

## LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 4.1 The effect of types of homework assignments on students' learning outcomes in SMAN 1, SMAN 2, and SMAN Medan, Academic Year 2014-2015 ( $F= 56,38$ ; $P= 0.00$ .....	61
Figure 4.2 Comparison of the results of students' posttest score between control (assigned with paper based homework) and treatment group (given with mobile homework/ MH). .....	61
Figure 4.3 The Ability in answering C1 (Knowledge) and C2 (comprehension) questions between students' who were assigned with 'mobile homework' and those who were given with 'paper based' homework ( $U = 5,060.00$ ; $P = 0.55$ ).....	62
Figure 4.4 Comparison of the results of students 'Ability in answering C1 (Knowledge) and C2 (comprehension) questions between .....	62
Figure 4.5 The effect of types of homework assignments on students' ability in answering C3 (Application) and C4 Analysis-Synthesis) between students' who were assigned with 'mobile homework' and those who were given with 'paper based' homework ( $U = 3, 130.00$ ; $P = 0.00$ )	64
Figure 4.6 Comparison of the results of students 'ability in answering C3 (Application) and C4 (Analysis-Synthesis) between control (assigned with paper based homework) and treatment group (given with mobile homework/ MH) .....	64
Figure 4.7 The effect of types of homework assignments on students' ability in answering C5 (Evaluation) and C6 (Creation) between students' who were assigned with 'mobile homework' and those who were given with 'paper based' homework $U = 3, 643.00$ ; $P = 0.00$ ).....	65
Figure 4.8 Comparison of the results of on students' ability in answering C5 (Evaluation) and C6 (Creation) between control (assigned with paper based homework) and treatment group (given with mobile homework/ MH).....	65
Figure 4.9 The effect of types of assignments on students' weekly homework average score in SMAN 1, SMAN 2, and SMAN 4 Medan, Academic Year 2014-2015 ( $U = 3, 194.00$ ; $P = 0.00$ )...	68
Figure 4.10 Comparison of the results of students' weekly homework average scores between control (assigned with paper based homework) and treatment group (given with mobile homework/ MH).....	68
Figure 4.11 The effect of types of assignments on students' homework quality average scores in SMAN 1, SMAN 2, and SMAN 4 Medan, Academic Year 2014-2015 ( $U = 1, 090.00$ ; $P = 0.00$ )...	69
Figure 4.12 Comparison of the results of students' homework quality average scores between control (assigned with paper based homework) and treatment group (given with mobile homework/ MH).....	69

Figure 4.13 The Average scale of students' homework quality analyzed form 7 aspects of students' homework quality assessments, (HQ1: Assignment completeness; HQ2: Students work neatness and organization; HQ3: Understanding of Topics; HQ4: Answer Accuracy ;HQ5: Academic Integrity; HQ6: Time for Submission; HQ7: Format of submitted work) .....	70
Figure 4.14 The correlation between learning outcomes (X) and weekly homework average score (Y) in SMAN 1, SMAN 2, and SMAN 4 Medan, Academic Year 2014-2015 ( $r_s = 0.47$ ; $P < 0.00$ ).....	73
Figure 4.15 The correlation between learning outcomes (X) and average homework quality sores (Y) in SMAN 1, SMAN 2, and SMAN 4 Medan, Academic Year 2014-2015 ( $r_s = 0.49$ ; $P < 0.00$ ).....	73
Figure 4.16 The rate of homework submission between classes. Students of experimental and control group were placed into three category of homework submission; complete (full), partial, and zero submission, during the four times homework distribution..	78
Figure 4.17 The rate of homework submission between treatments.....	79