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**INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, the development of technology influences all human life to do anything in their daily activities. The world now has been getting into the new era called industry 4.0, which all things conducted by people are based on the digital form. The development of digital has empowered all people to think globally and act locally which must be able and ready to be part of it. These effects in any fields or sectors of human life including in education.

There are many embodiments of technology that can be applied in education sector, such as Google Classroom, Zoom Cloud Meeting, and Duo lingo, etc. Those are online applications that help teachers and students in learning. Google Classroom is an online application promoted by Google for schools that intended to facilitate teachers in assorting, creating, and valuing the task in a paperless way (Negara, 2018). Zoom Cloud Meeting is a perfect tool for those who are on the way and still need to have meeting. It has special group service of massages in real time and secure recording of sessions (Archibald, Ambagtsheer, Casey, & Lawless, 2019). Duo lingo is a useful language application that gives learners the systematic and practical steps to know a new language on their own.

The use of Google Classroom is the point of the discussion in the education issues. It is an online device generated to help teachers and students in conducting teaching and learning process. The initial release of Google Classroom is on August 12, 2014. Negara (2018) explains that Google Classroom is an application to help teachers or lecturers in creating, sharing, collecting paperless assignment, assessing student assignment, which complemented by automatic document storage. In addition, it can be utilized as a media of interaction between students and teachers, organizing classes while in distance class or paperless tasks can be held without being bound by space and field. The learning and teaching process is organized and conducted through google platform which is integrated with an email, then each student is demanded to possess one email account to participate an online learning.

The existence of Google Classroom as an instructional medium is a new thing in education sector which is expected to make learning and teaching process easier especially in conducting teaching recount text. This aims to make students comfortable in learning and teaching process without any inserted assignment during the class is on. Writing define as one of the productive skills that also known as the most difficult skill among other skills. This is caused by the complex activity in the writing such as; organize the ideas or information, avoid ambiguity, grammatical use, and choose an appropriate vocabulary. This is in line with what was explained McLean (2011) that effective writing involves organization in the development of ideas, argumentation and information, a great exactness to keep away from ambiguity, a intricacy of grammatical use, and selecting an appropriate vocabulary.

Based on the pre-observation in Senior High School X the writer found that there are problems commonly face students in writing as following; they feel hard to obtain an idea to write because they dislike reading. Another thing may contribute to the difficulty is to compose writing because of lack of vocabulary. Next, they frequently get confused to construct sentences with correct grammar. The last, the teacher used monotonous method, as a result, students easily get bored.

This study used Google Classroom as the instructional medium in teaching writing recount text. It is applied out of the classroom which is intended to make students feel free, have fresh ideas and get much more inspiration to do the work. This also involves Information and Communication (ICT) development in teaching and learning process by using Google Classroom among students or with the teachers without any bound by time and space.

As stated above, this study aims to open up broad knowing of the Google Classroom effect on teaching writing in EFL Classroom. By the light the theoretical background the current research is led by the following statement of the problems are:Is Google Classroom effective to enhance students’ writing skill in recount text? What is the writing performance achieved by students? To answer the two questions, this research was based on the theoretical language such as writing, recount text, and Google Classroom.

**Writing**

Writing is a productive skill that focuses on how to produce language than receive it. Harmer (2012) found that writing is continuing activity which comes from the result of writer’s mind about what they want to say and how to say it. The writer should read and make correction of their writing after finished writing text. Therefore, writing is not only need one step but it need several steps such as; planning, drafting, editing, and final version (Harmer, 2012). However, good writing commonly attract a reader to pay attention to the text. So the students need to use correct grammatical rules, choose suitable vocabularies, and consider the coherent and cohesion then it will afford good sentences with clear meaning (Wijaya, 2014).

The teacher should understand how to teach four skills in English language especially in teaching writing. Kurotun (2015) explained that there are many reason to teach writing to students such as; 1) Reinforcement is process of acquiring language by students in a purely oral/aural way. 2) Language development is the process of how students arrange their writing via the writing itself. When they are writing, they create the text to be explorer with the language. 3) Learning style is some students are possible to discover easier way to acquire language by looking and listening. Writing is appropriate for students because it make them think thing slowly in producing language. 4) Writing is a skill. It is important as another skills, students need to understand how to write an emails, letters and reports.

**Recount Text**

A recount text is a text that retells something happen in the past events, usually the writer retells their experiences or events happen in the past. A recount text is similar to a narrative text. It has not any complication part, whereas narrative text. This is in line with what was assumed by Wisdhawan and Kumalarini (2014) that recount text is a text which retells everything happen in the past events. It can be conducted with experiences and activities happened in the past. It has three types; the first, personal recount the example, diary and personal letters/email, the second is factual retelling such as science research, and newspaper report, the third is imaginative recount.

**Google Classroom**

Google Classroom is considered as one of the best features provided by Google web for improving teachers’ and students’ performance in teaching and learning activities. It is included as a set of useful features to make it an ideal device that can be used by the scholar, it can save much times and still keep class is on. Iftakhar (2016) explained that Google Classroom is the best features provided by the Google platform that can be used by the scholar to get information about the class material with the use of much times saved. It can be accessed by everyone on their smart phone, tablet, laptop, and personal computer. It is available for every electronic with Google Application for education, a free installation of productivity device including Gmail, Drive, and Documents.

Google Classroom is completely simple to be used. Here are all available features integrated and correlated between one and others. The teachers facilitated to keep all files in the Google Drive, they able to give rank and level, attach pdf, photo, video, voice note, document or any links for instructional purposes. From Google Classroom the teacher able to send the assignment to all learners’ at the same time (Iftakhar, 2016).

The other things may contribute the advantage of Google Classroom are spending time more saved. Next, the teachers can give instruction for class and share the paperless assignment, comment, and scoring of students’ work at the same time then it can minimize wasting time when the class is on. Furthermore, the teachers more focused in explaining the material during the class (Iftakhar, 2016).

Google Classroom has many advantages as explained above, but it also has disadvantages even it is equipped with good features. The disadvantages namely limited integrated options to Google Calendar which may contribute any problems with handling assignment deadlines and material by the time decided. When Google Classroom is integrated to Google Calendar the students currently get notifications of every single assignment which equipped by the alarm of their phones. (Pappas, 2015)

**Previous Studies: Google Classroom** **in EFL**

In the previous study, Negara (2018) said that Google Classroom is an application created to help teachers or lecturers in creating, sharing, collecting paperless assignment, assessing student assignment, which complemented by automatic document storage. In addition, it can be utilized as a media of interaction between students and teachers, organizing classes while in distance class or paperless tasks which can be held without being bound by space and field. Based on the data obtained by researcher 23 students (42.6%) stated strongly agree and 31 students (57.4%) agreed. From this calculation index, it was found that 88.51% was in the excellent category. It can be inferred that respondents strongly agree that Google Classroom is very worthwhile in learning activities.

In addition, (Shaharanee, Jamil, & Rodzi, 2016) who conduct research in the same field said that their finding shows most of the learners feel satisfied and successful in their process of studying with the use of Google Classroom as media tool of teaching. This indicates that the tool used for the instructional media is effective as an active learning device. Based on the data obtained by the researcher, the Google Classroom apps would switch the conventional to an online instruction with the designing of educational support programs that enable the students achieve through an online system (Shaharanee et al., 2016).

The next researcher who conduct in the same field was Harjanto and Sumarni (2019) which reveals the teacher’s perspective on the use of Google Classroom as a learning media. This study was qualitative research with the use of interview method. It was involved seven high school teachers who have actively implemented Google Classroom in their teaching at least 1 year. The results of this study displayed that the teachers apply it as a facilitation tool for organizing student’s task, managing classroom, and facilitating student’s interaction. It was also very helpful to carry out their virtual learning.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This study was a quantitative research with specific design namely pre-experimental research. The researcher concerned to one case that currently exists in the field of education. The design of this study used one-group pretest-posttest. The researcher conducted the research without control group and this was the weakness of pre-experimental research because the lack of a comparative group to control for incompatible variables that might contaminate the result of the study (Latief, 2015).

Here are the steps of the research. First, the researcher prepared the instrument, then the researcher used teachers’ journal as pre-test. Secondly, she was giving treatment in order to find out the effectiveness of using Google Classroom in writing performance of recount text. After giving the treatment, she was providing the post-test that related to recount text. This was conducted to know the students’ achievement after the group is treated. The last step was giving a questionnaire to the learners’ to collect the data in depth about the effectiveness of using Google Classroom to support the data collection.

**Population and Sample**

The population of this study was tenth grade students of SMA in the West Surabaya, in the academic year of 2019-2020 that consists of 5 classes such as: X IPA 1, X IPA 2, X IPA 3, X IPS 1 and X IPS 2. Every class consists of 30 students except IPS 2 that consist of 28 students. Then, the total population is about 148 students. However, they have the same chance to be the object of this study.

The obtained result of interview basis the researcher to choose one class that undertook difficulties in writing and they needs some treatments in the learning process namely XIPS 1 that consist of 30 students. In determining the sample of this study, the researcher preferred to use purposive sampling by choosing 15 students which was categorized into students with under *Ketuntasan Belajar Minimal* (KBM) and over the KBM score.

**Instrument**

In this study, the data collection technique were test and questionnaire. The purpose of the test was to obtain the data of students’ writing performance in teaching writing recount text with Google Classroom as the instructional medium. The purpose of questionnaire was to obtain the data in-depth about the effectiveness of using Google Classroom as the instructional medium in teaching writing recount text. It consist of 10 questions with closed answer. The questionnaire which was given to students are related with to the performance of platform during the implementation toward teaching and learning process. This aims to figure out the students’ respond with the use of Google Classroom.

The researcher handed over the students with post-test after giving treatment since pre-test could not be performed because of the pandemic situation. Then it was replaced by teacher’s journal. The post-test of this study is essay of students’ writing recount text. It was delivered in Google Classroom by the following instruction; write one of the following topics such as; historical event, folk tale, a legend, or personal experience which consist at least three paragraph and 200 words by notes or word application then resend it to the teacher through Google Classroom. After finishing the post-test, students were requested to fulfill the questionnaire to support data of the research.

**Data Analysis**

This study used *Paired-Sample T-Test* as data analysis technique and the data analyzed by using IBM SPSS Statistics 23. This test aimed to find out whether there are differences between the result of pre-test and post-test of students’ score.

**Validity and Reliability**

In this study, testing validity of students’ essay of recount text and questionnaire was chosen by the researcher as the validity of instrument. It was a test with a score in the form of continuum. Djaali and Muljono (2014) explained that if the item score is continuum, then to test the validity of the item test by calculating the product moment correlation coefficient between the item score and the total score.

Jonhson and Christensen (2016) explained that reliability shows the stability or consistency of the test scores. In this study, the researcher preferred to use *Alpha Cronbach* method. It is a reliability test continuum with a range score of 0-10 or 0-100.

**Normality Test**

Ananda and Fadhli (2018) explained that normality test is purposed to point out whether the data distribution is normal or not. This was important to be recognized dealing with the provision of parametric statistical test selection requiring data to be normally distributed.

The researcher used SPSS to measure the normality test namely *One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test* and *Shapiro-Wilk*. The basic formula is if the significance value is higher than 0.05 then the data have a normal distribution. On the contrary, if the significance value is less than 0.05 then the data is not normal.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

The following section point out the research findings and discussion. For research findings there were some data that will be presented such as; data description, validity, reliability, data analysis, hypothesis testing, and discussion.

**Research Findings**

**Data Description**

The data description will be presented three kinds of data; the score of pre-test, post-test, and the result of questionnaire. The test was analyzed using writing scoring rubric.

Table 1. Pre-test and Post-test Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Name | KBM | Pre-test | Post-test |
| 1 | S1  | **77** | 76 | 0 |
| 2 | S2 | **77** | 76 | 83 |
| 3 | S3  | **77** | 76 | 75 |
| 4 | S4 | **77** | 78 | 92 |
| 5 | S5 | **77** | 90 | 92 |
| 6 | S6 | **77** | 86 | 92 |
| 7 | S7 | **77** | 77 | 0 |
| 8 | S8 | **77** | 80 | 83 |
| 9 | S9 | **77** | 76 | 83 |
| 10 | S10 | **77** | 78 | 83 |
| 11 | S11 | **77** | 88 | 92 |
| 12 | S12 | **77** | 86 | 92 |
| 13 | S13 | **77** | 76 | 83 |
| 14 | S14 | **77** | 78 | 83 |
| 15 | S15 | **77** | 78 | 83 |
| N=15 | Total | 80.93 | 94 |
|  | Mean | 79.93 | 74.4 |

Based on the preceding table, it displayed the students’ pre-test with the highest score was 90 and the lowest was 76. While, the students’ post-test with the highest score was 92 and the lowest was 0. After gained the students’ score the data was analysed using IBM SPSS Statistic 23. The following table presents the result statistic and frequency score in pre-test.

Table. 2 Statistics Result in Pre-test

|  |
| --- |
| **Statistics** |
| N | Valid | 15 |
| Missing | 0 |

Table 3. Frequency of Score in Pre-test

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid** | 76 | 5 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 33.3 |
| 77 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 40.0 |
| 78 | 4 | 26.7 | 26.7 | 66.7 |
| 80 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 73.3 |
| 86 | 2 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 86.7 |
| 88 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 93.3 |
| 90 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the preceding table, it can be seen that 5 students obtained under KBM score. The scale is 33,3% which indicates that several students experienced an obstacle in the process of writing performance. They are difficult to construct the sentences into paragraph which is caused by the lack of concept or ideas. In addition, 10 students received over KBM score that indicates that they did not get any serious problem in the process of writing performance. The following table presents the result statistic and frequency score in post-test.

Table. 4 Statistics Result in Post-test

|  |
| --- |
| **Statistics** |
| N | Valid | 15 |
| Missing | 0 |

 Table 5. Frequency of Score in Post-test

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Frequency** | **Percent** | **Valid Percent** | **Cumulative Percent** |
| **Valid** | 0 | 2 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 13.3 |
| 75 | 1 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 20.0 |
| 83 | 7 | 46.7 | 46.7 | 66.7 |
| 92 | 5 | 33.3 | 33.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 15 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

From the table above, 1 student has score 75, 7 students have score 83, and 5 students have score 92. This can be seen that 2 students did not collect their assignment as a result the researcher gave them 0 score. It can be concluded that there were 3 students who have under KBM score and 12 students who have over KBM score.

 Table 6. Questionnaire Result

Based on the findings in the preceding chart, it showed students’ responses about the implementation of Google Classroom as teaching and learning medium. The researcher counted the percentage number of students’ response is average which means they respond is a neutral. It can be inferred that students behave fairly balanced in responding to the implementation of Google Classroom. It means, they did not experience any difficulties in using Google Classroom as a medium in teaching recount text.

**Validity and Reliability**

To analyze the data of validity of student’s essay writing recount text, the researcher applied validity test of *Product Moment* through IBM SPSS Statistics 23. If significance value (2-tailed) < 0.05 and Pearson correlation has positive value, it indicates the question is valid. Whereas, if the significance value (2-tailed) > 0.05 and Pearson correlation has negative value, it indicates the question is not valid. The result can be seen in the following table:

 Table 7. Validity Result

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Item\_1** | **Item\_2** | **Item\_3** | **Skor\_total** |
| Item\_1 | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .862\*\* | .768\*\* | .932\*\* |
| Significance. (2-tailed) |  | .000 | .001 | .000 |
| N | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Item\_2 | Pearson Correlation | .862\*\* | 1 | .890\*\* | .970\*\* |
| Significance. (2-tailed) | .000 |  | .000 | .000 |
| N | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Item\_3 | Pearson Correlation | .768\*\* | .890\*\* | 1 | .934\*\* |
| Significance. (2-tailed) | .001 | .000 |  | .000 |
| N | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Skor\_total | Pearson Correlation | .932\*\* | .970\*\* | .934\*\* | 1 |
| Significance. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 |  |
| N | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| \*\*. Correlation is significance at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). |

From the preceding table, N = 15 means there are 15 samples of the research. The total score of significance (2-tailed) item 1, 2 and 3 was 0.000. It indicates that the questions are valid. In accordance to the formula, if significance value < 0.05 it means the question is valid whereas, if the significance value > 0.05 it indicates the question is not valid.

To analyze reliability of test, the researcher used reliability test of *Alpha Cronbach* method through IBM SPSS Statistics 23. The basis for decisions in *Alpha Cronbach* reliability testing is: If the value of *Alpha Cronbach* > 0.60 it indicates the question or questionnaire is reliable. Whereas, if the value of *Alpha Cronbach* < 0.60 it indicates the question or questionnaire is not reliable. The result of reliability test can be seen in the table below:

 Table 8. Reliability of Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Case Processing Summary** |
|  | N | % |
| Cases | Valid | 15 | 100.0 |
| Excludeda | 0 | .0 |
| Total | 15 | 100.0 |
| a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .939 | 3 |

From the table above, it can be summarized that the total score of reliability test was 0.939 > 0.60 indicates that the test was reliable.

To analyze the data of validity of questionnaire the researcher used test validity of *Product Moment* through IBM SPSS Statistics 23. If significance value (2-tailed) < 0.05 and Pearson correlation has positive value, it indicates the questionnaire is valid. Whereas, if the significance value (2-tailed) > 0.05 and Pearson correlation has negative value, it indicates the questionnaire is not valid. The result can be seen in the table below:

 Table 9. Validity of Questionnaire Result

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | $$r\_{xy}$$ | **Sig. (2-tailed)** | $$r\_{tabel}$$ | **Status** |
| 1 | 0.578 | 0.024 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 2 | 0.744 | 0.001 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 3 | 0.513 | 0.051 | 0.514 | Invalid |
| 4 | 0.584 | 0.022 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 5 | 0.752 | 0.001 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 6 | 0.714 | 0.003 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 7 | 0.600 | 0.018 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 8 | 0.767 | 0.001 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 9 | 0.588 | 0.021 | 0.514 | Valid |
| 10 | 0.787 | 0.021 | 0.514 | Valid |

From the preceding table, N = 15 means there are 15 samples and 10 questions of the questionnaire in this research. The total score of significance (2-tailed) from Q1 (0.024), Q2 (0.001), Q3 (0.051), Q4 (0.022), Q5 (0.001), Q6 (0.003), Q7 (0.018), Q8 (0.001), Q9 (0.021), and Q10 is (0.001). It indicates that the questions from Q1, Q2, Q4 until Q10 are valid because the significance value <0.05. In contrast, the significance value of Q3 was 0.051 or more than 0.05 that means the question was not valid.

*Alpha Cronbach* method through IBM SPSS Statistics 23 was used to analyze the reliability of questionnaire. The basis for decisions in *Alpha Cronbach* reliability testing is: If the value of *Alpha Cronbach* > 0.60 it indicates the question or questionnaire is reliable. whereas, if the value of *Alpha Cronbach* < 0.60 it indicates the question or questionnaire is not reliable. The result of reliability test can be seen in the table below:

 Table 10. Reliability of Questionnaire Result

|  |
| --- |
| **Case Processing Summary** |
|  | N | % |
| Cases | Valid | 15 | 48.4 |
| Excludeda | 16 | 51.6 |
| Total | 31 | 100.0 |
| a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reliability Statistics** |
| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
| .851 | 10 |

From the table above, it can be summarized that the total score of reliability questionnaire 0.851 which was higher than 0.60 it indicates that the questionnaire was reliable.

**Normality Test**

The researcher used IBM SPSS Statistics 23 to measure the normality test namely *One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test* and *Shapiro-Wilk*. SPSS has criterion in normality test. If the significance value is higher than 0.05, it indicates the data has a normal distribution. Conversely, if the significance value is less than 0.05 it means the data is not normal. The result of normality test can be seen in the table below:

 Table 11. Normality Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Tests of Normality** |
|  | Kolmogorov-Smirnova | Shapiro-Wilk |
| Statistic | df | Significance. | Statistic | Df | Significance. |
| Post\_test | .411 | 15 | .000 | .549 | 15 | .000 |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |

The table above indicates the significance (2-tailed) of Kolmogorov-Smirnov was 0.000 < 0.05 which mean that the data is not normally distributed, and significance (2-tailed) of Shapiro-Wilk was 0.000 < 0.05 which mean that the data is not normally distributed. From the table above, it can be concluded that the data is not normally distributed and the Paired-Sample T-Test cannot be applied in data analysis technique. Combined with the previous sentence, one of the requirement to apply it the data must be normally distributed. As the alternative, the researcher used non-parametric statistics to analyze the data namely *Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test* by using IBM SPSS Statistics 23 to find out the hypothesis data whether any differences between the result of students’ pre-test and post-test score.

**Data Analysis**

The result of pre-test and post test are analyzed by using *Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test*. The result of questionnaire by using testing validity and reliability in IBM SPSS Statistics 23 to measure the effectiveness of Google Classroom to enhance students’ writing performance. The result can be seen at the following table:

Table 12. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

|  |
| --- |
| **Ranks** |
|  | N | Mean Rank | Sum of Ranks |
| Post\_test - Pre\_test | Negative Ranks | 3a | 10.00 | 30.00 |
| Positive Ranks | 12b | 7.50 | 90.00 |
| Ties | 0c |  |  |
| Total | 15 |  |  |
| a. Post\_test < Pre\_test |
| b. Post\_test > Pre\_test |
| c. Post\_test = Pre\_test |

 Based on the computation data of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test the values obtained are: negative ranks was (3) which indicates there are 3 students’ value decrease from pre-test to post-test, (12) positive ranks which indicate there are 12 students’ value increase from pre-test to post-test. The Mean rank was (7.50) whereas the sum of ranks was 90.00, and the ties was (0). This indicates that none of students get the same value in the score of pre-test and post-test.

**Hypothesis Testing**

This research applied two kinds of hypothesis: (1) Null hypothesis *(Ho)* mentions that there is no significant effectiveness value of students’ achievement on the writing performance of recount text by using Google Classroom. (2) Alternative hypothesis *(Ha)* mentions that there is effectiveness value of students’ achievement on the writing performance of recount text by using Google Classroom. The result can be seen in the following table:

 Table 13. Test Statistics

|  |
| --- |
| **Test Statisticsa** |
|  | Post\_test - Pre\_test |
| Z | -1.707b |
| Asymp. Significance. (2-tailed) |  .088 |
| a. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test |
| b. Based on negative ranks. |

From the previous table it can be seen that the data of significance (2-tailed) was 0.088 it indicates that the significance level higher than 0.05 (0.088>0.05). It means that the null hypothesis (*Ho*) was accepted and the alternative hypothesis (*Ha*) was rejected. The total Mean of students’ value before applying Google Classroom was 79.93 after implementing the treatment, the total Mean of students’ value was 74.40. This can be explained that there was no significant effectiveness value of students achievement on the writing performance of recount text by using Google Classroom for tenth grade students of Senior High School X in Surabaya. It showed that the use of Google Classroom was not effective in teaching writing.

The data obtained from the questionnaire showed that the students’ response is neutral. It means they respond behave fairly balance in the use of Google Classroom. They did not fell any difficulties in the implementation of Google Classroom as the instructional medium in teaching and learning process.

**Discussion**

**Effectiveness of Google Classroom**

Based on the results of this study in the previous section, the table of *Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test* statistics showed the significance level was 0.088. As a hypothesis requirements, when the significance level smaller than significance (0.05) which indicates that the null hypothesis (*Ho*) is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (*Ha*) is accepted. In contrast, if the significance value is higher than (0.05), it indicates that the null hypothesis (*Ho*) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis (*Ha*) is rejected. Based on the statement above, it can be inferred that the null hypothesis (*Ho*) was accepted while the alternative hypothesis (*Ha*) was rejected based on the result of significance value 0.088 > 0.05.

The result of this study was in line with Negara (2018) that Google Classroom is an online medium generated to help teachers or lecturers in creating task, sharing teaching material, collecting paperless assignment, assessing student duty, attributed by automatic document storage. In addition, it can be utilized as a media of interaction between students and teachers, arranging classes either in distance class or paperless tasks which can be held without being bound by space and time. On the other hand, Google Classroom did not affect well to the student’s writing product because this case was not a scope of Google Classroom to grow with, in term of psychological area to make them discipline in every single activity related to the academic assignment. In term of discipline, many students were late in submitting the assignment and eventually they ignored the duty though it was attributed by notification of due date and time. As a result, there were several assignments given by the teacher not handed in. This might be caused by factors; internal or external.

The internal factors caused by the lack of awareness from the students themselves, they did not care about that and get lack of motivation to do the assignment, while the researcher has warned to every single students through Google Classroom and WhatsApp Group. It was used as a communication medium to facilitate communication with students which provide free chat network services then it is more accessible and closer to their daily lives. On the other hand, the students experienced difficulties and felt hard to buy internet data with unlimited network because they did not have enough money while it was expensive for them. In addition, sometimes they got an internet error to explore this occurrence caused by signal error or power failure.

In conclusion, the implementation of Google Classroom as a medium in teaching writing recount text does not make a significant effect in the students’ writing product. In other words, Google Classroom only assist teachers and students to communicate the material and assignment between them. Furthermore, it might need more time, more effort, and more spirit for teachers and additional technique to enhance students’ ability in writing.

**The Students’ Writing Performance**

To investigate the students writing performance, the researcher used Brown (2003) writing performance theory. Brown (2003) explained that written performance divided into four categories such as; imitative category, intensive category, responsive category, and extensive category. The result of data can be seen in the table below:

**Table 14. The Students Writing Performance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Name** | **Writing Performance** |
| **Imitative** | **Intensive** | **Responsive** | **Extensive** |
| 1 | Student 1  |  - | -  | -  | -  |
| 2 | Student 2 |  - |  ✓ | -  | -  |
| 3 | Student 3  |   ✓ |  - | -  | -  |
| 4 | Student 4 |  - | -  | -  | -  |
| 5 | Student 5 |  - |   ✓ |  - | -  |
| 6 | Student 6 |  - |   ✓ | -  | -  |
| 7 | Student 7 |    ✓ |   |   |   |
| 8 | Student 8 |  - |   ✓ | -  | -  |
| 9 | Student 9 |   |   ✓ |   |   |
| 10 | Student 10 |   ✓ |  - | -  | -  |
| 11 | Student 11 |  - |   ✓ | -  | -  |
| 12 | Student 12 |  - |   ✓ | -  | -  |
| 13 | Student 13 |  - |   ✓ | -  | -  |
| 14 | Student 14 |   ✓ |  - | -  | -  |
| 15 | Student 15 |   ✓ |  - | -  | -  |

Based on the table, it can be observed that there 5 students got imitative category. This means that their writing performance were in the basic category which include an appropriate words, punctuation, and very brief sentences. Another finding that can be explained that there were 10 students who got intensive category. This indicates that the students writing has produced an appropriate vocabulary, arranging the sentences into good paragraph, and correct grammatical features.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results and discussion of the study, it can be summarized that there was no significant effectiveness value on students writing performance of recount text by using Google Classroom for Tenth Grade students of Senior High School X in Surabaya. Learning outcomes of students score that shown by the result of *Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test* the value of significance (2-tailed) was higher than significance level (0.088 > 0.05), then the Ho was accepted.

Furthermore, based on the result of a questionnaire the students behave fairly balanced in responding to the implementation of Google Classroom. It means that the students did not have any difficulty in using Google Classroom. However, in this study the students did not adapt well with the use of Google Classroom because they were usually late in submitting the assignment and ignoring it, then it contributed to few students missed it. This can be recognized from the record of post-test and several assignments delivered during the research.

Furthermore, based on the result of a questionnaire the students behave fairly balanced in responding to the implementation of Google Classroom. It means that the students did not have any difficulty in using Google Classroom. However, in this study the students did not adapt well with the use of Google Classroom because they were usually late in submitting the assignment and ignoring it, then it contributed to few students missed it. This can be recognized from the record of post-test and several assignments delivered during the research. From this statement it can be inferred that Google Classroom is not give a significant effect to students’ writing performance but its only help them to finish and collect the assignment without any bound by time and space.
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