kegiatan</th>
<th>Tanggal</th>
<th>Keterangan</th>
<th>Nilai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Orientasi Pengenalan Akademik dan Kemahasiswaan (OPAK) DEMA STAIN Salatiga</td>
<td>18-20 Agustus 2008</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pelatihan Emotional Spiritual Intelligence Quotient STAIN Salatiga</td>
<td>21 Agustus 2009</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>User Education (UPT Perpustakaan STAIN Salatiga)</td>
<td>25-29 Agustus 2009</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DISKUSI PANEL &amp; BUKA BERSAMA CEC, ITTAQO, dan LDK &quot;Aktualisasi Bahasa Arab dan Bahasa Inggris Dalam Dakwah Islam&quot;</td>
<td>5 September 2009</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ENGLISH FRIENDSHIP CAMP Communicative English Club (CEC) STAIN Salatiga</td>
<td>17-18 November 2009</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SEMINAR NASIONAL &quot;Strategi Pembeajaran Kreatif, Menarik, dan Menyenangkan Menuju Siswa Cerdas&quot; (Kak Seto) Smart Teacher Development Institute (STDI)</td>
<td>20 Januari 2010</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SURAT KETERANGAN “Praktikum Kepramukaan” STAIN Salatiga</td>
<td>22-24 Februari 2010</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SEMINAR REGIONAL “Menggali Potensi Mahasiswa Dalam Menghadapi Persaingan Global” HMI Cabang Salatiga</td>
<td>18 Mei 2010</td>
<td>Paniita</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SURAT KETERANGAN “Praktikum Tarbiyah Bahasa Inggris”</td>
<td>1 September 2010</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Basic Training (LK 1) “Membangun Pola Idealis Mahasiswa di tengah Bergolakan Arus Global guna Mencapai Insan yang Miliitan dan Bernafaskan Islam”</td>
<td>13 Oktober 2010</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Basic Training (LK 1) “Implementasi Nilai ke-HMI an Dalam Diri Mahasiswa Demi Terbentuknya Insan Yang Intelekualitas Dan Bernafaskan Islam”</td>
<td>16-19 Maret 2011</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>KAJIAN “Tingkat Keadilan Tuhan Dalam Manusia”</td>
<td>26 Mei 2011</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SEMINAR “Radikalisme Keagamaan di Indonesia”</td>
<td>01 Juni 2011</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEARING “Meningkatkan Tataan Birokrasi Kampus Yang Berbasis Pada Prinsip-Prinsip Integritas”</td>
<td>25 Juni 2011</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>REUNI AKBAR &amp; SARASEHAN “Merajut Ukhuwah Memperkokoh Kebersamaan”</td>
<td>03 Juli 2011</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Event Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PENGINAPAN OPAK HMI CABANG SALATIGA</td>
<td>28 Agustus 2011</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DISKUSI INTERNASIONAL</td>
<td>21 November 2011</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>TRAINING SENIOR COURSE (SC)</td>
<td>15-20 Februari 2012</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>TRAINING SENIOR COURSE (SC)</td>
<td>15-20 Februari 2012</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEARING</td>
<td>27 Maret 2012</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>&quot;SOSIALISASI Pencegahan Penanggulangan HIV AIDS SE-KOTA SALATIGA&quot;</td>
<td>22 Mei 2012</td>
<td>Panitia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PUBLIC HEARING 2 &quot;Evaluasi Kinerja Lembaga Menanggapi Public Hearing II&quot;</td>
<td>20 Juni 2012</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Judul</td>
<td>Tanggal</td>
<td>Keterangan</td>
<td>Anggota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>SURAT KETERANGAN Praktikum Pelatihan TOEFL STAIN Salatiga</td>
<td>30 Juli-15 Agustus 2012</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>SEMINAR KEPEMUDAAN “Hari Sumpah Pemuda” Forum Generasi Muda Peduli Salatiga (FGMPS)</td>
<td>28 Oktober 2012</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>SEMINAR &amp; LOKA KARYA (SEMILOKA) BADAN KOORDINASI HIMPUNAN MAHASISWA ISLAM JAWA TENGAH-D.I YOGYAKARTA “Meningkatkan Wawasan Kebangsaan Berbasis Hijau”</td>
<td>28-30 Desember 2012</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>SEMINAR NASIONAL “Kepemimpinan dan Masa Depan Bangsa”HMI Cabang Salatiga</td>
<td>23 Februari 2013</td>
<td>Peserta</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>SURAT KEPUTUSAN Pengurus Dewan Pimpinan (DPP)GEWA KOSGORO JAWA TENGAH Sebagai anggota</td>
<td>03 Mei 2013</td>
<td>Pengurus</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Salatiga, 08 Maret 2015

Mengetahui,
Wakil Kerja III Bidang
Kementerian Agama & Kerjasama

Moh. Khairul M. Ag., M.A.
NIP 19711212 199003 1003
### SILABUS PEMBELAJARAN

**Sekolah:** SMP N 2 Jumapolo  
**Kelas:** VIII (Delapan)  
**Mata Pelajaran:** BAHASA INGGRIS  
**Semester:** 1 (Satu)  
**Standar Kompetensi:** Berbicara

3. Mengungkapkan maksud dalam percakapan transaksional dan interpersonal lisan pendek sederhana untuk berinteraksi dengan lingkungan sekitar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kompetensi Dasar</th>
<th>Materi Pembelajaran</th>
<th>Kegiatan Pembelajaran</th>
<th>Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi</th>
<th>Pesilalan</th>
<th>Alokasi Waktu</th>
<th>Sumber Belajar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 Mengungkapkan maksud dalam monolog pendek sederhana dengan menggunakan ragam bahasa lisan secara akurat, lancar, dan berinteraksi dengan lingkungan sekitar dalam teks berbentuk recount dan narrative | 1. Teks monolog berbentuk recount dan narrative  
2. Ciri-ciri kebahasaan teks narrative dan recount  
3. Langkah retorika teks narrative dan recount  
4. Tata Bahasa  
  - Simple Past tense  
  - Past continuous tense  
  - temporal conjunctions  
  - Connective words  
  - Adverbs | 1. Review kosakata dan tata bahasa terkait jenis teks recount dan narrative di dalam teks dengan tema yang dipilih  
2. Membuat kalimat sederhana secara lisan terkait ciri-ciri kebahasaan teks recount dan narrative  
- Simple past  
- Past continuous  
- Temporal conjunctions | Unjuk kerja  
Kisi Petik  
Bercerita  
Bermain peran | 1. Tell us briefly what you did yesterday  
2. Retell a story that you know very well  
3. Tell a story based on the series of a pictures given | 4 x 30 menit | 1. Buku teks yang relevan  
2. Gambar-gambar terkait tema  
3. Realia Benda sekitar |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character Name</th>
<th>Jon Doe</th>
<th>Character Name</th>
<th>Jane Smith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>1/1/1985</td>
<td>Date of Birth</td>
<td>1/1/1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>6'2&quot;</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>5'10&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>180 lbs</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>120 lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair Color</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Hair Color</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Color</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Eye Color</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Color</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Favorite Color</td>
<td>Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Food</td>
<td>Pizza</td>
<td>Favorite Food</td>
<td>Salad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Drink</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Favorite Drink</td>
<td>Coffee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Movie</td>
<td>Avengers</td>
<td>Favorite Movie</td>
<td>Titanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Book</td>
<td>Harry Potter</td>
<td>Favorite Book</td>
<td>To Kill a Mockingbird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Sport</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Favorite Sport</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite Game</td>
<td>Chess</td>
<td>Favorite Game</td>
<td>Video Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table (individual)</td>
<td>Keterangan dan Pemindaian (Rescat)</td>
<td>Kontak Pemindaian</td>
<td>Jumlah Daftar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nama Lengkap</td>
<td>Akses Informasi</td>
<td>Kompetensi</td>
<td>Teknik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jabatan</td>
<td>Pendidikan</td>
<td>Kemampuan</td>
<td>Hasil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekerjaan</td>
<td>Latar Belakang</td>
<td>Kompetensi</td>
<td>Memori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Latar Belakang</td>
<td>Keterampilan</td>
<td>Keterampilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nomor Telepon</td>
<td>Latar Belakang</td>
<td>Keterampilan</td>
<td>Keterampilan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIP</td>
<td>Latar Belakang</td>
<td>Keterampilan</td>
<td>Keterampilan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The table contains information related to individual details, such as name, position, education, and skills. The NIP is required for identification.*
Yang bertanda tangan dibawah ini:
Nama: Nuk Budiastuti, S.Pd., M.Pd
NIP: 19640401 198403 2 003
Jabatan: Kepala Sekolah
Unit Kerja: SMP Negeri 2 Jumapolo

Dengan ini menerangkan bahwa:
a. Nama: Ahmad Khoirur Rohman
b. NIM: 113068157
c. Jurusan/Program Studi: Tarbiyah / Tadris Bahasa Inggris (TBI)

Bahwa yang tersebut diatas telah melaksanakan riset/penelitian dari tanggal 17 Desember 2014 s/d 20 Desember 2014, guna menyusun Tugas Akhir Skripsi (TAS) dengan judul: “ERROR ANALYSIS OF STUDENTS TEST RESULTS ON THE USE OF COMPARISON DEGREE (A CASE STUDY AT THE SECOND YEARS OF SMPN II JUMAPOLO IN THE ACADEMIC YEAR OF 2014/2015)“

Demikian Surat Keterangan ini dibuat untuk dapat dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya

Jumapolo, 21 Februari 2015

Kepala Sekolah

SMP NEGERI 2 JUMAPOLO
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Alamat: Jumapolo, Kec. Jumapolo, Kab. Karanganyar Telp. (0271)7084197
CURRICULUM VITAE
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