



An Analysis of Students' Ability in Using Degrees of Comparison in Adjective and Adverb at English Language Education Program of UNP

Nur Azmi Novzalia¹ and Senorica Yulia Sari²

Abstract

¹²Universitas Negeri Padang Email: <u>nurazminovzalia17@gmail.com</u>

Article History

Submitted: 2022-11-16 Accepted: 2022-12-27 Published: 2022-12-27

Keywords: Analysis, ability, grammar, degrees of comparison in adjective, degrees of comparison in adverb.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the ability of fifthsemester students in the English Language Education Program UNP's use degrees of comparison in adjectives and adverbs. The Participants in this study were 35 fifth-semester students at the English Language Education Program of the UNP. This study was a quantitative study. Tests and interviews were conducted for this study. According to the study's findings, 55.42% of students were able to master the items of positive degrees in adjectives, followed by the items of comparative degrees in adjectives, with 61.14% of students being able to master those items. Of the students, 77.14% demonstrated the ability to master the items of the superlative degree in adjectives. In terms of adverbs, 72.57% of students were able to master the items of positive degree in adverbs, 66.85% of students were able to master the items of comparative degree in adverbs, and 38.28% of students were able to master the items of superlative degree in adverbs. This indicates that more than 50% of the students had mastered the degree of comparison. The respondents supported this finding, stating that the fifth-semester students in the English language education program have problem comprehending comparisons for the following reasons: They misplaced the article "the" in the superlative form and forgot to add "than" after the adjective in the comparative form. They also did not know how to modify words that ended in -y to -i and add -er/-est. Finally, they did not understand the purpose of using irregular forms.

©2022 The Author(s) Publish by Jurusan Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris FBS UNP. This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

How to Cite: Novzalia, N. A., & Sari, S. Y. (2022). An Analysis of Students' Ability in Using Degrees of Comparison in Adjective and Adverb at English Language Education Program of UNP. Journal of English Language Teaching, 11. (4):pp. 629-646, DOI: <u>10.24036/jelt.v11i4.120456</u>

INTRODUCTION

Grammar is a skill that studies a group of words and how they work together; an invisible skill that can make us put words together into sentence Debata (2013). Students' understanding of grammar can help them to become aware of mistakes in their sentences. Harmer (2004) states that grammar describes how words may take different forms and can be combined to create sentences. According to experts, there



are some rules that explain how language is constructed and used in communication, and many components of grammar are taught. One is the degree of comparison.

Munoz (1991) says that comparison shows the degree of deference, with the adjective and adverb possibly being equal or unequal. This indicates that different levels of two or more things, persons, or places are indicated using degrees of comparison to compare them. According to Parrott (2004), a comparative is an adjective or adverb that ends in -er, such as bigger, richer, or faster, while a superlative is an adjective or adverb that ends in -est (e.g., largest, richest, fastest). There are three levels of comparison: positive, comparative, and superlative. A positive degree indicates no comparisons. The comparative degree is used to compare two things, one of which is "more" than the other. The superlative degree is used to describe the thing that has the "most" trait, among others.

According to Parrott (2004), Adjectives are frequently referred to as "describing words" since they provide information about the traits of anything being described by a noun, noun phrase, or noun clause. Adjectives can be compared in English. For instance, one can say that one house is big, that it is bigger than another, or that it is the biggest house of all. Not all adjectives lend themselves to comparison, such as perfect, right, natural, and wrong. These words cannot be compared because the positive forms express only the possible degree. An adjective can be used in one of three locations: before a noun, after a noun, or in the predicate. Parrott (2004) says that the word "adverb" refers to a variety of words with quite different functions. It is neither accurate nor very helpful in defining adverbs as words that "modify an adjective, adverb, or another verb." In English, the adverbs were compared. For instance, it is possible to say that she runs fast, faster than the others, or the fastest of all.

From the viewpoint above, the researcher believes that this study is necessary for the following reasons: there are limited studies that discuss degrees of comparison in adverbs, with most previous studies focusing only on adjective comparisons. In this study, the researcher wanted to include the degrees of comparison in adverbs, because according to the researcher, adjectives and adverbs are equally important. In addition, based on students' abilities, the researcher wanted to know what made their scores high or low.

RESEARCH METHOD

Quantitative methods were used in this study. The participants in this research were students of the English Language Education Program at the University of Padang. According to Watson (2015), in order to systematically examine social phenomena using statistical or numerical data, a variety of techniques are referred to as "quantitative research." This study aimed to validate the measurements as well as pattern and connection findings through data analysis.

The reason for choosing the class of 2020 as the population was because the researcher had searched for this topic already learned by the students in the fifth semester, so the researcher chose them to be the population.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION Research Finding

A. Students' Ability in Degrees of Comparison of Adjective a. The Form of Positive Degree in Adjective

The following table shows the general frequency of students' ability to use adjectives in positive form:

Table 4.4

Gener	General Frequency of Students' Ability in Positive Form			
No.	Student	Score	Category	
1.	AD	60	Fair	
2.	DPN	100	Excellent	
3.	FK	60	Fair	
4.	GZS	40	Very poor	
5.	MY	100	Excellent	
6.	NR	100	Excellent	
7.	SL	100	Excellent	
8.	AE	40	Very poor	
9.	AM	80	Good	
10.	AGF	100	Excellent	
11.	А	60	Fair	
12.	CA	40	Very poor	
13.	EA	40	Very poor	
14.	FR	40	Very poor	
15.	HR	20	Very poor	
16.	IAM	100	Excellent	
17.	MDS	20	Very poor	
18.	MMP	20	Very poor	
19.	MIJ	40	Very poor	
20.	NC	60	Fair	
21.	RPF	40	Very poor	
22.	NF	40	Very poor	
23.	OG	20	Very poor	
24.	QHG	40	Very poor	
25.	R	80	Good	
26.	RW	20	Very poor	
27.	S	20	Very poor	
28.	SMP	0	Very poor	
29.	RCZ	80	Good	
30.	RAA	80	Good	
31.	SFZS	0	Very poor	
32.	TAP	40	Very poor	
33.	TMS	80	Good	
34.	TFM	100	Excellent	
35.	YW	80	Good	
Total	35	55.43		

The table shows that seven students scored 100, six scored 80, four scored 60, ten got scores 40, six scored 20, and two scored 0. Overall, the average student scores for adjectives with a positive degree were 55.43.

The following table shows the percentage of students with positive degree of adjective ability based on the results above:

The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification			
Criterion	Frequency	Percentage	
Excellent	7	20%	
Good	6	17.14%	
Fair	4	11.43%	
Poor	0	0%	
Very poor	18	51.43%	
Total	35	100%	

Table 4. 5	
The Percentage Result of Students' Sc	ore Classification

The table indicates that 7 students, or 20% of the students, are at excellent criteria, 17.14% or 6 students are at good criteria, 11.43% or 4 students are at fair criteria, 0% or 0 students are at poor criteria, and 51.43% or 18 students are at very poor criteria.

b. The form of comparative degree in adjective

The general frequency of students' abilities in comparative form in adjectives can be seen in the following table:

No.	Student	Score	Category
1.	AD	100	Excellent
2.	DPN	100	Excellent
3.	FK	80	Good
4.	GZS	80	Good
5.	MY	40	Very poor
6.	NR	80	Good
7.	SL	80	Good
8.	AE	60	Fair
9.	AM	60	Fair
10.	AGF	60	Fair
11.	А	60	Fair
12.	CA	80	Good
13.	EA	60	Fair
14.	FR	40	Very poor
15.	HR	80	Good
16.	IAM	80	Good
17.	MDS	20	Very poor

Table 4. 6
General Frequency of Students' Ability in Comparative Form

18.	MMP	20	Very poor
19.	MIJ	80	Good
20.	NC	20	Very poor
21.	RPF	20	Very poor
22.	NF	40	Very poor
23.	OG	40	Very poor
24.	QHG	80	Good
25.	R	20	Very poor
26.	RW	100	Excellent
27.	S	20	Very poor
28.	SMP	60	Fair
29.	RCZ	80	Good
30.	RAA	100	Excellent
31.	SFZS	0	Very poor
32.	TAP	40	Very poor
33.	TMS	80	Good
34.	TFM	100	Excellent
35.	YW	80	Good
Total	35	62.86	Fair

According to the table, five students scored 100, twelve got scores 80, six scored 60, five scored 40, six scored 20, and one received 0. Overall, the average students' positive degree score in adjective was 62.86.

The following table shows the percentage of students' ability to use comparative degrees as adjectives:

The referrage result of students score classification			
Criterion	Frequency	Percentage	
Excellent	5	14.29%	
Good	12	34.29%	
Fair	6	17.14%	
Poor	0	0%	
Very poor	12	34.28%	
Total	35	100%	

 Table 4. 7

 The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification

The table above shows that 14.29% or 5 students are at the excellent criteria, 34.29% or 12 students are at the good criteria, 17.14% or 6 students are at the fair criteria, 0% or 0 students are at poor criteria, and 34.28% or 12 students are at the very poor criteria.

c. The form of superlative degree in adjective

The general frequency of students' ability in superlative form in adjectives can be seen in the following table:

eral Frequency of Students Ability in Superfative r			
No.	Student	Score	Category
1.	AD	80	Good
2.	DPN	100	Excellent
3.	FK	60	Fair
4.	GZS	100	Excellent
5.	MY	100	Excellent
6.	NR	100	Excellent
7.	SL	80	Good
8.	AE	80	Good
9.	AM	100	Excellent
10.	AGF	100	Excellent
11.	А	100	Excellent
12.	CA	100	Excellent
13.	EA	80	Good
14.	FR	40	Very poor
15.	HR	80	Good
16.	IAM	100	Excellent
17.	MDS	80	Good
18.	MMP	40	Very poor
19.	MIJ	60	Fair
20.	NC	20	Very poor
21.	RPF	80	Good
22.	NF	0	Very poor
23.	OG	80	Good
24.	QHG	60	Fair
25.	R	80	Good
26.	RW	100	Excellent
27.	S	60	Fair
28.	SMP	80	Good
29.	RCZ	100	Excellent
30.	RAA	80	Good
31.	SFZS	60	Fair
32.	TAP	60	Fair
33.	TMS	100	Excellent
34.	TFM	60	Fair
35.	YW	100	Excellent
Total	35	77 14	Good

Table 4. 8General Frequency of Students' Ability in Superlative Form

The table shows that thirteen students got 100, eleven got 80, seven got 60, two got 40, and one got 20, and one student got 0. Overall, the average students' positive degree score in adjective was 77.14.

The following table shows the percentage of students' ability to use superlative degree adjectives:

The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification			
Criterion	Frequency	Percentage	
Excellent	13	37.14%	
Good	11	31.43%	
Fair	7	20%	
Poor	0	0%	
Very poor	4	11.43%	
Total	35	100%	

Table 4. 9The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification

According to the table, 37.14% or 13 students are at the excellent criteria, 31.43% or 11 students are at the good criteria, 20% or 7 students are at the fair criteria, 0% or 0 students are at the poor criteria, and 11.43% or 4 students are at the very poor criteria.

B. Students' ability in degrees of comparison of adverb

a. The form of positive degree in adverb

The general frequency of students' ability in positive forms of adverbs can be seen in the following table:

No.	Student	Score	Category
1.	AD	100	Excellent
2.	DPN	100	Excellent
3.	FK	80	Good
4.	GZS	100	Excellent
5.	MY	80	Good
6.	NR	100	Excellent
7.	SL	60	Fair
8.	AE	80	Good
9.	AM	100	Excellent
10.	AGF	80	Good
11.	Α	80	Good
12.	CA	100	Excellent
13.	EA	60	Fair
14.	FR	80	Good
15.	HR	20	Very poor
16.	IAM	100	Excellent
17.	MDS	40	Very poor
18.	MMP	60	Fair
19.	MIJ	80	Good
20.	NC	20	Very poor
21.	RPF	60	Fair
22.	NF	60	Fair

Table 4. 10General Frequency of Students' Ability in Positive Form

22	06	100	Excellent
23.	00	100	Excentent
24.	QHG	60	Fair
25.	R	40	Very poor
26.	RW	100	Excellent
27.	S	80	Good
28.	SMP	80	Good
29.	RCZ	80	Good
30.	RAA	100	Excellent
31.	SFZS	0	Very poor
32.	TAP	40	Very poor
33.	TMS	80	Good
34.	TFM	80	Good
35.	YW	60	Fair
Total	35	72.57	Good

According to the table, there were ten students got 100, 12 students got 80, seven students got 60, three students got 40, two students got 20, and one student got 0. Overall, the average score of positive degrees in adverbs was 72.57.

The percentage of students' ability to use positive degree adverbs is shown in the table below:

The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification			
Criterion	Frequency	Percentage	
Excellent	10	28.57%	
Good	12	34.29%	
Fair	7	20%	
Poor	0	0%	
Very poor	6	17.14%	
Total	35	100%	

 Table 4. 11

 The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification

From the table, we know that 28.57% or 10 students meet the excellent criteria, 34.29% or 12 students meet the good criteria, 20% or 7 students meet the fair criteria, 0% or 0 students meet the poor criteria, and 17.14% or 6 students meet the very poor criteria.

b. The form of comparative degree in adverb

The general frequency of students' ability in comparative forms of adverbs can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. 12								
General Frequency of Students' Ability in Comparative Form								
		-	-					

No.	Student	Score	Category
1.	AD	60	Fair
2.	DPN	80	Good

3.	FK	60	Fair
4.	GZS	80	Good
5.	MY	80	Good
6.	NR	100	Excellent
7.	SL	80	Good
8.	AE	80	Good
9.	AM	60	Fair
10.	AGF	100	Excellent
11.	А	80	Good
12.	CA	80	Good
13.	EA	60	Fair
14.	FR	60	Fair
15.	HR	80	Good
16.	IAM	80	Good
17.	MDS	40	Very poor
18.	MMP	60	Fair
19.	MIJ	40	Very poor
20.	NC	20	Very poor
21.	RPF	40	Very poor
22.	NF	80	Good
23.	OG	60	Fair
24.	QHG	60	Fair
25.	R	60	Fair
26.	RW	80	Good
27.	S	0	Very poor
28.	SMP	80	Good
29.	RCZ	80	Good
30.	RAA	100	Excellent
31.	SFZS	0	Very poor
32.	TAP	80	Good
33.	TMS	80	Good
34.	TFM	80	Good
35.	YW	80	Good
Total	35	66.86	Fair

The table shows that three students got 100, 17 got 80, nine got 60, three got 40, one got 20, and two got 0. Overall, the average students' positive degree score in adverb was 66.86.

According to the above data, the following table shows the percentage of students who are proficient in comparing adverbial degrees:

Table 4. 13The Percentage Result of Students' Score ClassificationCriterionFrequencyPercentageExcellent38.57%

JELT, 11(4), 629-646

Good	17	48.57%
Fair	9	25.71%
Poor	0	0%
Very poor	6	17.14%
Total	35	100%

The table above shows that 8.57% or 3 students met the excellent criteria, 48.57% or 17 students met the good criteria, 25.71% or 9 students met the fair criteria, 0% or 0 students met the poor criteria, and 17.14% or 6 students met the very poor criteria.

c. The form of superlative degree in adverb

The general frequency of students' ability in superlative form in adverbs can be seen in the following table:

No.	Student	Score	Category
1.	AD	20	Very poor
2.	DPN	0	Very poor
3.	FK	0	Very poor
4.	GZS	20	Very poor
5.	MY	20	Very poor
6.	NR	60	Fair
7.	SL	0	Very poor
8.	AE	40	Very poor
9.	AM	20	Very poor
10.	AGF	40	Very poor
11.	А	40	Very poor
12.	CA	60	Fair
13.	EA	20	Very poor
14.	FR	40	Very poor
15.	HR	40	Very poor
16.	IAM	100	Excellent
17.	MDS	60	Fair
18.	MMP	40	Very poor
19.	MIJ	0	Very poor
20.	NC	20	Very poor
21.	RPF	0	Very poor
22.	NF	40	Very poor
23.	OG	20	Very poor
24.	QHG	20	Very poor
25.	R	40	Very poor
26.	RW	100	Excellent
27.	S	40	Very poor
28.	SMP	0	Very poor

Table 4. 14General Frequency of Students' Ability in Superlative Form

29.	RCZ	100	Excellent
30.	RAA	80	Good
31.	SFZS	0	Very poor
32.	TAP	40	Very poor
33.	TMS	60	Fair
34.	TFM	80	Good
35.	YW	80	Good
Total	35	38.29	Very poor

Three students scored 100, three scored 80, four scored 60, eleven got scores 40, eight scored 20, and seven scored 0, as can be seen in the table. Overall, the average students' positive degree score in adverbs was 38.29.

The following table shows the percentage of students who were proficient in employing superlative degree adverbs:

The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification					
Criterion	Frequency	Percentage			
Excellent	3	8.57%			
Good	3	8.57%			
Fair	4	11.43%			
Poor	0	0%			
Very poor	25	71.43%			
Total	35	100%			

Table 4.15

Based on the table above, 8.57% or 3 students are at the excellent criteria, 8.57% or 3 students are at the good criteria, 11.43% or 4 students are at the fair criteria, 0% or 0 students are at poor criteria, and 71.43% or 25 students are at very poor criteria.

According to the data analysis for each category above, it can be said that students' ability in using degrees of comparison in adjective and adverb is as follow:

1. Students' ability in using degrees of comparison in adjective

	Type and Percentage of Ability in Learning Degrees of Comparison					
No.	Types	Average score	Criterion			
1.	The form of positive degree in adjective	55.43	Fair			
2.	The form of comparative degree	62.86	Fair			

Table 4. 16
Type and Percentage of Ability in Learning
Degrees of Comparison

	in adjective		
3. The form of		77.14	Good
	superlative degree		
	in adjective		
	Average	65.14	Fair

According to the above data, the students' ability to use degrees of comparison in adjectives was 65.14, which is considered fair.

2. Students' ability in using degrees of comparison in adverb

	Degrees of Comparison					
No.	Types	Average Score	Criterion			
1.	The form of positive degree in adverb	72.57	Good			
2.	The form of comparative degree in adverb	66.86	Fair			
3.	The form of superlative degree in adverb	38.29	Very poor			
	Average	59.24	Fair			

Table 4.17 Type and Percentage of Ability in Learning

From the table, it can be concluded that the students' ability to use degrees of comparison in adverb is 59.24 or belongs to fair.

C. Overall Students' Ability in Degrees of Comparison

The	The Result of Students' Ability in Using Degrees of Comparison					
No.	Students	Right Answer	Score	Quality		
1.	AD	21	70	Good		
2.	DPN	24	80	Good		
3.	FK	17	57	Fair		
4.	GZS	21	70	Good		
5.	MY	21	70	Good		
6.	NR	27	90	Excellent		
7.	SL	20	67	Fair		

Table 4.18

8. AE 19 63 Fair 9. AM 21 70 Good 10. AGF 24 80 Good 11. A 21 70 Good 12. CA 23 77 Good 13. EA 16 53 Poor 14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12					
9. AM 21 70 Good 10. AGF 24 80 Good 11. A 21 70 Good 11. A 21 70 Good 12. CA 23 77 Good 13. EA 16 53 Poor 14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG <	8.	AE	19	63	Fair
10. AGF 24 80 Good 11. A 21 70 Good 12. CA 23 77 Good 13. EA 16 53 Poor 14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW	9.	AM	21	70	Good
11. A 21 70 Good 12. CA 23 77 Good 13. EA 16 53 Poor 14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50	10.	AGF	24	80	Good
12. CA 23 77 Good 13. EA 16 53 Poor 14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 <t< td=""><td>11.</td><td>А</td><td>21</td><td>70</td><td>Good</td></t<>	11.	А	21	70	Good
13. EA 16 53 Poor 14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90	12.	CA	23	77	Good
14. FR 15 50 Poor 15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 </td <td>13.</td> <td>EA</td> <td>16</td> <td>53</td> <td>Poor</td>	13.	EA	16	53	Poor
15. HR 16 53 Poor 16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 <t< td=""><td>14.</td><td>FR</td><td>15</td><td>50</td><td>Poor</td></t<>	14.	FR	15	50	Poor
16. IAM 28 93 Excellent 17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32.	15.	HR	16	53	Poor
17. MDS 13 43 Very poor 18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83	16.	IAM	28	93	Excellent
18. MMP 12 40 Very poor 19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM	17.	MDS	13	43	Very poor
19. MIJ 15 50 Poor 20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW	18.	MMP	12	40	Very poor
20. NC 8 27 Very poor 21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	19.	MIJ	15	50	Poor
21. RPF 12 40 Very poor 22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	20.	NC	8	27	Very poor
22. NF 13 43 Very poor 23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	21.	RPF	12	40	Very poor
23. OG 16 53 Poor 24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	22.	NF	13	43	Very poor
24. QHG 16 53 Poor 25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	23.	OG	16	53	Poor
25. R 16 53 Poor 26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	24.	QHG	16	53	Poor
26. RW 25 83 Good 27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	25.	R	16	53	Poor
27. S 11 37 Very poor 28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	26.	RW	25	83	Good
28. SMP 15 50 Poor 29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	27.	S	11	37	Very poor
29. RCZ 26 87 Excellent 30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	28.	SMP	15	50	Poor
30. RAA 27 90 Excellent 31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	29.	RCZ	26	87	Excellent
31. SFZS 3 10 Very poor 32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	30.	RAA	27	90	Excellent
32. TAP 15 50 Poor 33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	31.	SFZS	3	10	Very poor
33. TMS 24 80 Good 34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	32.	ТАР	15	50	Poor
34. TFM 25 83 Good 35. YW 24 80 Good	33.	TMS	24	80	Good
35. YW 24 80 Good	34.	TFM	25	83	Good
	35.	YW	24	80	Good

As shown in table above, one student scored 93, two scored 90, one scored 87, two scored 83, four scored 80, one scored 77, five scored 70, one scored 67, one scored 63, one scored 57, five scored 53, four scored 50, two scored 43, two scored 40, one scored 37, one scored 27, and one scored 10 out of a possible 100. The diagram below illustrates these explanations:



Figure 4. 1 Graphic of Data Analysis

Table 4. 19 The Percentage Result of Students' Score Classification						
Level of Ability	Frequency (f)	Percentage (P)				
Excellent	4	11.43%				
Good	12	34.29%				
Fair	3	8.57%				
Poor	9	25.71%				
Very poor	7	20%				
Total	35	100%				

The table above shows that 11.43% or 4 students met the excellent criteria, 34.29% or 12 students met the good criteria, 8.57% or 3 students met the fair criteria, 25.71% or 9 students are the poor criteria, and 20% or 7 met the very poor criteria.

The result of students' score classification can be seen in the following graphic:



Figure 4. 2 Graphic of Data Analysis

Based on the findings, it can be said that the English Language Education Program at Universitas Negeri Padang students have strong competence in comparing adjective and adverb degrees or belongs to good.

D. Causes of students' ability to use degrees of comparison

After analyzing the data, the researcher interviewed five students who received high and low scores to determine why they had good or bad mastering degrees of comparison. The interviewee was asked the following questions, which are listed below:

- 1. What do you think about degrees of comparison?
- 2. In what aspects do you have difficulty understanding degrees of comparison?
- 3. What causes of difficulty in understanding and mastering degrees of comparison?
- 4. What makes it easy for you to understand and master the degrees of comparison?

Answers:

Student 1

1. I think it is not too difficult because I already know when to use "more/most" or "er/-est.

2. Condition where I have to use "more ... / most ..." or "-er / -est". Sometimes, I use my feeling to think logically and make the correct answer. (This method sometimes not works properly, incorrect answer may occur)

3. Read the sentence over and over. Example: Put your answer in the blank, and read. First, you use "more ... / most Then, If they are not appropriate to used. Change it to "-er / -est" and vice versa.

Student 2

1. I think degree of comparison is not too difficult if we understand the concept. Because I find it difficult to analyze the sentences that use it. It's hard for me.

2. The difficulty in the used of superlative and comparative in sentence. I have problem on how to analyze the difference to used it in sentence.

3. I'm not careful and don't study enough to understand it better. Besides that, I also forgot the concept because the learning was online. The notes are also not too many so it is difficult to distinguish the superlative and the comparative.

Student 3

1. *I think the degree of comparison is not that difficult. Because we can use keywords like more, less, the most, and others.*

2. That is the language aspect itself. Because English is a foreign language so it is difficult to really get into the brain so that it is difficult for us to understand it.

3. I think the reason is because of the lack of vocabulary mastery in the form of adjectives and adverbs

Student 4

1. It's difficult for me.

2. I guess I don't have difficulty in understanding degree of comparison, but I think there is a lack of clarity in the instructions of question form so that I don't understand how I should answer the question.

3. I think the thing that makes it easy to understand the degree of comparison is when we know how many syllables are there in the adv or adj so thatwe know how to compose sentences using -er/more or -est/most in comparisons of adjective or adverb.

Student 5

1. Easy for me but sometimes I forget the structure of the degree of comparison and hesitate to distinguish superlative and comparative sentences.

2. I hesitate sometimes to distinguish between superlative and comparative sentence.
3. The difficulty is that I sometimes forget the structure of degree of comparison and hesitate to distinguish between superlative and comparative sentences. Example: I hesitate when I should use "more/most" or "er/est" in the sentence.

Discussion

Based on the findings of this study, the fifth semester students of the English Language Education Program of UNP discussed the degrees of comparison in adjectives and adverbs. In this study, three categories of each degree of comparison between adjectives and adverbs were tested. Meanwhile, previous studies have only focused on the degrees of comparison in adjectives with three categories.

The results of this study revealed that the score of students' ability to use positive degrees in adjective was 55.43 or belongs to fair, the score of students' ability to use a comparative degree in adjectives was 62.86, belonging to fair, and 77.14, or good for superlative degree in adjectives. This indicates that the average of students' scores in degrees of comparison in adjective was 65.14 or belongs to fair.

This finding differs from that of a previous study. For instance, According to Shusantie (2011), 16,66% of students had mastered the comparative form, 33,77% had mastered the superlative form, and 42,105% had mastered the use of both comparative and superlative degrees. This implies that fewer than 50% of the students have mastered the use of degrees of comparison.

The second research question focused on the students' ability to use degrees of comparison in adverbs. The results showed that the score of students' ability to use a positive degree in adverbs was 72.57, the score of students' ability to use a comparative degree in adverbs was 66.86, belonging to fair, and 38.29, or very poor for a superlative degree in adverbs. This indicates that the average of students' scores in degrees of comparison in adjective was 59.24 or belongs to fair.

In this second research question, the researcher had difficulty finding similar studies on the degrees of comparison in adverbs. Therefore, the researcher did not compare how the degrees of comparison in adverbs are similar to those in previous studies.

In general, 11.43%, or four students, had an excellent level. As Student 4 said, "*Degrees of comparison are not that hard for me*." A total of 34.29% (12 students) had good levels. As Student 2 said, I think the degree of comparison is not too difficult". 8.57% or 3 students had a fair level, 25.71% or 9 students had a poor level, and 20% or seven students had very poor levels. This means that the students' ability to master the degree of comparison in adjectives and adverbs is good.

The third research question focused on the causes of students' abilities to use degrees of comparison. According to the results of the interview, degrees of comparison are not too difficult, but sometimes they forget the structure of degrees of comparison. As student 5 said, "I forgot the structure of degree of comparison and hesitated to distinguish between superlative and comparative". Some of them thought that degrees of comparison are easy because they read the sentence over and over and they were familiar with sentences that use "-er/-est". As student 1 illustrate "I think it is not too difficult because I already know when to use "more/most" or "er/-est". Also, they knew how many syllables were there in the adjective or adverb, so that they knew how to compose sentences using "-er/more" or "-est/most" in degrees of comparison in adjective and adverb. In addition, there are some reasons why students have low mastery in degrees of comparison are that they frequently confuse which words to add the prefix more or most, as well as the suffix -er or -est. Moreover, this condition was further supported by a study by Shusantie (2011), who found that students frequently get confused about which word needs to be added with the prefix more or most, as well as the suffix -er or -st/-est, which is the most common cause of low mastery in degrees of comparison.

CONCLUSION

According to the results and findings, it can be concluded that the scores of students in items with positive degrees of adjectives were 55.43, 62.86, and 77.14, respectively. This indicates that students' ability of degrees of comparison in adjective is 65.14 or belongs to fair. In terms of adverbs, the scores of students for items with a positive degree of adverb were 72.57, 66.86 for comparative degree, and 38.29, respectively. This means that students' mastery of degrees of comparison in adverb is 59.24 or belongs to enough.

Moreover, based on the interview and the answers of students in the Google form, there are some reasons why English language education program students in the fifth semester had difficulty in mastering degrees of comparison: they misplaced *the* article in the superlative form, forgot to add *than* after the adjective in the comparative form, did not know how to change words that ended in *-y* to *-i* and add *-er/-est*, and did not understand the use of irregular forms. They were also unsure of how to use the prefix *more* for comparative and *most* for superlative, or the suffix *-er* for comparative and *-st/-est* for superlative.

REFERENCES

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. In *Educational Research* (Vol. 4).

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1d5ZzlgJuCrwAyLpdBeK5dhKMZTpE2HNb/v iew

Al-Mekhlafi, A. M., & Nagaratnam, R. P. (2011). Difficulties in teaching and learning grammar in an EFL context. *International Journal of Instruction*, 4(2), 14–17.

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?a ccno=ED522689

- Bungsu, O. P., Daud, A., & Masyhur, M. (2021). An Analysis on Students' Grammatical Errors in Writing Degrees of Comparison. *Indonesian Journal of Economics, Social, and Humanities, 3*(1), 55–63. https://doi.org/10.31258/ijesh.3.1.55-63
- Garson, G. D. (2013). VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY 2013 Edition. In *Statistical Publishing Associates*. www.statisticalassociates.com
- Goldberg, A. E. (2016). Quantitative Research. *The SAGE Encyclopedia of LGBTQ Studies*, 2015, 44–48. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483371283.n319
- Harmer, J. (2004). *Jeremy_Harmer_How_to_Teach_Writing_Longm.pdf* (pp. 1–153). www.longman.com
- kumar Debata, P. (2013). The Importance of Grammar in Second Language Teaching A Reassessment. *Language in IIndia*, 13(June), 482–486.
- Kurniawan, I., & Oktalia, M. (2017). An analysis of students' mastery in using degrees of comparison at the 1st semester of the 10th grade of SMK PGRI 4 Bandar Lampung in the academic year of 2016/2017. English Education: Jurnal Tadris Bahasa Inggris IAIN Raden Intan, 10(1), 88–103.
- Mahdin, M., Jabu, B., & Basri, M. (2019). English Grammar Learning Strategies applied by a successful student at Midwifery Academy of Bataritoja. *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 6(11), 951–952., 5–24.
- Messner, P. E., & Liu, N. (1995). The Test of English as a Foreign Language. In International Journal of Educational Management (Vol. 9, Issue 2). https://doi.org/10.1108/09513549510082378
- Pachler, N., Barnes, A., & Field, K. (2020). Teaching and learning grammar. In Learning to Teach Modern Languages in the Secondary School (pp. 171–194). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315800066-15
- Parrott, M. (2004). Grammar fo English Language Teachers pdf.pdf.
- Sadiku, L. M. (2015). The Importance of Four Skills Reading, Speaking, Writing, Listening in a Lesson Hour. European Journal of Language and Literature, 1(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.26417/ejls.v1i1.p29-31
- Shusantie, M. A. (2011). AN ANALYSIS ON THE STUDENTS ' MASTERY OF DEGREES OF COMPARISON (A Case Study at Second Grade Students (VIII.10) of SMPN 3 Tangerang Selatan).
- Sugiyono, D. (2013). Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Tindakan.
- Swan, M. (1995). Practical English Usage Fully Revised International Edition complete topic-by-topic grammar guide to over 250 vocabulary problems.