READING STRATEGIES OF SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN BOGOR, WEST JAVA

AURORA FATHYAA

GRADUATE SCHOOL
BOGOR AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY
BOGOR
2018
DECLARATION OF THESIS AND INFORMATION SOURCES

I hereby genuinely state that the master thesis entitled *Reading Strategies of High School Students in Bogor, West Java* is true of my own work under the supervision of advisory board and that has not been submitted before in any form or universities. All the information taken and quoted from published and unpublished scientific papers from other writers have been mentioned in the script and listed in the references at the end of this thesis.

I hereby hand the copyright of my thesis to Bogor Agricultural University

Bogor, May 2018

*Aurora Fathyac*

G352150211
RINGKASAN

AURORA FATHYAA. Strategi Membaca Siswa Sekolah Menengah Atas di Kota Bogor, Jawa Barat. Dibimbing oleh BAMBANG SURYOBROTO dan KANTHI ARUM WIDAYATI.


Subjek dalam penelitian ini terdiri dari 97 siswa laki-laki dan 159 siswa perempuan (n=256). Penilaian mengenai pemakaian strategi membaca menggunakan kuisisoner Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (Marsi) versi bahasa Indonesia. Siswa menilai pernyataan pada kuisisoner dengan skala 1 sampai 5. Rataan nilai yang didapat disebut sebagai skor Marsi. Siswa perempuan memiliki skor Marsi yang lebih tinggi daripada siswa laki-laki. Siswa dilaporkan cenderung menggunakan strategi membaca yang berorientasi pemecahan masalah saat membaca. Strategi membaca dilaporkan membantu kemampuan akademik siswi perempuan dari kelas ilmu sosial, sementara hasil sebaliknya dilaporkan pada siswi perempuan dari kelas ilmu alam.

Kata kunci: strategi membaca metakognisi, kemampuan akademik, Marsi
SUMMARY

AURORA FATHYAA. Reading Strategies of Senior High School Students in Bogor, West Java. Supervised by BAMBANG SURYOBROTO and KANTHI ARUM WIDAYATI.

Reading is one of the important process in learning. By reading, students are capable to comprehend new information from the text. Reading comprehension is believed to be helped by reading strategies. Here, we assessed the usage of these strategies and their implications to student academic performance.

The subjects in this study were 97 males and 159 females students (N=256). The assessment used the Indonesian version of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (Marsi). Students rated the statements using 5-point Likert type scale. Average rating score called Marsi score represented the frequency of reading strategies usage. Female students were reported to have higher Marsi score than male. Problem solving reading strategies was reported used more often than other strategies. Reading strategies only helped social science female students, meanwhile the effect was reversed in natural sciences students.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Background

Reading is one of the important skills students need to master. Maclellan (1997) described reading as an activity to get something from text. Students decode the sentence word by word and paraphrase it into their own knowledge as new information (Alexander et al. 1991). Students start to learn to read since primary education. In this stage, they learned how to read properly, usually guided with some instructions from their teacher. Through time students are capable to acquire new information by reading on their own. Paris et al. (1983) regarded the deliberate actions which gives students control over their own reading process as reading strategies. Using these tactics students actively monitor and consequently regulate and orchestrate the learning process.

There are three reading (sub)strategies, i.e.: Global Reading Strategies (GRS), Problem Solving Reading Strategies (PSS), and Support Reading Strategies (SRS) (Mokhtari and Reichard 2002). GRS represents a set of strategies oriented toward a global analysis of text. PSS appears to be oriented around strategies for solving problems when text becomes difficult to read. SRS might be described as functional or support strategies including use of outside reference materials such as dictionary, taking notes, and other practical strategies. Student awareness concerning their own cognitive mind is a metacognitive process (Flavell 1976). Therefore, these strategies are part of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies (MARS) (Mokhtari and Reichard 2002). The frequency of using the strategies can be quantified by MARS Inventory (MARSI) scores. The more often students used a specific strategy, the higher score they get. Mokhtari and Reichard (2002) classified MARSI score: if a student get score less than 2.5 he/she is grouped as poor skilled reader; if the score between 2.5 to 3.4 he/she is grouped as medium skilled reader; if the score more than 3.4 he/she is grouped as high skilled reader.

Problem statement

Previous studies reported that reading comprehension positively correlated with student’s academic performance (Chege 2012, Kerubo 2014, Akbusli et al. 2016). Knowing how students use their reading strategies is important to help improving student reading comprehension, especially in secondary education students. They are in the transition from early learning stage to higher one. Previous studies about MARS in Indonesia conclude these strategies improve student’s reading comprehension (Nuryana et al. 2015, Sawarna and Subekti 2017, Fatimah 2017). Unfortunately, all of them are qualitative study by only interviewing a group of class from one school. This study provides more vary sample population and use a questionnaire as quantitative approach.

The aim of the study

The aim of this study was to quantify reading strategies from senior high school students in Bogor City and its covariation to their academic performances.
Benefit of the study

This study contributes data about student’s reading strategies in Indonesia, especially Bogor City. The data can be used as consideration for policy makers or academicians when reconstructing school curriculum. Teachers can use it to create efficient learning instruction for reading tasks. On the other hand, students can use it to evaluate their own reading strategies.

2 MATERIAL AND METHODS

Time and Place

The data were collected on July to August 2016 in five public senior high school in Bogor City. Data analysis was done in Animal Biosystematics and Ecology Laboratory, Department of Biology, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Bogor Agricultural University. The protocol was conformed to requirement of local Bogor City government (Surat Kepala Kantor Kesatuan Bangsa data Politik Kota Bogor Nomor: 070/716-Kesbangpol).

Subjects

The subjects of this study were 256 senior high school students consisted of 97 males and 159 females with age range between 15 to 18 years old (M=16.3). Subjects were divided into two groups based on their major study: natural sciences and social sciences with their grades (Grade 10th and 12th, Grade 11th was not available in this study). The researcher stated the purpose of the study, researcher’s contact address, and agreement form before the signing (Appendix 1). Participation was voluntarily and each student signed an informed consent before taking the test. The researcher also asked student’s background information, such as date of birth, school history, current school grade, and major study.

Student’s Reading Strategies

MARSi consists of 30 statements about reading behavior (Mokhtari and Reichard 2002). The Indonesian version of MARSi was used for assessing the underlying processes involved in reading in this study. Student had to rate the statements using a 5-point likert-type scale ranging from 1 (I never do that, Saya tidak pernah melakukan hal ini) to 5 (I always do that, Saya selalu melakukan hal ini) (Appendix 2). Data were collected directly at the classroom during school hours. There was no time limit in rating MARSi.

Student’s Academic Performance

Student academic performance was represented according to the average exam score of all subjects he/she got in last semester. The researcher asked the students directly about it before collecting the data. If they do not remember the
score, the researcher would ask it from their homeroom teachers. Student’s academic score was standardized to 0-100 based on Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 81A Tahun 2013 (Kemendikbud).

Data Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using multiple comparison and linear model with reading strategies as a factor that might covariate academic performance (Venables and Ripley 1999). The analysis was performed in statistical packages R version 3.4.1 (R Core Team 2017).

3 RESULTS

Student’s Reading Strategies

Overall, female \( (M=3.54) \) had significantly higher overall MARSI score than male \( (M=3.30) \) \( (p<0.05, \) Table 1). Female also had statistically significant higher score than male in all of (sub)strategies. Based on Mokhtari and Reichard’s classification, female students can be classified as high skilled in GRS \( (M=3.41) \), PSS \( (M=3.78) \), SRS \( (M=3.42) \) while male only in PSS \( (M=3.49) \). The result indicates that female student is doing better in term of execute reading strategies than male. Within major, female of natural science had significantly higher score in all (sub)strategies than male while in social science class, female only had higher score in PSS and SRS score. It indicates that female in natural science is better in execute the strategies than female in social science class.

Higher score of PSS than other strategies showed that students in this study preferred using PSS more often than others (Table 1). Some strategies were skillfully used in most of students, such as “Setting reading goal”, “Previewing the text”, “Using prior knowledge”, “Resolving conflicting information”, “Reading slowly and carefully”, “Trying to stay focus”, and “Re-reading”. Meanwhile, some were poorly used in some students, such as “Reading aloud” and “Using text features”. It showed us that some strategies might not teach properly in the early stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Mean score of each reading strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall MARSI score&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall GRS score&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting reading goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previewing the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using prior knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checking if the text fits with reading goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming the text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1 Mean score of each reading strategies (continued)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 6  | Determining what to read | 3.18 | 3.35 | 3.35 | 3.44 | 3.45 | 3.27 | 3.42 | 3.53 |
| 7  | Using text features      | 2.79 | 2.51 | 2.86 | 2.68 | 2.92 | 2.75 | 2.39 | 2.61 |
| 8  | Using context clues      | 3.62 | 3.18 | 3.45 | 3.65 | 3.26 | 3.35 | 3.61 | 3.35 |
| 9  | Using typographical aids | 3.00 | 2.57 | 2.76 | 2.93 | 2.98 | 3.33 | 2.90 | 3.01 |
| 10 | Evaluating what I read   | 3.26 | 3.16 | 2.86 | 3.07 | 2.87 | 3.08 | 2.73 | 2.95 |
| 11 | Resolving conflicting information | 3.54 | 3.33 | 3.95 | 3.56 | 3.51 | 3.55 | 3.42 | 3.66 |
| 12 | Predicting the text meaning | 3.09 | 3.43 | 3.84 | 3.45 | 3.40 | 3.28 | 3.07 | 3.55 |
| 13 | Confirming prediction    | 3.29 | 3.51 | 3.67 | 3.49 | 3.43 | 3.43 | 3.39 | 3.57 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall PSS score c</th>
<th>3.49</th>
<th>3.78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Reading carefully and slowly</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Trying to stay focus</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Adjusting reading rate</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Paying close attention</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Pausing and thinking about what I read</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Visualizing about what I read</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Re-reading</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Guessing meaning of unknown words</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall SRS score d</th>
<th>3.11</th>
<th>3.42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Taking notes</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Reading aloud</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Summarizing information</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Discussing with others</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Underlining information</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Using references</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Paraphrasing into own language</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Going back and forth</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Asking oneself questions</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strategies that score more than 3.4 printed in bold while score less than 2.5 printed in italic.

*PSS*=Problem Solving Reading Strategies; *SUP*=Support Reading Strategies.

**Student's Academic Performance and The Covariation with Reading Strategies**

Overall, students in Bogor did well in school by having average school grades more than the standard threshold (65, Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 81A Tahun 2013) (Table 3). There was
no difference between male and female in overall score of academic performance ($p=0.28$).

### Table 2 Average score of academic performance between sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$d^a$</th>
<th>$p^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>82.87 (4.80)</td>
<td>83.48 (4.58)</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural science</td>
<td>83.87 (4.47)</td>
<td>83.66 (5.10)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10th</td>
<td>86.72 (5.33)</td>
<td>84.26 (6.67)</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12th</td>
<td>82.62 (2.52)</td>
<td>83.04 (2.83)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>82.08 (4.95)</td>
<td>83.34 (4.13)</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10th</td>
<td>77.89 (6.02)</td>
<td>80.31 (5.01)</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12th</td>
<td>84.02 (2.18)</td>
<td>84.56 (2.99)</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ = difference between male-female, Tukey Honest Difference (Miller 1981; Yandell 1997)

$^b$ = probability that the difference is zero, Tukey Honest Difference (Miller 1981; Yandell 1997)

Male students of Grade 10th in both major had positive covariance between GRS score with their academic performance (Figure 1a and 1b). In contrast, female of Grade 10th in both major had reverse situation (Figure 2a and 2b). However, these covariations didn’t statistically significant ($p>0.05$). Only female of Grade 12th social sciences students whose academic performance was significantly helped by GRS ($p=0.02$; Figure 2b). PRS helped most of male students except Grade 12th social science students (Figure 3). Only in Grade 10th social students whose academic performance was significantly helped by PRS ($p=0.01$; Figure 3b). This also occurred in female of Grade 12th social science students. PRS only significantly helped female of Grade 12th social science students ($p=0.01$; Figure 4b). SRS didn’t help student academic performance in most of students (Figure 5 and 6) except for female of Grade 12th social science students ($p=0.01$; Figure 6b).

**Figure 1** Effects of global reading strategies (GRS) in academic performance in (a) natural science and (b) social science male students. GRS didn’t significantly help overall male’s academic performance.
Figure 2 Effects of global reading strategies (GRS) in academic performance in (a) natural science and (b) social science female students. GRS only significantly \((p=0.02)\) helped female of Grade 12\(^{th}\) social science’s academic performance.

Figure 3 Effects of problem solving reading strategies (PRS) in academic performance in (a) natural science and (b) social science male students. PRS only significantly \((p=0.01)\) helped male of Grade 10\(^{th}\) social science’s academic performance.
Figure 4 Effects of problem solving reading strategies (PRS) in academic performance in (a) natural science and (b) social science female students. PRS only significantly ($p=0.01$) helped female of Grade 12th social science’s academic performance.

Figure 5 Effects of support reading strategies (SRS) in academic performance in (a) natural science and (b) social science male students. SRS didn’t significantly help overall male’s academic performance.
Figure 6 Effects of support reading strategies (SRS) in academic performance in (a) natural science and (b) social science female students. SRS only significantly ($p=0.01$) helped female of Grade 12th social science’s academic performance.

4 DISCUSSION

Present study aimed to determine high school students reading strategies and its covariation to their academic performance. Male and female performed similar in their academic, but we found that female outperformed male in term of using reading strategies. From all thirty strategies rated by students, problem solving strategies were frequently used in this study. Some strategies were similarly used between male and female. All reading (sub)strategies only helped female of social science students in academic performance.

Over decades, many studies about sex difference in school reading claimed that female performed better than male (Jacobs and Paris 1987; Sheorey and Mokhtari 2001; Rutter et al. 2004; Logan and Johnston 2009; OECD 2015). However, the factors which caused sex difference in cognitive tasks are still in discussion, such as cultural influences and gender stereotypes (Miller and Halpern 2013). Stoet and Geary (2018) stated that boys in elementary school believed their own strength was in mathematical ability, while girls was in reading. Pomerantz (2002) also found that female student evaluate their learning process more often than male. These high self-efficacy behavior in girls might initiate them to regulate reading strategies better than boys.

We found that female of natural science students did better in execute their reading strategies than social science. However, our analysis showed that using reading strategies skillfully only help female of social science to increase their academic performance. We believe this might happen because natural science
topics are more complex than social science, not only in the textbooks but also in question sentence. Statements that are written in textbooks or questions for natural science major usually written in scientific language (McNamara 2009). Sometimes they struggle in reading unfamiliar words or phrases. Moreover, paragraphs in the textbooks are written in expository form. Students need to analyze and connect each part from the text with their prior knowledge to become one main idea. Thus, natural science students need more effort to understand and solve the problems than social science students do.

Strategies provide students to surpass the difficulties. However, we found similar strategies that poorly used by students. Students in this study also found using PSS more often than other strategies. This might happen because general purpose of studying is to solve the problems interpret as questions. Thus, this finding could use as reference for teachers or academicians when teaching strategies for their students. Direct teaching about how to use strategies properly to the students and give real example about when and where to use the strategies help students realize and aware about the benefit of using strategies in reading. Moreover, teachers can help their students by aiming the purpose of studying is not only solve the problems but also reflect and discover something new from the topic.

5 CONCLUSION

Female students reported better than male in term of execute strategies in reading process. However, reading strategies only helped female in social class to increase their academic performance. Students preferred using Problem Solving Reading Strategies than other strategies. The differences of using reading strategies reflect how students behave about the learning process. The role of teacher might be important to direct and teach students in using reading strategies properly.
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Appendix 1 Informed consent

PERSETUJUAN MENJADI RESPONDEN

Salam Hangat,

Data berikut yang akan diambil di kuisiner ini akan digunakan untuk kepentingan ilmu pengetahuan yaitu sebagai data penelitian yang berjudul “Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies in High School Student”. Untuk informasi yang lebih lengkap Anda dapat menghubungi peneliti via telepon 08771570291 atau email: aurorafathyaa@gmail.com

Terima Kasih atas partisipasinya

Dengan mengisi kuesioner ini, Saya bersedia untuk menjadi partisipan untuk penelitian “Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies in High School Student”.

Bogor, ...................... 2016

DATA DIRI

1. Nama : 
2. Jenis Kelamin : 
3. TTL : 
4. Alamat sekolah
   SD : Kota/Kab: .......... Tahun(masuk&keluar): 
   SMT : Kota/Kab: .......... Tahun(masuk&keluar): 
   SMA : Kota/Kab: .......... Tahun(masuk&keluar):
5. Alamat asal : 
6. Kelas/Semester : 
7. Peminatan : 
8. RATAAN NILAI RAPORT (Semester sebelumnya):
Appendix 2 The Indonesian version of Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

1. Dilihat mengingat sebanyak, atau seluruh karya tulis ini dan menentukan penidik, penelitian, penulisan dan menyusun sumber.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategi</th>
<th>Skala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saya melakukan tujuan pada saat saya membaca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya membacukannya catatan saat membaca untuk menolong saya</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya memikirkan apa yang saya ketahui untuk menolong saya</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya memahami apa yang saya bacaan sebelum membaca dengan Serious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya membaca dengan sulit, saya membaca keras-keras untuk memahami apa yang saya baca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya membaca dengan hal-hal penting yang ada dalam membaca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya membaca dengan apakah apa yang saya baca mengerti sekalipun membaca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya membaca secara pelan dan hati-hati untuk memastikan apa yang saya baca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya berasosiasi dengan orang lain mengenai hal yang saya baca untuk memastikan pemahaman saya</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya membaca dengan cepat terlebih dahulu untuk memahami dan panjang membaca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya menemukan faktor, saya akan kembali mencoba lebih berkonsentrasi</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya menggaris bawahi atau melingkari informasi dalam membaca untuk membantu saya mengatasi</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecepatan membaca saya bergantung kepada apa yang saya baca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya memutuskan apa yang saya ingin baca dengan cermat dana pa yang saya ingat abakan</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya menakai bahan referensi lain seperti kumpulan untuk membantu saya memahami apa yang saya baca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saat membaca menjadi sulit, perhatian terhadap kalimat menjadi menentukan</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya menggunakan tabel, grafik, atau gambar pada teks untuk membantu saya memahami apa yang saya baca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya memahami apa yang sudah saya baca</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saya menggunakan konteks petunjuk untuk membantu saya mencari informasi yang tersirat</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Hak Cipta Diilustrasi Lendang-Lendang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saya menyusun komul idc dari bacaan, dengan bahasa saya mengungkapkan atau menulisiaskan informasi untuk bacaan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Saya menggunakan bahasa yang sesuai dengan konteks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saya menulis dengan cara yang sesuai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saya menulis dengan cara yang sesuai.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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