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#### Abstract

This research is a quantitative descriptive study that aims to obtain data about the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences for students of class observed. The population in this study was class XI of the school which consisted of 3 classes totaling 52 students. The sampling technique was carried out using a random sample, so the sample in this study was students of the study, a total of 16 students. The research data were obtained from synonym and antonym tests. The data were analyzed using the percentage technique with a result of $60.63 \%$ for the synonym test and the antonym test with a result of $65.63 \%$. The results showed that the level of ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences students had not yet reached the KKM because the synonym and antonym test obtained a score of $63.13 \%$ which was included in the quite enough. The factors that caused the level of students' ability to not reach the KKM were the lack of interest in students learning Chinese and students finding it difficult to learn Chinese.
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## I．INTRODUCTION

Language is an arbitrary sound－symbol system and is used by members of a society to work together，interact and identify themselves．Chinese is one of the most widely used foreign languages．The development of Chinese in Indonesian can also be seen from the many schools that include Chinese in the school curriculum．The use of Chinese words and grammar is an obstacle to learning Chinese，this is because in communicating people often express the same statement，which is often called synonym（同义词／tóngyìcí）and the opposite word meaning the antonym（反义词／fǎnyìcí）．

Maryani（2014）states that a sentence is the smallest unit of language that can express a complete thought or utter information which complete．Achmad and Alex（2016）states that the types of sentences are divided into several parts，namely 1）Statement Sentences（Declarative Sentences）are used by speakers to convey complete information to their interlocutors．In speaking，declarative sentences have a decreasing intonation，in written form，declarative sentences use a full stop （．）．2）Interrogative Sentence aims to ask or ask．Question sentences are used if the speaker wants to get the expected information or reaction（actions，answers）．In speaking，interrogative sentences are marked by increasing intonation and then decreasing at the end of the sentence．In writing，questions are marked with a question mark（？）．Interrogative sentences often begin with the question words what，when，what，when，who，which，how，where，why，and how much．3） Command and Request Sentences（Imperative Sentences）are used to order or forbid someone to do something．The intonation of imperative sentences and requests decreases and in writing，imperative sentences and requests use punctuation in the form of a period（．）or an exclamation point（！）．4）Exclamatory Sentences（Exclamative Sentences）are similar to commands and requests in terms of intonation and punctuation，but exclamatory sentences are used to express strong or sudden feelings．Exclamatory sentences have intonation that increases and then decreases and in writing，exclamatory sentences are marked with an exclamation point（！）and a full stop（．）which are similar to commands and requests．

黄伯荣（2008）states that the types of sentences are divided into several parts， namely 1）A declarative sentence is a sentence with a declarative tone that narrates or explains facts．It is called a declarative sentence．Sometimes it can have modal particles such as＂了，的，呢，罢了，嘛，啊＂等．A declarative sentence is the most general form of expression of thinking，and it is also the most widely used sentence．2）Interrogative sentences are interrogative sentences，and sentences that express questions are called interrogative sentences．Means of questioning，there are intonation，interrogative words．Interrogative sentences can be divided into four categories according to the means of questioning and the semantic situation： yes and no questions，specific questions，choice questions，positive and negative questions．3）An imperative sentence is a sentence that asks the other party to do or not to do something．It can be divided into two categories：one is command and
prohibition，and the other is request and dissuasion．This kind of sentence often does not use a subject，has a simple structure，has a sharp drop in tone and is very short，and does not use much modal particles．4）An exclamatory sentence is a sentence with a strong emotion called an exclamatory sentence．It expresses strong emotions such as joy，surprise，sorrow，anger，disgust，fear，etc．Exclamatory sentences generally use falling intonation．

Waridah（2017）suggests that synonym comes from the root word＂syn＂ which means with and＂onoma＂which means name．Thus，synonyms are words that have the same or nearly the same meaning．＂意义相同或相近的词组成的语义场叫做同义义场，同义义场中的各个词叫做同义词＂this means that the semantic field composed of words with the same or similar meaning is called a synonymous field，and each word in the synonymous field is called a synonym（黄伯荣，2008， p．242）．Sulastri（2020）states that antonyms are a semantic relationship between two utterances whose meanings express opposite or contradictory meanings．黄伯荣（2008）says＂两个意义相反或相对的词可以构成反义义场，这两个词互为反义词 ＂（p．24）．This means that two words with opposite or conflicting meanings can form an antonym，the two words are antonym．

According to Chaplin（1997），ability（ability，skill，dexterity，talent，ability）is the power to do something．Bloom（in Purwanto，2014）states that learning outcomes are divided into three aspects，namely a）Cognitive aspects related to knowledge，types of learning which include cognitive abilities，among others，rote knowledge，understanding，application，analysis，synthesis，and evaluation．b）The affective aspect is related to attitudes，and learning outcomes related to awareness， feelings，and judgments about something．c）The psychomotor aspect relates to skills and abilities in acting．The learning outcomes relate to the skills and abilities to act after a person receives a certain learning experience．Maryani（2014）states that a sentence is the smallest unit of language that can express a complete thought or utter information which complete．

The factors that influence language mastery according to Saadah（2016）stem from three things，namely：a）The influence of the first language，the process of learning a second／foreign language is inseparable from the influence of the first language which students master first because of the many language differences． between the two so it is very difficult for the process of mastering the target language or a second language．b）Internal factors of the target language，there are many errors that occur in the process of mastering a second language originate from the difficulty of the target language system itself．c）Teaching system，student errors are caused by teachers who have not mastered the material，lack of media， and the material provided is inaccurate．

The study of Chinese language in Indonesian context is rarely found． Junaeny and Azizah（2022）studied error in the use of You and Zai by the Indonesian students．On the other hand，the studies in error analysis in English are easily found（Sa＇adah，2012；Bukit，2020；Duygun \＆Karabacak，2022；

Karimi Alavijeh，2020；Sembiring et al，2021）．The researchers got three studies in Chinese language（Zhang et al，2022a；Zhang et al，2022b；Likhanov et $\mathrm{al}, 2023)$ ．Based on the explanation above，the main problems of the research are 1）

How is the use of synonym and antonym in Chinese sentences for class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students? 2) What are the factors that influence the mastery of synonyms and antonyms? The objectives to be achieved in this study are 1) To obtain data about the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences. 2) To find out the factors that influence the mastery of synonym and antonym.

## II. METHOD

This type of research is quantitative descriptive research. Quantitative research is a type of research that produces new findings that can be obtained using statistical procedures proposed by Jaya (2020). This type of quantitative descriptive research is research by describing objects based on existing facts and statistical procedures obtained as proposed by Siregar (2017). This research was conducted in the even semester of the 2022/2023 academic year with a period of approximately 2 months in learning Mandarin which was carried out at the MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto school. The research design uses a quantitative descriptive research method with a quantitative approach to explain a situation that will be studied so that it further strengthens the researcher's analysis in making a conclusion that aims to obtain data in the form of numbers and information about the ability to use synonyms in Chinese sentences for class XI MAS students. An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto. The population in this study were students of class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini with a total of 3 classes with a total of 52 students.

The sample in this study was students of class XI MIA 1 with a total of 16 students. The sampling technique is using a random sample technique. The research instrument was used to collect data obtained by using test questions. There are two tests used in this study, namely synonym and antonym tests. The data collection technique used in this study used a test instrument, then to obtain data on factors that influence language mastery carried out by student researchers using questionnaire instrument, the type of questionnaire was a closed questionnaire. Data analysis techniques in quantitative research in the form of data obtained are then analyzed using quantitative descriptive techniques in the form of test questions that will be given to students.

Data processing uses quantitative descriptive techniques as follows: to obtain data on factors that influence language mastery carried out by students the researcher used a questionnaire instrument, and the type of questionnaire used by the researcher was a closed questionnaire. Data analysis techniques in quantitative research in the form of data obtained are then analyzed using quantitative descriptive techniques in the form of test questions that will be given to students. Data processing uses quantitative descriptive techniques as follows: then to obtain data on factors that influence language mastery carried out by students the researcher used a questionnaire instrument, and the type of questionnaire used by the researcher was a closed questionnaire. Data analysis techniques in quantitative research in the form of data obtained are then analyzed using quantitative descriptive techniques in the form of test questions that will be given to students. Data processing uses quantitative descriptive techniques as follows.

$$
\text { final score }=\frac{\text { gain score }}{\underset{\text { maximum score }}{\text { (Purwanto, 2012) } . ~}} x 100
$$

After obtaining the raw score, then find out the average value (mean) that has been done by all students using the following formula:

$$
\bar{X}=\frac{\sum X i}{n}
$$

Information:
$\sum X i=$ value of each data
$\bar{X} \quad=$ mean
$n \quad=$ amount of data (Siregar, 2015)
After obtaining the average value, it is then analyzed in percentage form using the following formula: $P=\frac{X}{N} x 100$
Information:
$\mathrm{P}=$ Percentage
X = Average score
$\mathrm{N}=$ Sum of total scores (Sudjana, 2005)
After obtaining the average value, then converting the value to determine and find out the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences.

Table 1 Success Reference

| Mastery Level Intervals | Criteria |
| :--- | :--- |
| $86-100$ | Excellent |
| $75-85$ | Good |
| $56-74$ | Enough |
| $10-55$ | Less |
| $>10$ | Bad |
| Nurgiyantoro, 2010) |  |

Furthermore, to obtain the factors that influence the mastery of the use of synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences carried out by students, the researchers used the results of a questionnaire and then concluded.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the results section of this study, students' abilities in using synonyms and antonyms will be described based on the results of distributing test instruments and questionnaires to 16 students of class XI MIA 1. This research was conducted in 2 meetings. In the first meeting the researchers gave synonym and antonym test questions, then in the second meeting the researchers gave a questionnaire to class XI MIA 1 MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students.

### 3.1 Synonym and Antonym Test Results

## a. Synonym

The instrument used in collecting synonym ability data is a test that is divided into two types of tests, namely the match test in which students match the left-hand sentence with words on the right that are almost similar (synonyms) and the second type of test, namely multiple choice in which students choose one answer that almost resembles (synonym) by giving a cross, described in the following table.

Table 1 Data on the Ability to Use Synonyms in Chinese Sentences for Class XI Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jenepont

| An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jenepont |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Test Type | Score |
| 1. | Matchmaking Test | 500 |
| 2. | Multiple Choice Test | 470 |
|  | Total | 970 |
|  | Souce ${ }^{\text {Students' }}$ Synonym Test Results |  |

Source: Students' Synonym Test Results
In table 1 of the 16 students, it can be seen that the score obtained on the matchmaking test was 52 questions answered correctly and the score obtained on the multiple choice test was 46 questions and they are answered correctly. Based on table 1 above, the next step is to analyze the data as follows.
3.2 The average score for the matchmaking test
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum X i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{500}{16}$
$\bar{X}=31,25$ out of a maximum score of 50
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows:
$P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{31,25}{50} X 100 \%$
$P=62,5 \%$
Based on the results of the analysis of the tests achieved by the students above, it shows that the level of ability to use synonyms in Chinese sentences for the matchmaking test is $62,5 \%$ and falls into the sufficient category of enough.

1. The average score for the multiple-choice test
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum X i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{470}{16}$
$\bar{X}=29,38$ out of a maximum score of 50
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows:
$P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{29,38}{50} X 100 \%$
$P=58,76 \%$
Based on the results of the test analysis achieved by the students above, it shows that the level of ability to use synonyms in Chinese sentences for the multiple choice test is $58,76 \%$ and fall into the category of enough.
Data from the ability to use synonyms in Mandarin sentences for class XI MIA 1 students has a maximum score of 100 , the range of scores obtained is $100-40$ so the minimum score is 40 and the maximum score is $100, \mathrm{n}$ as many as 16 . Below will be
described how to determine the data regarding the range $(\mathrm{R})$, the number of classes $(\mathrm{K})$, and the interval $(\mathrm{P})$, with the following formula.
a. Range (R)
$R=$ Maximum score - Minimum score
$=100-40$
$=60$

## b. Classes (K)

## $\mathrm{K}=1+3.3 \log n$

$=1+3.3 \log 16$
$=1+(3.3) 1.204$
$=4.97$
classes ( K ) is 4.96 rounded up to 5
c. Intervals (P)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P} & =\frac{R}{K} \\
& =\frac{60}{5} \\
& =12
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on this description, it can be seen that the range $(\mathrm{R})$ is 60 , the number of classes $(\mathrm{K})$ is 5 and the interval ( P ) is 12.
Based on the average results obtained by students on both types of tests, it is known that the average scores achieved by students of class XI MIA 1 MAS AnNuriyah Bontocini on the overall ability test to use synonyms in Chinese sentences are:
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum x i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{970}{16}$
$\bar{X}=60,63$ of a maximum score of 100
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows:
$P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{60,63}{10} X 100 \%$
$P=60.63 \%$
The results of the analysis above shows that the level of ability to use synonyms in Mandarin sentences for students of class XI MIA 1 MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini is $(60.63 \%)$ included in the category enough.

Table 2 Frequency Distribution of Data on the Ability to Use Synonyms in Mandarin Sentences for Class XI Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

| No. | Interval Class | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | $40-51$ | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| 2. | $52-63$ | 5 | $31.3 \%$ |
| 3. | $64-75$ | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| 4. | $76-87$ | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 5. | $88-100$ | 1 | $6,3 \%$ |
| Amount |  | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Based on table 2, it can be seen that the distribution of frequency and percentage of students' data on the ability of students to answer synonym tests is as follows: from 16 students it can be seen from the acquisition of scores with a
range between 40-51 consisting of 7 students ( $43.8 \%$ ), the range between 52-63 consisted of 5 students ( $31.3 \%$ ), the range between 64-75 consisted of 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ), the range between $76-87$ consisted of 2 students ( $12.5 \%$ ) and the range between $88-100$ consisted of 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ).
From table 2, it can be concluded that the student who obtained the highest score was in the class interval $88-100$ consisting of 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) and the student who obtained the lowest score was in the class interval 40-51 consisting of 7 students $(56.3 \%)$ ). For more details, see the histogram below.


Figure 1 Histogram of Ability to Use Synonyms in Mandarin Sentences of Class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto Students

It can be narrated that the level of ability to use synonyms in Mandarin sentences for class XI students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto is in the quite capable category $(60.63 \%)$. To find out the percentage level, a rating scale is used with a score range of 10-100. These values can be seen in table 3 below.

Table 3 Categories of Usability Sinonim in Mandarin Sentences for Class XI Students of MAS An-
Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

| No. | Category | Score Range | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Excellent | 86-100 | 1 | 6,3\% |
| 2. | Good | 75-85 | 2 | 12.5\% |
| 3. | Enough | 56-74 | 6 | 37.5\% |
| 4. | Less | 10-55 | 7 | 43,8\% |
| 5. | Bad | >10 | 0 | 0\% |
| Amount |  |  | 16 | 100 |

Based on table 3, it can be seen that the categories of students' abilities in the use of synonyms are as follows: of the 16 students it can be seen from the student scores in the very capable category there is 1 student in the score range 86100 with a percentage ( $6.3 \%$ ), in the capable category there are 2 students in the score range $75-85$ with a percentage ( $12.5 \%$ ), in the fairly capable category there are 6 students in the range $56-74$ with a percentage ( $37.5 \%$ ), in the underprivileged
category there are 7 students in the score range $10-55$ with a percentage ( $43.8 \%$ ), in the very poor category there were no students in the range $>10$ scores with a percentage ( $0 \%$ ).

From table 3. it can be concluded that students who get high scores with a score range of $86-100$ with a percentage (of $6.3 \%$ ) and those who get the lowest score are 7 students with a score range of $10-55$ with a percentage ( $43.8 \%$ ).

## b. Antonym

The instrument used in collecting data on antonym abilities is a test that is divided into two types of tests, namely the match test in which students match the lefthand sentence with the opposite right word (antonym) and the second type of test, namely multiple choice in which
students choose one of the opposite answers (antonyms) by giving a cross, described in the following table.

Table 4 Data on the Ability to Use Antonyms in Chinese Sentences for Class XI Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

| An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | Test Type | Score |  |
| 1. | Matchmaking Test | 640 |  |
| 2. | Multiple Choice Test | 410 |  |
|  | Total | 1050 |  |

In table 4, of the 16 students, it can be seen that the score obtained on the matchmaking test was 64 questions answered correctly and the score obtained on the multiple choice test was 43 questions answered correctly.
Based on table 4 above, the next step is to analyze the data as follows.

1. The average score for the matchmaking test
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum x i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{640}{16}$
$\bar{X}=40.00$ of a maximum score of 50
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows:
$P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{40,00}{50} X 100 \%$
$P=80 \%$
Based on the results of the test analysis achieved by the students above, it shows that the level of ability to use antonyms in Chinese sentences for the matchmaking test is $80 \%$ and is included in the good category.
2. The average score for the multiple choice test
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum x i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{410}{16}$
$\bar{X}=25,63$ from a maximum score of 50
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows:
$P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{25,63}{50} X 100 \%$
$P=51.26 \%$

Based on the results of the test analysis achieved by the students above, it shows that the level of ability to use antonyms in Chinese sentences for the multiple choice test is $51.26 \%$ and fall into the sufficient enaugh category.
Data from the ability to use antonyms in Mandarin sentences for class XI MIA 1 students has a maximum score of 10 , the range of scores obtained is $100-50$, so the minimum score is 50 and the maximum score is $100, \mathrm{n}$ is 16 . Below will describe how to determine the data regarding the range ( R ), the number of classes $(\mathrm{K})$ and the interval $(\mathrm{P})$, with the following formula.

## a. Range ( R )

$\mathrm{R}=$ Maximum score - Minimum score
$=100-50$
$=50$
b. Classes (K)
$\mathrm{K}=1+3.3 \log \mathrm{n}$
$=1+3.3+\log 16$
$=1+(3.3) 1.204$
$=4.97$
Many classes (K) 4.96 when rounded up to 5
c. Intervals (P)
$\mathrm{P}=\frac{R}{K}$
$=\frac{50}{5}$
$=10$
Based on this description it can be seen that the range $(\mathrm{R})$ is 50 , the number of classes $(\mathrm{K})$ is 5 and the interval $(\mathrm{P})$ is 10.
Based on the average results obtained by students on both types of tests, it is known that the average scores achieved by students of class XI MIA 1 MAS AnNuriyah Bontocini in the overall ability test to use antonyms in Chinese sentences are:
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum X i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{1.050}{16}$
$\bar{X}=65,63$
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows. $P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{65,63}{100} X 100 \%$
$P=65,63 \%$
Based on the results of the test analysis achieved by students, it shows that the level of ability to use antonyms in Chinese sentences is $65,63 \%$ included in the sufficiently enaugh category.
The results of the analysis above shows that the level of ability to use antonyms in Mandarin sentences of class XI MIA 1 MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini is (65,63\%) included in the quite capable category.

Table 5 Distribution of Frequency Data on the Ability to Use Antonyms in Mandarin Sentences for Class XI Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

| No. | Interval Class | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| 1. | $50-59$ | 3 | $18.8 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2. | $60-69$ | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| 3. | $70-79$ | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 4. | $80-89$ | 3 | $18.8 \%$ |
| 5. | $90-100$ | 1 | $6,3 \%$ |
|  | Amount | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

Based on table 5 it can be seen that the frequency distribution and percentage of students' data on students' ability to answer the antonym test are as follows: from 16 students it can be seen from the acquisition of scores with a range between $50-59$ consist of three (3) student ( $18,8 \%$ ), the range between $60-69$ consist of 7 students ( $43,8 \%$ ), range between $70-79$ consist of 2 students ( $12.5 \%$ ), range between $80-89$ consist of 3 students ( $18,8 \%$ ) and the range between $90-100$ consists of 1 student (6.3\%).

From table 5 it can be stated that students who get the highest scores are in the interval class range $90-100$ consisting of 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) and those who get the lowest score are in the interval class 50-59 consist of 3 students ( $18,8 \%$ ). For more details, see the histogram below.


Source: Table 5
Figure 2 Histogram of Ability to Use Antonyms in Chinese Sentences for Class XI Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

It can be concluded that the level of ability to use antonyms in Mandarin sentences of class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto is included in the quite capable category $(65,63 \%)$. To find out the percentage level, a rating scale is used with a score range of 10-100. These values can be seen in table 6 below.

Table 6 Categories of Ability to Use Antonyms in Mandarin Sentences for Class XI MAS
Students An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jenepont

| No. | Category | Score Range | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Excellent | $86-100$ | 1 | $6,3 \%$ |
| 2. | Good | $75-85$ | 3 | $18,8 \%$ |


| 3. | Enough | $56-74$ | 9 | $56,3 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4. | Less | $10-55$ | 3 | $18,8 \%$ |
| 5. | Bad | $>10$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  | Amount |

Based on table 6, it can be seen that the ability categories of students in the use of antonyms are as follows: of the 16 students it can be seen from the student scores in the very capable category there is 1 student in the score range $86-100$ with a percentage ( $6.3 \%$ ), in the capable category there are 3 students in the $75-85$ score range with a percentage ( $18.8 \%$ ), in the fairly capable category there were 9 students in the range $56-74$ with a percentage ( $56.3 \%$ ), in the underprivileged category there are 3 students in the score range $10-55$ with a percentage ( $18.8 \%$ ), in the very poor category there were no students in the range $>10$ scores with a percentage (0\%).

From table 6 it can be concluded that students who get high scores with a score range of $86-100$ with a percentage ( $6.3 \%$ ) and those who get the lowest score are 3 students with a score range of $10-55$ with a percentage ( $18.8 \%$ )

## c. Synonym and Antonym

Data from the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences for class XI students have a maximum score of 200 , the range of scores obtained $200-100$, so the minimum score is 100 and the maximum score is $200, \mathrm{n}$ as many as 16 . Below will be described how to determine the data regarding the range ( R ), the number of classes $(\mathrm{K})$ and the interval $(\mathrm{P})$, with the following formula:

## a. Range (R)

$\mathrm{R}=$ Maximum score - Minimum score
=100-50
$=50$

## b. Classes (K)

$\mathrm{K}=1+3.3 \log \mathrm{n}$
$=1+3.3+\log 16$
$=1+(3.3) 1.204$
$=4.97$
Many classes (K) 4.96 when rounded up to 5
c. Intervals (P)
$\mathrm{P}=\frac{R}{K}$
$=\frac{50}{5}$
$=10$
Based on this description, it can be seen that the range $(\mathrm{R})$ is 100 , the number of classes $(\mathrm{K})$ is 5 and the interval $(\mathrm{P})$ is 10 .
Based on the results obtained by students in both types of tests, it is known that the average scores achieved by class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini students in the overall ability test to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences are presented as follows.
$\bar{X}=\frac{\sum x i}{n}$
$\bar{X}=\frac{1.010}{16}$
$\bar{X}=63,13$
After obtaining the average score, then the percentage technique is used as follows:
$P=\frac{X}{N} X 100 \%$
$P=\frac{63,13}{100} X 100 \%$
$P=63.13 \%$
Based on the results of the test analysis achieved by students, it shows that the level of ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences is 63,13\% is included in the sufficient category enaugh.
The results of the analysis above show that the level of ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences for class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini students is $(63,13 \%)$ included in the quite capable category.

Table 7 Frequency Distribution of Usability DataSinonim and Antonyms in Mandarin Sentences for
Class XI Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

| No. | Interval Class | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | $50-59$ | 9 | $56,3 \%$ |
| 2. | $60-69$ | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 3. | $70-79$ | 2 | $12,5 \%$ |
| 4. | $80-89$ | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 5. | $90-100$ | 1 | $6,3 \%$ |
| Amount | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |  |

Based on table 7 it can be seen that the distribution of frequency and percentage of students data on students' ability to answer synonym and antonym tests is as follows: from 16 students it can be seen from the acquisition of scores with a range between $50-59$ consisting of 9 students ( $56.3 \%$ ) the range between 60 69 consisted of 2 students ( $12.5 \%$ ), range between $70-79$ consist of 2 student $(12.5 \%$ ), range between $80-89$ consists of 2 students ( $12.5 \%$ ) and the range is between 90 100 consisted of 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ).

From table 5, it can be narrated that students who get the highest scores are in the class interval 90-100 consisted of 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) and those who obtained the lowest score were in the 50-59 interval class consisting of 9 students ( $56.3 \%$ ). For more details, see the histogram below.


Figure 3 Histogram of Ability to Use Synonyms and Antonyms in Chinese Sentences for Class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto Students

It can be concluded that the level of ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Mandarin sentences of class XI MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto is included in the quite capable category 63,13 . To determine the percentage level, a rating scale is used with a score range of 10-100. These values can be seen in table 8 below.

Table 8 Categories of Ability to UseSinonim and Antonyms in Mandarin Sentences for Class XI
Students of MAS An-Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto

| No. | Category | Score Range | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Excellent | $86-100$ | 1 | $6,3 \%$ |
| 2. | Good | $75-85$ | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| 3. | Enough | $56-74$ | 12 | $75 \%$ |
| 4. | Less | $10-55$ | 1 | $6,3 \%$ |
| 5. | Bad | $>10$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Amount |  |  |  |  |
| (Source: Nurgiyantoro, 2010) |  |  |  |  |

Based on table 8, it can be seen that the frequency and percentage of students' ability data on the use of synonyms and antonyms are as follows: of the 16 students it can be seen from the student scores in the very capable category there is 1 student in the score range $86-100$ with a percentage ( $0 \%$ ), in the category capable there are 2 students in the score range $75-85$ with a percentage $(12.5 \%)$, in the moderately capable category there are 12 students in the range $56-74$ with a percentage ( $75 \%$ ), in the less able category there is 1 student in the score range 1055 with a percentage ( $6.3 \%$ ), in the very poor category there are no students in the range $>10$ scores with a percentage ( $0 \%$ ).
From table 4.8 it can be concluded that students who get high scores with a score range of $86-100$ with a percentage ( $6.3 \%$ ) and those who get the lowest score are 1 student with a score range of $10-55$ with a percentage (6.3\%).

## 2. Questionnaire Analysis Results

In this study, apart from using tests, they also used a questionnaire. The results of the questionnaire data analysis provided information about the factors that influence the students' mastery of using synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences.

As it has already been explained that the questionnaire given consists of 20 closed questionnaire numbers. For more details, an analysis of each number is presented in the following table.

| Table 9 Student Responses About Learning Mandarin |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| Very important | 6 | $6.3 \%$ |
| important | 9 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Not too important | 1 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Not important | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Source: Questionnaire number 1
Table 9 provides information that out of 16 samples 6 students ( $6.3 \%$ ) stated that it was very important to learn Mandarin, 9 students ( $56.3 \%$ ) stated that it was important to learn Mandarin, 1 student ( $37.5 \%$ ) stated that it was not important to learn Chinese Mandarin, and 0 students said it was not important to learn Mandarin. It can be concluded that in general students ( $56.3 \%$ ) stated that Mandarin was important to learn.

| Table 10 Student Responses About Interest in Learning Mandarin |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| Very interested | 4 | $25 \%$ |
| Interested | 9 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Less interested | 3 | $18.8 \%$ |
| Not interested | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Source: Questionnaire number 2
Table 10 provides information that out of 16 samples 4 students ( $25 \%$ ) stated that they were very interested in learning Mandarin, 9 students ( $56.3 \%$ ) stated that they were interested in learning Mandarin, 3 students ( $18.8 \%$ ) stated that they were not interested in learning Mandarin, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they were not interested in learning Mandarin. So it can be concluded that in general students ( $56.3 \%$ ) are interested in learning Mandarin.

Table 11 Students' Responses About Learning Mandarin

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very difficult | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |  |
| Difficult | 5 | $31.3 \%$ |  |
| Quite difficult | 10 | $62.5 \%$ |  |
| Not hard | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 11 provides the information that out of 16 samples 1 student (6.3\%) stated that it was very difficult to learn Chinese, 5 students ( $31.3 \%$ ) stated that it was difficult to learn Chinese, 10 students ( $62.5 \%$ ) stated that it was quite difficult to learn Chinese Mandarin, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said it was not difficult to learn Mandarin. So it can be concluded that in general students find it quite difficult to learn Mandarin.

Table 12 Students' Responses About Time to Study Mandarin Independently

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Sometimes | 6 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Once | 8 | $50 \%$ |
| Never | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
|  | Source: Questionnaire number 4 |  |

Table 12 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they always spend time studying Mandarin independently, 6 students ( $37.5 \%$ ) stated that they sometimes spend time studying Mandarin independently, 8 students $(50 \%)$ stated that they had taken the time to study Mandarin independently, and 2 students ( $12.5 \%$ ) stated that they had never taken the time to study Mandarin independently. So it can be concluded that in general students ( $50 \%$ ) have taken the time to study Mandarin independently.

| Table 13 Student |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |  |
| Very know | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Know | 10 | $62.5 \%$ |  |
| Do not know | 5 | $31.3 \%$ |  |
| Don't know | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |  |
| Friday | 16 | $100 \%$ |  |
| Source: Questionnaire number 5 |  |  |  |

Table 13 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they really knew grammar in Chinese sentences, 10 students ( $62.5 \%$ ) said they knew grammar in Chinese sentences, 5 students ( $31.3 \%$ ) said did not know grammar in Chinese sentences, and 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) said they did not know grammar in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general students ( $62.5 \%$ ) know grammar in Chinese sentences.

Table 14 Student Responses About Discussing with Friends Using Mandarin

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Often | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Sometimes | 6 | $37.5 \%$ |  |
| Never | 10 | $62.5 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 14 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they always use Mandarin to discuss with friends, 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they often use Mandarin to discuss with friends, 6 students (37.5\%) stated that sometimes -sometimes use Mandarin to discuss with friends, and 10 students ( $62.5 \%$ ) stated that they have never used Mandarin to discuss with friends. So it can be concluded that in general students never use Mandarin to discuss with friends.

Table 15 Student Responses About Interest in Learning Chinese Synonym Vocabulary

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very happy | 3 | $18.8 \%$ |
| like | 11 | $68.8 \%$ |
| Not happy | 2 | $12.5 \%$ |
| Not happy | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
|  |  |  |

Table 15 provides information that out of 16 samples 3 students ( $18.8 \%$ ) said they really enjoyed learning Chinese synonym vocabulary, 11 students ( $68.8 \%$ ) said they enjoyed learning Chinese synonym vocabulary, 2 students ( $12.5 \%$ ) said did not enjoy learning synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they did not like learning synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin. So it can be concluded that in general students like to learn Chinese synonym vocabulary.

Table 16 Student Responses About Interest in Learning Mandarin Antonym Vocabulary

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very happy | 4 | $25 \%$ |
| like | 6 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Not happy | 6 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Not happy | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
|  | Source: Questionnaire number 8 |  |

Table 16 provides information that out of 16 samples 4 students ( $25 \%$ ) said they really enjoyed learning Chinese antonym vocabulary, 6 students ( $37.5 \%$ ) said they enjoyed learning Chinese antonym vocabulary, 6 students ( $37.5 \%$ ) said they were not happy learning Mandarin antonym vocabulary, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they were not happy learning Mandarin antonym vocabulary. So it can be concluded that in general students enjoy learning Chinese antonym vocabulary.

Table 17 Students' Ability to Search for Synonym and Antonym Vocabulary in the Chinese
Dictionary

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very can | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Can | 9 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Less able | 6 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Can't | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |

## Source: Questionnaire number 9

Table 17 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they could very well look up synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary, 9 students ( $56.3 \%$ ) said they could find synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary, 6 students ( $37.5 \%$ ) said they could not find synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary, and 1 student (6.3\%) said they could not find synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary. So it can be concluded that in general students can look up synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary.

Table 18 Student Responses About Finding Synonymous Vocabulary in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Sometimes | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Once | 15 | $93 \%$ |
| Never | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
|  | Source: Questionnaire number 10 |  |

Table 18 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they always found synonymous Chinese vocabulary, 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) stated that they sometimes found synonymous Chinese vocabulary, 15 students ( $93.8 \%$ ) stated that they had found synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin, and 0 students stated that they had never found synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin. So it can be concluded that in general students have got the synonymous vocabulary of Mandarin.

Table 19 Students Responses About Finding Antonym Vocabulary in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Sometimes | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Once | 14 | $87.4 \%$ |
| Never | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
|  |  |  |

Table 19 provides the information that out of 16 samples 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) stated that he always found Chinese antonym vocabulary, 1 student ( $6.3 \%$ ) stated that he sometimes found Chinese antonym vocabulary, 14 ( $87.4 \%$ ) students stated that they had found Mandarin antonym vocabulary, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they had never found Mandarin synonym vocabulary. So it can be concluded that in general students have got the vocabularies of Mandarin antonym.

Table 20 Student Responses About Distinguishing Synonyms in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very can | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Can | 6 | $37.5 \%$ |
| Less able | 10 | $62.5 \%$ |


| Can't | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
|  | Source: Questionnaire number 12 |  |

Table 20 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they were very able to distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences, 6 students (37.5\%) said they could distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences, 10 students $(62.5 \%)$ ) stated that they were unable to distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they could not distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general students are less able to distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences.

Table 21 Student Responses About Distinguishing Antonym Words in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very can | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Can | 8 | $50 \%$ |
| Less able | 8 | $50 \%$ |
| Can't | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
|  | Source: Questionnaire number 13 |  |

Table 21 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they were very able to distinguish antonyms in Chinese sentences, 8 students ( $50 \%$ ) stated that they could distinguish antonyms in Chinese sentences, 8 students ( $50 \%$ ) stated that they could not distinguish antonym words in Chinese sentences, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they could not distinguish antonym words in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general there are students who can and cannot distinguish between antonyms in Chinese sentences.

Table 22 Students curiosity about any words that include synonyms and antonyms

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 0 | $18.8 \%$ |
| Sometimes | 5 | $31.3 \%$ |
| Once | 3 | $18.8 \%$ |
| Never | 8 | $50 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |
|  | Source: Questionnaire number 14 |  |

Table 22 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they always find out which words include synonyms and antonyms, 5 students ( $31.3 \%$ ) stated that they sometimes find out which words include synonyms and antonyms, 3 students ( $18.8 \%$ ) stated that they had found out which words included synonyms and antonyms, and 8 students ( $50 \%$ ) stated that they had never found out which words included synonyms and antonyms. So it can be concluded that in general students never find out what words include synonyms and antonyms.

Table 23 Students' Responses About Interest in Synonym Lessons in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Really like it | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Like | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| Do not like it much | 8 | $50 \%$ |
| Do not like | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
| Source: Questionnaire number 15 |  |  |

Table 23 provides information that out of 16 samples 1 student (6.3\%) said he really liked learning synonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 7 students ( $43.8 \%$ ) said he liked learning synonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 8 students $(50 \%)$ stated that they did not like learning synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they did not like learning synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general students do not like learning synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences.

Table 24 Student Responses About Interest in Antonym Lessons in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Really like | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Like | 8 | $50 \%$ |  |
| Do not like it much | 8 | $50 \%$ |  |
| Do not like | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 24 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they really liked learning antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 8 students $(50 \%)$ stated that they liked learning antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 8 students ( $50 \%$ ) stated that they did not like learn antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, and 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said they did not like learning antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general there are students who like and don't like learning the vocabulary of antonyms in Chinese sentences.

Table 25 Student Responses About Using Synonymous Vocabulary in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 0 | $0 \%$ |  |
| Sometimes | 4 | $25 \%$ |  |
| Once | 5 | $31.3 \%$ |  |
| Never | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |  |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Table 25 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that they always used synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 4 students ( $25 \%$ ) stated that they sometimes used synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 5 students ( $31.3 \%$ ) stated that they had used synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences, and 7 students ( $43.8 \%$ ) stated that they had never used
synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general students have used synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences.

Table 26 Student Responses About Using Antonym Vocabulary in Chinese Sentences

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Always | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Sometimes | 1 | $6.3 \%$ |
| Once | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| Never | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
| Source: Questionnaire number 18 |  |  |

Table 26 provides information that out of 16 samples 1 student (6.3\%) stated that he always used antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 1 student (6.3\%) stated that he sometimes used antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences, 7 students (43 .8\%) stated that they had used antonymic vocabulary in Chinese sentences, and 7 students ( $43.8 \%$ ) stated that they had never used antonymic vocabulary in Chinese sentences. So it can be concluded that in general there are students who have and have never used antonymic vocabulary in Chinese sentences.

Table 27 Students' Understanding of Using Chinese Synonym Vocabulary

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very easy | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Easy | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| Difficult | 9 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Very difficult | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |
|  |  |  |

Table 27 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) stated that it was very easy to use synonymous Chinese vocabulary, 7 students ( $43.8 \%$ ) stated that it was easy to use synonymous Chinese vocabulary, 9 students ( $56.3 \%$ ) stated that it was difficult to use synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin, and 0 students $(0 \%)$ stated that it was very difficult to use synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin. So it can be concluded that in general it is difficult for students to use synonymous Chinese vocabulary.

Table 28 Students' Understanding of Using Chinese Antonym Vocabulary

| Answer Choices | Frequency (f) | Percentage (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very easy | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Easy | 7 | $43.8 \%$ |
| Difficult | 9 | $56.3 \%$ |
| Very difficult | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Friday | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ |

Table 28 provides information that out of 16 samples 0 students ( $0 \%$ ) said it was very easy to use Chinese antonym vocabulary, 7 students ( $56.3 \%$ ) said it was
easy to use Chinese antonym vocabulary， 9 students（ $56.3 \%$ ）said it was difficult to use chinese antonym vocabulary，and 0 students（ $0 \%$ ）said it was very difficult to use Chinese antonym vocabulary．So it can be concluded that in general students find it difficult to use Chinese antonym vocabulary．

The results of the analysis of the ability to use synonyms in Chinese sentences are as follows．

1．The scoring percentage of students on the matchmaking test is $62.5 \%$ ． This shows that the level of ability of class XI MAS An－Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students on the matchmaking test is in the moderate category enaugh．Based on student test results on the matchmaking test，the average number made a mistake in the problem number2and 4．There is question number 4 你没去上课吗？（Nǐ méi qù shàngkè ma？）the average student matches the word 没（May）with美丽（měili）because they both have pinyin mei，so students assume that these words are synonymous，as a result of the large number of students matching the word 没（May）with美丽（měili）so question number 2 is wrong because the form of the question is like 她姐姐很漂亮（Tā jiějiě hěn piàoliang）for the word 漂亮（piaoliang）is synonymous with美丽（měilì）．
2．The scoring percentage of students on the multiple choice test is $58.76 \%$ ． This shows that the ability level of class XI MAS An－Nuiyah Bontocini Jeneponto students in the multiple choice test is in the moderate category enaugh．Based on the test results of the students on the multiple choice test，the average number made a mistake in question number2and 5 ．There is a question number 2 我很高兴认识你（Wǒ hěn gāoxìng rènshí nǐ）the average student answered伤心（Shangxin）which is the antonym of the word高兴（gāoxing）．Question number 5我爱你 （Wǒ ài nǐ）the average student answered 不爱（Bù ài）because there is a word爱（ai）so students think that the word 不爱（Bù ài）antonym of the word爱（ai）．
Based on this discussion it can be concluded score percentage of students on the overall ability to use testsynonymin Chinese sentences is 60,63 ．This shows that the level of ability of class XI MAS An－Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students in the overall test is in the category of enough．
Furthermore，the results of the analysis of the ability to use antonyms in Chinese sentences are as follows：

1．The scoring percentage of students on the matchmaking test was $80 \%$ ． This shows that the level of ability of class XI MAS An－Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students on the matchmaking test is in the category of good．Based on the results of student tests on the matchmaking test，the average error was made in part number 3 ．

Question number 3我喝茶（Wǒ hē chá）on average the original students answered the antonym of the word 喝（hē）．
2．The scoring percentage of students on the multiple choice test is $51.26 \%$ ． This shows that the level of ability of class XI MAS An－Nuiyah Bontocini Jeneponto students in the multiple choice test is in the category of enough．Based on the test results of the students on the multiple choice test，the average number made a mistake in question number 3．Question number 3 这是我的朋友（Zhè shì wǒ de péngyǒu）
the average student answered哪（Nă）while the word这（Zhe）antonyms with 那（Nà）can be seen that the word哪（Nă）and the word 那（Nà）the Chinese and pinyin characters are similar．
Based on this discussion，it can be concluded that the average score of students on the overall test of the ability to use antonyms in Chinese sentences is 65．63．This shows that the ability level of class XI MAS An－Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students in the overall test is in the moderate category enaugh．

The level of ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Mandarin sentences for class XI MAS An－Nuriyah Bontocini Jeneponto students has not fulfilled the KKM（Minimum Completeness Criteria），namely a score of 75．The score achieved by students，namely 63.13 ，is included in the fairly capable category，this is caused by many students who still do not understand the use of synonyms and antonyms in Mandarin sentences．

The factors that affect the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences are as follows：

1．Internal factors
a．Supporters
Based on the results of the questionnaire data analysis，it can be seen that the internal supporting factors that influence the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences are as follows：in questionnaire number 1 students think that learning Mandarin is important（table 7）of the 16 students in the sample there are 9 respondents（ $56.3 \%$ ）said it was important to learn Mandarin． Questionnaire number 2 is interested in learning Mandarin（table 8）of the 16 students as a sample， 9 respondents（ $56.3 \%$ ）stated that they are interested in learning Mandarin．

Questionnaire number 7 enjoys learning Chinese synonym vocabulary students（table 15）of the 16 samples，there are 11 respondents（ $68.8 \%$ ）stating that students enjoy learning Chinese synonym vocabulary．Questionnaire number 8 enjoyed learning Chinese antonym vocabulary for students（table 16）．Of the 16 samples，there were 6 respondents $(37.5 \%)$ who stated that students enjoyed learning Mandarin antonym vocabulary．Questionnaire number 9 students can look up synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary（table 17）．Of the 16 samples，there were 9 respondents（ $56.3 \%$ ）who said students could look up synonyms and antonyms in the Chinese dictionary．Questionnaire number 16 students like antonym lessons in Mandarin sentences（table 24）．Of the 16 samples， there were 8 respondents（ $50 \%$ ）stated that students liked antonym lessons in Mandarin sentences．
b．inhibitor

The inhibiting internal factors that affect the ability to use synonym and antonyms in Chinese sentences so that they still have not reached the KKM based on the results of the questionnaire analysis can be seen as follows: in questionnaire number 3 students think that it is quite difficult to learn Mandarin but students still make many mistakes because they do not learn enough vocabulary synonyms and antonyms in Mandarin sentences (table 11) of the 16 samples, there were 10 respondents $(62.5 \%)$ stated that it was quite difficult for students to learn Mandarin. Questionnaire number 4 students have only ever taken the time to learn Mandarin (table 12). Of the 16 samples, 8 respondents ( $50 \%$ ) stated that they had taken the time to learn Mandarin. Questionnaire number 5, although students know about grammar in Chinese sentences, students still make many mistakes because they still do not understand the grammar of synonyms and antonyms in sentences (table 13). Of the 16 samples, 10 respondents ( $62.5 \%$ ) said they knew grammar in Chinese sentences.

Questionnaire number 8 students were not happy learning Mandarin antonym vocabulary (table 16). Of the 16 samples, there were 6 respondents $(37.5 \%)$ stated that students were not happy learning Mandarin antonym vocabulary. Questionnaire number 9 students never find out vocabulary that includes synonyms and antonyms (table 17) of the 16 samples there are 8 respondents ( $50 \%$ ) stated students never find out any vocabulary that includes synonyms and antonyms. Questionnaire number 10 students have found synonymous vocabulary for Mandarin (table 18). Of the 16 samples, 15 respondents ( $93.8 \%$ ) stated that students had found synonymous Chinese vocabulary. Questionnaire number 11 students have ever found Chinese antonym vocabulary (table 19). Of the 16 samples, 14 respondents ( $87.4 \%$ ) stated that students had found Chinese antonym vocabulary. Questionnaire number 12 students were less able to distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences (table 20). Of the 16 samples, 10 respondents ( $62.5 \%$ ) stated that students were unable to distinguish synonyms in Chinese sentences.

Questionnaire number 13 students were less able to distinguish between antonyms in Chinese sentences (table 21). Of the 16 samples, there were 8 respondents $(50 \%)$ stated that students were unable to distinguish between antonyms in Chinese sentences. Questionnaire number 15 students did not like synonym lessons in Chinese sentences (table 23). Of the 16 samples, there were 8 respondents ( $50 \%$ ) stated that students did not like synonym lessons in Chinese sentences. Questionnaire number 16 students did not like antonym lessons in Chinese sentences (table 24). Of the 16 samples, there were 8 respondents ( $50 \%$ ) stated that students did not like antonym lessons in Chinese sentences.

Questionnaire number 17 students have never used synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences (table 25). Of the 16 samples, 7 respondents ( $43.8 \%$ ) stated that students had never used synonymous vocabulary in Chinese sentences. Questionnaire number 18 students have never used antonym vocabulary in Chinese sentences (table 26). Of the 16 samples, there were 7 respondents ( $43.8 \%$ ) stated that students had never used antonymic vocabulary in Chinese sentences. Questionnaire number 19 students had difficulty using synonymous Chinese vocabulary (table 27). Of the 16 samples, there were 9
respondents ( $56.3 \%$ ) who stated that students had difficulty using synonymous Chinese vocabulary. Questionnaire number 20 students had difficulty using Chinese antonym vocabulary (table 28). Of the 16 samples, there were 9 respondents ( $56.3 \%$ ) stated that students had difficulty using Chinese antonym vocabulary.
2. External factors
a. Supporters

Supporting external factors that affect the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences so that they still have not reached the KKM based on the results of the questionnaire analysis can be seen as follows: Questionnaire number 2 students are interested in learning Mandarin (table 8) of the 16 students in the sample there are 9 respondents ( $56.3 \%$ ) said they were interested in learning Mandarin because the teacher was beautiful.
b. inhibitor

The inhibiting external factors that affect the ability to use synonyms and antonyms in Chinese sentences so that they still have not reached the KKM based on the results of the questionnaire analysis can be seen as follows: in questionnaire number 6 students have never discussed with friends using Mandarin (table 14) of the 16 samples there are 10 respondents ( $62.5 \%$ ) stated that students had never had discussions with friends using Mandarin.

## IV. CONCLUSION

Motivation in this case internal or self-motivation plays an important role in the human life. Learning any subjects need internal motivation from the learners. The more motivated learners the better it will result. Self-motivation will drive the learners to learn more, to do more. Without self-motivation coming from the leaners themselves any process will result in unsatisfied one. It can be identified that motivation will include Intrinsic and extrinsic learning motivation. Intrinsic motivation is motivation that comes from the students themselves to learn. Extrinsic Learning Motivation. Extrinsic motivation is motivation that comes from outside, for example the environment, from the teacher.
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