

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

In this chapter, the researcher presents the finding and the discussion of the study. Those are the description of data, normality and homogeneity testing, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

#### **A. Research Finding**

##### **1. The description of data**

This research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Kauman Tulungagung with population were all of the 10<sup>th</sup> grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Kauman Tulungagung. Those are two majors in this school, that were MIPA and IPS. The sample of this research were X-MIPA 6 as the experimental group and X-IPS 3 as the control group. In X-MIPA 6 consist of 8 male and 28 female and X- IPS 3 consist of 14 male and 22 female students. This study used peer assessment through WhatsApp to teach the students' in writing recount text. This study was conducted on 12<sup>th</sup> February 2020 until 6<sup>th</sup> March 2020.

In this study, the researcher presented the data of students' writing score as the result of pre-test and post-test. Then, the researcher wanted to know the effectiveness of peer assessment through WhatsApp on the students' ability in writing recount text. It could be seen from the significant difference of students' score in writing recount text before and

after taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp. Therefore, the researcher administered pre-test in experimental and control group. Thenb, applied a treatment to experimental class by using peer assessment through WhatsApp in writing recount text and conventional peer assessment in control class. The last step was administered post-test after the treatment given. In addition, the criteria of students' score of pre-test and post-test were categorized as in the table.

**Table 4.1. Criteria of Students Score**

No	Range	Criteria
1.	85-100	Excellent
2.	71-84	Good
3.	60-70	Fair
4.	40-59	Poor
5.	0-39	Very poor

(Adapted from article Riswanto and Haryono E. 2012)

According to table 4.1, there were five categories; excellent, good, fair, poor, very poor. If the students got 85-100 score, there were categorized into excellent. It meant that they could finish the test very excellent. Next, the students were categorized into very good criteria if they got 71-84 score. In this category they could do the test very well. Afterward, the students were categorized into good score if they got 60-70 score which meant that they could do the test good. Moreover, the students were categorized into poor score if they got 40-59 score it could be interpreted that they just do the test. The last, the students were categorized into very poor if they got 0-39 score. In this categorization, it could be said that they could not do the test well.

a) **Data of The Students Taught by Using Peer Assessment Through WhatsApp of Experimental Group.**

**Tabel 4.2**  
**Score pre-test and post-test of experimental group**

No	Name	Gender	Score in pre-test	Score in post-test
1	AEP	P	65	71
2	ARD	L	67	71
3	AD	L	62	70
4	ANF	P	71	77
5	CTD	P	66	74
6	DU	P	74	79
7	DAQ	P	69	74
8	DPK	P	67	73
9	DVY	P	65	70
10	ENZ	P	64	72
11	INH	P	71	78
12	INA	P	70	74
13	JP	L	67	72
14	KR	P	68	73
15	LM	P	72	76
16	MS	P	68	72
17	MSF	P	59	64
18	MCAK	P	70	72
19	MNE	L	49	68
20	MRD	L	64	71
21	NSA	P	69	72
22	NPL	P	56	66
23	NAC	P	59	65
24	OPA	P	72	74
25	RAW	P	71	76
26	SAP	P	70	74
27	SAS	L	51	56
28	STAG	L	72	77
29	SHL	P	71	77
30	SAIWS	P	65	71
31	SD	P	62	75
32	SS	P	62	66
33	TRACA	P	66	74

34	VPP	L	71	75
35	VSM	P	69	72
36	WRW	P	61	70
SUM			2375	2591

The researcher used SPSS 20.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' score of pre-test.

**Tabel 4.3** frequency of score  
in pre-test of Statistics experimental  
group

		Pre-test	Post-test
N	Valid	36	36
	Missing	0	0

Pre-test				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	49	1	2,8	2,8
	51	1	2,8	5,6
	56	1	2,8	8,3
	59	2	5,6	13,9
	61	1	2,8	16,7
	62	3	8,3	25,0
	64	2	5,6	30,6
	65	3	8,3	38,9
Valid	66	2	5,6	44,4
	67	3	8,3	52,8
	68	2	5,6	58,3
	69	3	8,3	66,7
	70	3	8,3	75,0
	71	5	13,9	88,9
	72	3	8,3	97,2
	74	1	2,8	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

Based on the table 4.3, 1 student 2,8% got 49, 1 student 2,8% got 51, 1 student 2,8% got 56, 2 students 5,6% got 59, 1 student 2,8% got 61, 3 students 8,3% got 62, 2 students 5,6% got 64, 3 students 8,3% got 65, 2 students 5,6 got 66, 3 students 8,3 got 67, 2 students 5,6% got 68, 2 students 8,3% got 69, 3 students 8,3% got 70, 5 students 13,9% got 71, 3 students 8,3% got 72, 1 student 2,8 got 74. This result finding considering that students only used their background knowledge without any input before about how to write good recount text. So, their score will gain after the treatment and show in the next table of this pre-test data view.

**Tabel 4.4 frequency of score in post-test of experimental group**

Post-test				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
56	1	2,8	2,8	2,8
64	1	2,8	2,8	5,6
65	1	2,8	2,8	8,3
66	2	5,6	5,6	13,9
68	1	2,8	2,8	16,7
70	3	8,3	8,3	25,0
71	4	11,1	11,1	36,1
72	6	16,7	16,7	52,8
73	2	5,6	5,6	58,3
74	6	16,7	16,7	75,0
75	2	5,6	5,6	80,6
76	2	5,6	5,6	86,1
77	3	8,3	8,3	94,4
78	1	2,8	2,8	97,2
79	1	2,8	2,8	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

After got treatment (peer assessment through WhatsApp) the students got improved their result in post-test in the table showed earlier. 1 student 2,8% got 56, 1 student 2,8% got 64, 1 student 2,8% got 65, 2 students 5,6% got 66, 1 student 2,8% got 68, 3 students 8,3% got 70, 4 students 11,1% got 71, 6 students 16,7% got 72, 2 students 11,1% got 71, 6 students 5,6% got 73, 6 students 16,7% got 74, 2 students 5,6% got 75, 2 students 5,6% got 76, 3 students 8,3% got 77, 1 student 2,8% got 78, 1 student 2,8% got 79.

Beside the tables, the researcher showed the statistic data of students' pre-test and post-test score. The data was showed below:

**Table 4.5 Statistics Data of Students Pre-Test and Post-Test in Experimental Group**

		Statistics	
		Pre-test	Post-test
N	Valid	36	36
	Missing	0	0
Mean		65,97	71,97
Std. Error of Mean		,967	,750
Median		67,00	72,00
Mode		71	72
Std. Deviation		5,804	4,501
Variance		33,685	20,256
Range		25	23
Minimum		49	56
Maximum		74	79
Sum		2375	2591

Based on the data statistics of students' pre-test and post-test the mean of the pre-test was 65,97 improved as 71,97 in post-test. That median in the pre-test was 67,00 and 72,00 in post-test. The mode was 71 and 72 in pre-test and post-test. The standard deviation in pre-test was 5,804 and in the post-test was 4,501, the variance was 33,685 in pre-test and 20,256 in post-test. the range of pre-test was 25 and in post-test was 23. The minimum score was 49 and 58 in post-test.

And the maximum score was 74 in pre-test and 79 in post-test. Finally, the summary of both test was 2375 in pre-test and 2591 in post-test. Then, the researcher made the categorization of the students' score as follow:

**Table 4.6 categorization of experimental group  
Pre-test**

Range	Frequency	Categorization
<b>85-100</b>	0	Excellent
<b>71-84</b>	9	Good
<b>60-70</b>	22	Fair
<b>40-59</b>	5	Poor
<b>0-39</b>	0	Very poor

Based on the table of the categorization of experimental group the range 85-100 was none, students' range in 71-84 categorization of good was 9, students' range in 60-70 categorization of fair was 22, students' range in 40-59 categorization poor was 5. In conclusion, the biggest categorization was fair.

**Post-test**

Range	Frequency	Categorization
<b>85-100</b>	0	Excellent
<b>71-84</b>	21	Good
<b>60-70</b>	8	Fair

<b>40-59</b>	1	Poor
<b>0-39</b>	0	Very poor

Based on the table of the categorization of experimental group the range 85-100 was none, students' range in 71-84 categorization of good was 21, students' range in 60-70 categorization of fair was 8, students' range in 40-59 categorization poor was 1. In conclusion, the biggest categorization was good. It was gained after the treatment.

**b) Data of The Students Taught by Using Peer Assessment Without Using WhatsApp of Control Group (Conventional).**

**Table 4.7**  
**Score pre-test and post-test of control group**

<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Score in pre-test</b>	<b>Score in post-test</b>
1	AAP	P	64	69
2	AA	P	62	67
3	AIE	L	60	62
4	AR	P	59	66
5	ATH	L	61	68
6	ARB	L	63	74
7	ATP	P	65	70
8	CPA	P	65	69
9	DFAN	P	60	61
10	DPR	P	59	71
11	DFH	P	68	71
12	EAS	P	70	72
13	FSA	L	63	68
14	IHW	L	63	73
15	MT	P	56	59
16	MK	L	62	65
17	MRMA	L	55	61
18	MMA	L	64	70
19	NFR	P	70	71
20	HAA	P	69	70
21	PAF	P	65	70
22	RYP	L	62	70
23	RLAS	L	59	61



24	RB	L	51	69
25	SHSTA	P	61	67
26	STA	L	62	66
27	SAP	P	64	66
28	SDS	P	58	63
29	SDS	P	70	74
30	SDA	P	66	68
31	SAM	P	59	62
32	SBA	P	55	66
33	TP	P	58	60
34	TBS	L	62	64
35	YYF	P	60	64
36	YASP	P	72	77
SUM			2242	2424

The researcher used SPSS 20.0 version to know the descriptive statistic and the percentage of students' score of post-test.

**Tabel 4.8** **Frequency of**  
**Score in Pre-Test** **Statistics** **of Control Group**

		pretest	posttest
N	Valid	36	36
	Missing	0	0

**Pretest**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
51	1	2,8	2,8	2,8
55	2	5,6	5,6	8,3
56	1	2,8	2,8	11,1
58	2	5,6	5,6	16,7
59	4	11,1	11,1	27,8
60	3	8,3	8,3	36,1
Valid 61	2	5,6	5,6	41,7
62	5	13,9	13,9	55,6
63	3	8,3	8,3	63,9
64	3	8,3	8,3	72,2
65	3	8,3	8,3	80,6
66	1	2,8	2,8	83,3
68	1	2,8	2,8	86,1

69	1	2,8	2,8	88,9
70	3	8,3	8,3	97,2
72	1	2,8	2,8	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

Based on the table 4.8, 1 student 2,8% got 51, 2 students 5,6% got 55, 1 student 2,8% got 56, 2 students 5,6% got 58, 4 students 11,1% got 59, 3 students 8,3% got 60, 2 students 5,6% got 61, 5 students 13,9% got 62, 3 students 8,3% got 63, 3 students 8,3% got 64, 3 students 8,3% got 65, 1 student 2,8% got 66, 1 student 2,8% got 68, 1 student 2,8% got 69, 3 student 8,3% got 70, 1 student 2,8% got 72. This result finding considering that students only used their background knowledge without any input before about how to write good recount text.

**Table 4.9 Frequency of Score in Post Test of Control Group**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
59	1	2,8	2,8	2,8
60	1	2,8	2,8	5,6
61	3	8,3	8,3	13,9
62	2	5,6	5,6	19,4
63	1	2,8	2,8	22,2
64	2	5,6	5,6	27,8
65	1	2,8	2,8	30,6
66	4	11,1	11,1	41,7
67	2	5,6	5,6	47,2
Valid 68	3	8,3	8,3	55,6
69	3	8,3	8,3	63,9
70	5	13,9	13,9	77,8
71	3	8,3	8,3	86,1
72	1	2,8	2,8	88,9
73	1	2,8	2,8	91,7
74	2	5,6	5,6	97,2
77	1	2,8	2,8	100,0
Total	36	100,0	100,0	

The table 4.9 showed that 1 student 2,8% got 59, 1 student 2,8% got 60, 3 students 8,3% got 61, 2 student 5,6 got 62%, 1 student 2,8% got 63, 2 students 5,6% got 64, 1 student 2,8% got 65, 4 students 11,1% got 66, 2 students 5,6% got

67, 3 students 8,3% got 68, 3 students 8,3% got 69, 5 students 13,9% got 70, 3 students 8,3% got 71, 1 student 2,8% got 72, 1 student 2,8% got 73, 2 students 5,6% got 74, 1 student 2,8% got 77. Related the tables in the earlier, the researcher showed the statistics data of students' pre-test and post-test score. The data was showed below.

**Table 4.10 Statistics Data of Students Pre-Test and Post-Test in Control Group**

**Statistics**

		pretest	posttest
N	Valid	36	36
	Missing	0	0
Mean		62,28	67,33
Std. Error of Mean		,781	,732
Median		62,00	68,00
Mode		62	70
Std. Deviation		4,688	4,395
Variance		21,978	19,314
Range		21	18
Minimum		51	59
Maximum		72	77
Sum		2242	2424

According to the data statistics of students, it showed that pre-test and post-test. The mean of the pre-test was 62,28 improved as 67,33 in post-test. That median in the pre-test was 62,00 and 68,00 in post-test. The mode was 62 and 70 in pre-test and post-test. The standard deviation in pre-test was 4,688 and in the post-test was 4,395, the variance was 21,978 in pre-test and 4,395 in post-test. the range of pre-test was 21 and in post-test was 18. The minimum score was 51 and

59 in post-test. And the maximum score was 72 in pre-test and 77 in post-test. Finally, the summary of both tests was 2242 in pre-test and 2424 in post-test. Then, the researcher made the categorization of the students' score as follow:

**Table 4.11 Categorization of Control Group  
Pre-test**

Range	Frequency	Categorization
<b>85-100</b>	0	Excellent
<b>71-84</b>	1	Good
<b>60-70</b>	25	Fair
<b>40-59</b>	10	Poor
<b>0-39</b>	0	Very poor

The table 4.11 showed the categorization of control group the range 85-100 was none, students' range in 71-84 categorization of good was 1, students' range in 60-70 categorization of fair was 25, students' range in 40-59 categorization poor was 10. In conclusion, the biggest categorization was fair.

Range	Frequency	Categorization
<b>85-100</b>	0	Excellent
<b>71-84</b>	8	Good
<b>60-70</b>	27	Fair
<b>40-59</b>	1	Poor
<b>0-39</b>	0	Very poor

Based on the table categorization mentioned earlier of control group the range 85-100 was none, students' range in 71-84 categorization of good was 8, students' range in 60-70 categorization of fair was 27, students' range in 40-59 categorization poor was 1. In can be concluded that, the biggest categorization was fair. It improved 2 students than table categorization in pre-test.

The researcher only compared the students' score of Post-Test because the pre-test score of experimental and control group were normal and homogeneous. The researcher compared students' score post-test both of group that consisted of highest score in post-test, lowest score and the mean score of each group from students' score in post-test to know whether the students' comprehension was getting down, same or different. The result of difference of statistical data in post-test of experimental and control group could be seen in the table below:

No	Name	Gender	Score experimental	No	Name	Gender	Score control
1	AEP	P	71	1	AAP	P	69
2	ARD	L	71	2	AA	P	67
3	AD	L	70	3	AIE	L	62
4	ANF	P	77	4	AR	P	66
5	CTD	P	74	5	ATH	L	68
6	DU	P	79	6	ARB	L	74
7	DAQ	P	74	7	ATP	P	70
8	DPK	P	73	8	CPA	P	69
9	DVY	P	70	9	DFAN	P	61
10	ENZ	P	72	10	DPR	P	71
11	INH	P	78	11	DFH	P	71
12	INA	P	74	12	EAS	P	72
13	JP	L	72	13	FSA	L	68
14	KR	P	73	14	IHW	L	73
15	LM	P	76	15	MT	P	59
16	MS	P	72	16	MK	L	65
17	MSF	P	64	17	MRMA	L	61
18	MCAK	P	72	18	MMA	L	70
19	MNE	L	68	19	NFR	P	71
20	MRD	L	71	20	HAA	P	70
21	NSA	P	72	21	PAF	P	70
22	NPL	P	66	22	RYP	L	70
23	NAC	P	65	23	RLAS	L	61
24	OPA	P	74	24	RB	L	69
25	RAW	P	76	25	SHSTA	P	67
26	SAP	P	74	26	STA	L	66
27	SAS	L	56	27	SAP	P	66

28	STAG	L	77	28	SDS	P	63
29	SHL	P	77	29	SDS	P	74
30	SAIWS	P	71	30	SDA	P	68
31	SD	P	75	31	SAM	P	62
32	SS	P	66	32	SBA	P	66
33	TRACA	P	74	33	TP	P	60
34	VPP	L	75	34	TBS	L	64
35	VSM	P	72	35	YYF	P	64
36	WRW	P	70	36	YASP	P	77
SUM			2591	SUM			2424

**Table 4.12 The Score of Post-Test of Both Classes**

**Table 4.13 The Score of Post-Test of Both Classes in statistics**

**Statistics**

	Post-test experimental	Post-test control
N Valid	36	36
N Missing	0	0
Mean	71,97	67,33
Std. Error of Mean	,750	,732
Median	72,00	68,00
Mode	72	70
Std. Deviation	4,501	4,395
Variance	20,256	19,314
Range	23	18
Minimum	56	59
Maximum	79	77
Sum	2591	2424

Based on the table above, it can be seen the difference of the students' score in post-test of experimental and control group in writing recount text were taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp and without using peer assessment through WhatsApp (conventional peer assessment) to increase

student's writing in writing recount text. In the statistic of experimental group showed that the minimum score was 56 and 59 in control group. the maximum score in the experimental group was 79 and 77 in control group and the means of experimental group was 71,97 and 67,33 in control group. And standard deviation was 4,501 in experimental group and 4,395 in control group.

The result above showed that the experimental group was higher than the control group. It showed that there was significant difference between the class were taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp and without using peer assessment through WhatsApp (conventional) to improve students' ability in writing recount text in 10<sup>th</sup> grade SMA Negeri 1 Kauman Tulungagung. In other words, the using of peer assessment through WhatsApp to improve students' ability in writing recount text in 10<sup>th</sup> grade SMA Negeri 1 Kauman Tulungagung.

## **B. The result of Normality and Homogeneity Testing**

In this sub chapter, the researcher presented and discussed the result of normality and homogeneity testing using SPSS 20.0. Calculating normality is used to know the data has been normal distributed or not. Meanwhile, homogeneity is used to make sure whether the sample data is homogeneous or not. Homogeneity test is used to test whether the data from the two groups have the same types in order that the hypotheses can be tested by T-test.

### **1. Result of Hypothesis testing**

In this study to measure the normality testing, the researcher used SPSS 20.0 One Sample Kolmogrov – Smirnov by the value of significance

( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05. The total sample of this research was 72 so, the researcher Kolmogorov-Smirnov. Because the sample is huge.

Basic decisions in making normality testing were as follows:

- If the significance value > 0.05, the data was normal distributed
- If the significance value < 0.05, the data did not have normal distribution.

The result of normality testing in this study can be seen as below:

**Table 4.14**  
**Normality Testing of Experimental Group**  
**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Pre-test experimental	Post-test experimental
N		36	36
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	65,97	71,97
	Std. Deviation	5,804	4,501
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,128	,164
	Positive	,122	,076
	Negative	-,128	-,164
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,768	,987
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,598	,284

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

**Table 4.15**  
**Normality Testing of Control Group**  
**One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test**

		Pre-test control	Post-test control
N		36	36
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	62,28	67,33
	Std. Deviation	4,688	4,395
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,086	,092
	Positive	,086	,082
	Negative	-,076	-,092
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,518	,553
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,951	,920



- a. Test distribution is Normal.
- b. Calculated from data.

In the table 4.14 it showed that the *Asymp. Sig.* (2-tailed) was  $0,598 > 0,05$ . It meant the data of pre-test in experimental group was normal distributed. Then, the sig of post-test was  $0,284 > 0,05$  it meant the data was normal distributed.

In the table 4.15 it showed that the *Asymp. Sig.* (2-tailed) was  $0,951 > 0,05$ . It meant the data of pre-test in control group was normal distributed. Then, the sig of post-test was  $0,920 > 0,05$  it meant the data was normal distributed. It can be concluded that both classes have normal distribution.

## 2. Result of homogeneity testing

Homogeneity testing was intended to know whether the variance of data was homogeneous or not. It was used to know the similarity of the two conditions or population. In this case to measure the homogeneity testing, the researcher analysed the sample by using SPSS 20.0 (ANNOVA). The value of significance ( $\alpha$ ) was 0.05. Basic decisions making in homogeneity testing were as follows:

- If the significance value  $> 0.05$ , the data distribution was homogeneous
- If the significance value  $< 0.05$ , the data distribution was not homogeneous

The data can be seen below:

**Table 4.16**  
**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Pretest

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1,129	1	70	,292

Table 4.16 showed the data homogeneity of pre-test in experimental and control group. it was homogeneity because the sig. 0,292 > 0,05. It meant the sig was bigger than 0,05. In conclusion, the data was homogeneity.

**Table 4.17**  
**Test of Homogeneity of Variances**

Posttest			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
,444	1	70	,507

The value sig that showed in table 4.15, the data of post-test in experimental and control group was 0,507 > 0,05. It meant the data was homogeneity because the sig bigger than 0,05. According to the data showed in table 4.14 and 4.15 both classes, the data qualified to be analyzed.

### C. Hypothesis Testing

This study is conducted to know whether there is significant difference score of 10<sup>th</sup> grade students at SMA Negeri 1 Kauman Tulungagung in academic year 2019/2020 on writing recount text before and after being taught by using Peer Assessment through WhatsApp.

The hypothesis of this study are:

- a. If  $P\text{-value} \leq \alpha$ , the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and the alternative ( $H_a$ ) is accepted. It means that there is a significance difference score in writing recount text of the students taught by using peer assessment through

WhatsApp and those taught by using a conventional peer assessment without using WhatsApp.

- b. If P-value  $> \alpha$ , the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted and the alternative ( $H_a$ ) is rejected. It means there is no significance difference score in writing recount text of the students taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp and those taught by using a conventional peer assessment without using WhatsApp.

**Table 4.18 The Result of Analyzing Independent Sample T-test**

		Independent Samples Test								
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
score post-test	Equal variances assumed	,444	,507	4,425	70	,000	4,63889	1,04842	2,54788	6,72990
	Equal variances not assumed			4,425	69,960	,000	4,63889	1,04842	2,54786	6,72992

The table 4.18 as the result of compared the post-test of experimental group and control group. Then, the data computed with SPSS 20.0 tested by Independent sample test. Based on the table of t-test in the earlier, it showed that Df value was 70 and sig (2-tailed) value was 0,000. To know the significant

difference score, sig (2-tailed) value necessary to be compared with the significance level 0,05. It revealed that  $0,000 < 0,05$ . It meant that the sig (2-tailed) less than significance level 0,05 and the difference is significant. Since 0,000 is smaller than the  $\alpha = 0.05$  the null hypothesis saying that there is no significant difference score in writing recount text of the students taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp and those taught by using a conventional peer assessment without using WhatsApp is rejected. And the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) saying that there is a significance score in writing recount text of the students taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp and those taught by using a conventional peer assessment without using WhatsApp is accepted.

#### **D. Discussion**

After conducting the research proved that the peer assessment through WhatsApp was effective to improve the students' ability in writing recount text. It can be seen from the score mean score of pre - test was 62,28 and the post-test score was 67,33. The gain of the mean score in control group was 5,15. While in the pre-test of experimental group the mean score was 65,97 and the mean score of post-test was 71,97. The gain of the mean score in experimental group between pre and post-test was 14,00. It showed that the gain of the mean score in the experimental group got higher score than control group.

Related to the statistic calculation of Independent Samples T-test by using SPSS 20.00, the result of sig. (2-tailed) showed that the significant value was

0,000. It was smaller than the significance level ( $\frac{1}{20}$ ) 5% or 0,05. It meant that there was significant difference score before and after being taught by using Peer Assessment through WhatsApp. In other words, the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there is significance difference score in writing recount text of the students taught by using peer assessment through WhatsApp and those taught by using a conventional peer assessment without using WhatsApp.

Next, the use of peer assessment through WhatsApp in writing recount text was effective. It can help them to grade their friend's writing form through WhatsApp. By implementing peer assessment, it will help the students to improve their skill especially in writing recount text. It supported by Hylad (2004) said that in order to improve writing ability, the students should be able to assess and edit their own and peer's work.

They can conduct peer assessment inside the class or outside the class even far or near. The statement of Gon and Rawekar (2017:23) state that WhatsApp has advantages over other technological tools employed by the education system, such as low cost, simplicity, accessibility, and efficiency. In this digital era 4.0, media such as WhatsApp crucial role both in social life or in the education. By using WhatsApp the students can connect each other through internet. Mostly students in SMA Negeri Kauman Tulungagung have a smartphone and the school facilitated by internet.

The using of WhatsApp as the medium to help teaching and leaning process can make the student feels enjoy and relax in the class. It also strengthened by statement of Mhandeni and Mwakapina (2016:83) students are always worried

of making mistakes as they learn, but WhatsApp makes them feel relaxed among friend. Not also those advantages, WhatsApp is also helpful in conducting peer assessment. The students can connect each other others even though outside the class. So, it makes the students easy in implementing peer assessment anywhere and anytime. It confirmed theory by Berger (2011) also argue that using the media in teaching English better realization of “Anywhere and Anytime”.

So, all the society in the school can access the internet to support teaching and learning. It really helpful both teacher and students. That are the reasons of the improvement of the students’ score in writing recount text by conducting Peer Assessment From through WhatsApp. From the finding research, it can be concluded that conducting Peer Assessment through WhatsApp can develop the student’s score in writing recount text.

The result of this research was also similar to the previous studies. The first was the research from Qory (2018) entitled “*The Effectiveness of Peer Assessment through WhastApp on The Students’ Writing Descriptive Text of First Grade Students’ at Sman 1 Tulungagung*”. From the result of her research, it revealed that Peer Assessment through WhatsApp on The Students’ Writing Descriptive Text was effective. The writer found several differences in the first previous study, such as writing skill and sampling. The prior researcher used peer assessment through WhatsApp on the student’ writing descriptive text and the sampling is random. Its mean, the students had the same chance to be selected. But, the step in applied the peer assessment was the same way. In this research,

the focus on recount text and used purposive sampling technique in term suggestion by eligible person in the school.

The second was research from Awwaludin, A. (2012) entitled “*The Effectiveness of Peer Assessment Through Facebook Towards Students’ Writing Skill in Narrative Text*”. His research showed that using media could develop students’ in writing skill. The writer also found several differences between this research that were about the media and writing skill. The prior researcher used Facebook as the media to be applied on students’ narrative writing. In this step, the researcher used WhatsApp in conducting peer assessment to improve students’ ability in writing recount text. So, the skills were difference between prior study and this study.

It can be concluded that the effectiveness of peer assessment through WhatsApp was effective to be used in teaching writing especially in writing recount text. It were proved by several research and also the theories from the experts that mentioned in the previous. The research finding of this research also said that by conducting Peer Assessment through WhatsApp can develop students’ score in writing recount text of 10<sup>th</sup> grade at SMA Negeri 1 Kauman Tulungagung.