EEJ 6 (2) (2016)

English Education Journal

http://journal.unnes.ac.id/sju/index.php/eej

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LISTING AND COMPARING TASKS IN TEACHING TRANSACTIONAL CONVERSATION FOR REFLECTIVE AND IMPULSIVE STUDENTS (The Case of 10th Graders of SMA IbuKartini Semarang in the Academic Year of 2015/2016)

Yan Hardiansyah✉ & Dwi Anggani Linggar Bharati

English Language Education Postgraduate Program Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Article Info

Article History:
Received 10 August 2016
Accepted 15September 2016
Published 20 November 2016

Keywords:
Listing Task, Comparing Task, Reflective students, Impulsive Students, Speaking Skill, Transactional Conversation.

Abstract

This study was an attempt to test speaking task modelsin teaching transactional conversation for students who have different cognitive styles. These tasksare expected to be appropriatespeaking task models for the students in other to they engage effectively in learning English.This study investigated the effectiveness of listing and comparing tasks in teaching transactional conversation for reflective and impulsive students, the significant differences of achievement between the students by using the listing task and the comparing tasks, discover the significant interaction among the tasks and the cognitive styles in affecting students' speaking achievement, and the students' feedback in learning transactional conversation by using the tasks. The research method of this study was quantitativeby using 2x2 factorial experimental research design. The method of collecting the data was observing the cognitive styles of the students, conducting the pre-test and the post-test, and finally givingquestionnaires. After that, the method of analyzing the data used *t*-test, ANOVA, and triangulation. The results of this study can be concluded that the use of listing task was effective in teaching transactional conversation for the reflective and impulsive students. The result showed that the level of significance by using the listing task and comparing tasks for the reflective and impulsive students was significant because the p values ware smaller than 0.05 (5%). In other hand, the significant difference of achievement between the students by using the listing and comparing tasks were not significant because the p values were greater than 5%. Then, the significant of interaction among the tasks and the cognitive styles in affecting the students' speaking achievement was not significant because the f-account (1.830) was lower than the t-table (4.098) or it can be assumed that the tasks and the cognitive styles did not affect the students' achievement significantly.

✉ Correspondence:
E-mail :yanhardiansyah040191@gmail.com
Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang, 50233

p-ISSN 2087-0108
e-ISSN 2502-4566

INTRODUCTION

Speaking tasks frequently deal with making a dialogue and performance in which teachers mostly expect their students tobe able to speak confidently, meaningfully, and grammatically. But what madeworse is when a teacher asks students to do a task/activity as the same as a provided dialogue and they utter each sentences without having any ideas what they are saying about. Such task is a poor task model. It does not have any clear phases and particular objective, encourage students actively, give them opportunities to produce English (e.g., asking and giving information) more often, make their own language/ideas, and acquire the language they have learnt for communicating with their classmate even the teachers.It is obvious that a language is used as communication (Widdowson, 1978: 16; Richard, 1985: 208; Celce-Murcia, 2000: 18; Willis & Willis, 2001: 173).

Teachers commonly confront students who have different language metacognition to do the provided tasks by the teacher. It is because every students have their own habitual strategies that are generalized across tasks (Snow, Corno, & Jackson, 1996).One hand, there is an individual student does tasks slowly, make fewer mistakes and spend extra time analyzing the problem and detailed presented. In other hand, there is an individual student does tasks quickly with little concern for accuracy and takes more time to reach decision that is called impulsive students (Kagan, 1966: 17-18; Bazargani&Larsari, 2013: 198). The term of 'task' might have many definitions from some experts. There is an approach tends to task-based, that is Task Based Learning (TBL) / Task Based Language Teaching (TBLT). Unfortunately, many of researchers who had conducted TBLT resarches did not focus a particular task when they were undertaking the approach so they still did not find which tasks were effective for the students in learning foreing language. Other findings some researchers regarding with reflective and impulsive (cognitive styles) learners in language learning that English is a foreign language. They focused on reading comprehension, listening comprehension, and writing. *Reading comprehension*, it has been found that learners who are conceptually reflective tend to make fewer errors in reading than impulsive learners (Jamieson, 1992; Kagan, 1996); *Listening comprehension*, reflective students are significantly better listeners than impulsive ones (Sedarat, 1996). *Writing*, reflective students gain better results in writing a composition than impulsive ones (Azizi, 1990).Therefore, I intend to test the effectiveness of Listing and Comparing Tasks which coined by Willi& Willis (1996) for teaching speaking of transactional conversation for reflective and impulsive students.

METHODOLOGY

I used 2x2 factorial research design. The population in this study was derived from senior high school students with have different cognitive styles and the size of population was small-scale. The samples were the 10^{th} reflective and impulsive students of SMA IbuKartini Semarang and this experimental study took two classroomswhich consisted of 20 students. Method of collecting the data has some phases in conducting the reseach such as observation two classes and students' cognitive styles, conducting pre-test, giving treatments, conducting post-test, and giving questionnaires. Besides that, method of analyzing the collected data used*t-test* to see the level of significance of the tasks, ANOVA for analyzing the two different groups (reflective and impulsive students) and the interaction among the tasks and cognitive styles, and triangulation to compare the result of the study with the teacher's point of view toward the effectiveness of the tasks in teaching transactional conversation for the students.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The first alternative hypothesis (Ha) dealt with comparison between the achievement in the pre-test and post-test for the reflective students using the listing task. The obtained statistics were given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for the Reflective Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Achievement	Pre-Test	74.00	10	6.146	1.944
	Post-Test	90.50	10	7.619	2.409

The calculation can be seen in the table, the mean of achievement in the pre-test for the 10 participants who form the reflective group is 74.00. And the mean of the post-test is 90.50. The obtained values (see table 2) were t= -8.337, df= 9. P<.000 (2-tailed).

Table 2. Paired Sample T-test for the Performance of Reflective Group

			Achievement
			Pre-Test – Post-Test
Paired Differences	Mean		-16.500
	Std. Deviation		6.258
	Std. Error Mean		1.979
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-20.977
		Upper	-12.023
T			-8.337
Df			9
Sig. (2-tailed)			.000

Based on the explanation above, the level of significance was 0.05. The result of the test showed that the t-table (0.05.9) was 2.262 and the t-account was -8.337. It can be said that the t-account was lower than the t-table or Ha was accepted. Meanwhile based on the probability p *value* was 0.00 or lower than 0.05. It meant the level of significance was highly significant. Therefore, the result demonstrated that Ha was accepted, the use of listing task was effective for the reflective students because the data was significant after the treatment.

The second alternative hypothesis (Ha) deals with a comparison between the achievement in the pre-test and post-test for the impulsive students using the listing task. The obtained values obtained were t= -12.075, df= 9. P<.000 (2-tailed).

Table 3. Paired Sample T-test for the Performance of Impulsive Group

			Achievement
			Pre-Test – Post-Test
Paired Differences	Mean		-22.500
	Std. Deviation		5.893
	Std. Error Mean		1.863
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-26.715
		Upper	-18.285
T			-12.075
Df			9
Sig. (2-tailed)			.000

The result of test above showed that the t-table (0.05.9) was 2.262 and the t-account was -12.075. It can be said that the t-account was lower than the t-table or Ha was accepted. Meanwhile, based on the probability p *value* was 0.00 or lower than 0.05. It meant that it was highly significant. Therefore, the result demonstrated that the Ha was accepted, the use of listing task was effective fortheimpulsive students.

The third alternative hypothesis (Ha) compares between the achievement in the pre-test and post-test for the reflective students using the comparing task. The obtained values were given in the table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for the Reflective Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Achievement	Pre-Test	71.50	10	7.835	2.478
	Post-Test	88.50	10	7.091	2.242

The result can be seen in the table, the mean of achievement in the pre-test for the 10 participants who fare the impulsive group was 71.50 and the post-test was 88.50. The obtained values (see table 5) were t= -6.530, df= 9. P<.000 (2-tailed).

Table 5. Paired Sample T-test for the Performance of Reflective Group

			Achievement
			Pre-Test – Post-Test
Paired Differences	Mean		-17.000
	Std. Deviation		8.233
	Std. Error Mean		2.603
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-22.889
		Upper	-11.111
T			-6.530
Df			9
Sig. (2-tailed)			.000

The result of test showed that the t-table (0.05.9) was 2.262 and the t-account was 6.530. It can be said that the t-account was lower than the t-table or Ha is accepted. Meanwhile, based on the probability p *value* is 0.00 was lower than 0.05. It meant the level of significance was significant. Therefore, the result demonstrated that the Ha was accepted, the use of comparing task was effective for the impulsive students. It can be concluded that the achievement was significant after the treatment.

The fourth alternative hypothesis (Ha) compares between the achievement of the impulsive students in the pre-test and post-test by using the comparing task. The values were given in the table 6.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for the Impulsive Group

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Achievement	Pre-Test	65.00	10	6.236	1.972
	Post-Test	83.00	10	7.149	2.261

The result can be seen in the table, the mean of achievement in the pre-test for the 10 participants who are the impulsive group was 65.00 and the post-test was 83.00. The obtained

values (see table 7) were t= -11.784, df= 9. P<.000 (2-tailed).

Table 7. Paired Sample T-test for the Performance of Impulsive Group

			Achievement
			Pre-Test – Post-Test
Paired Differences	Mean		-18.000
	Std. Deviation		4.830
	Std. Error Mean		1.528
	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	Lower	-21.456
		Upper	-14.544
T			-11.784
Df			9
Sig. (2-tailed)			.000

The result of test showed that the t-table (0.05.9) was 2.262 and the t-account was-11.784. It can be said that that the t-account was lower than the t-table or Ha was accepted. Meanwhile, based on the probability p *value* was 0.00 or lower than 5% which means it was significant. Therefore, the Ha was accepted or it can be said that the comparing task was effective for the impulsive students as well.

The fifth alternative hypothesis (Ha) is to prove whether there is significant difference of achievement between the reflective and impulsive students using the listing task. To test it, the achievement in the post-test was statistically calculated through the independent *t*-test. These groups had mean difference, 2.50 and its difference was -4.616 to 9.61 (see *lower* and *upper*). In other side, the table summarizes the obtained values from the t-test. The p value of post-test (sig (2-tailed) = .470) was greater than the level of significance 5% (0.05). It means that the Ho was accepted, there was no significant differences of achievement between the reflective and impulsive students using listing task.

Table 8. T-test for the Performance of Reflective and Impulsive Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Mark	Equal variances assumed	.040	.843	.738	18	.470	2.500	3.387	-4.616	9.616
Assumed	Equal variances not assumed			.738	17.997	.470	2.500	3.387	-4.616	9.616

The sixth alternative hypothesis (Ha) is actually similar with the experimental class 1 but it applied the comparing task for the students. These groups had mean difference, 5.50 (88.50-83.00) and its difference was -1.190 to 12.190 (see *lower* and *upper*). Then, the table (4.28)

showed that p value of post-test (sig (2-tailed) = .101) was higher than the level of significance 5% (0.05). It means that Ho was accepted, there was no significant differences of achievement between the reflective and impulsive students by using the comparing task.

Table 9.T-test for the Performance of Reflective and Impulsive Groups

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Mark	Equal variances assumed	.090	.768	1.727	18	.101	5.500	3.184	-1.190	12.190
	Equal variances not assumed			1.727	17.999	.101	5.500	3.184	-1.190	12.190

The seventh alternative hypothesis (Ha) is to discover the significant interaction among the tasks and the cognitive styles in affecting students' speaking achievement. The Table figured out the mean difference of the class 1 was 89.00 and the class 2 was 85.75. The difference was 3.25 (89.00-85.75). Then the statistical analysis of homogeneity (see table 4.31) figured out the p value was 0.830 or greater than significance test 5% (0.05). It means that test of homogeneity of variances (class 1 and 2) were same.

Table 10. Descriptive Statistics for the Reflective and Impulsive Groups

Achievement

					95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
1	20	89.00	7.712	1.724	85.39	92.61	75	100
2	20	85.75	7.482	1.673	82.25	89.25	75	100
Total	40	87.38	7.678	1.214	84.92	89.83	75	100

Table 11. ANOVA for the Performance of Reflective and Impulsive Groups
Achievement

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	105.625	1	105.625	1.830	.184
Within Groups	2193.750	38	57.730		
Total	2299.375	39			

The result above showed that the F-account was 1.830 and F-table was 4.098. It means that there was no significant interaction among the tasks and the cognitive styles in

affecting students' speaking achievement or it is called 'no interaction effects'. In this study, it can be assumed that the tasks and the cognitive styles did not affect the students' achievement.

Discussion

The result showed that the listing task was effective becausethe task stimulated the students to list numerous appropriate words that they sought and practice how to pronounce the words. Commonly, the students found the words through experiencing, asking, discussing to their pair and looking up on dictionaries (printed and digital), they listed them on their notes then they took them to make their dialogues. Indeed, it was one of benefits that task-based pedagogy bring to the classroom, an emphasis on learning to communicate in the target language through interaction of peers (Nunan, 2004: 1). Another advantage is the task reduced the students' hesitation to speak because they have chances to practice their dialogue so that, their accuracy got better. One interesting thing to see was they discussed what situation they wanted to make and they made longer dialogues in good order. In contrast, based on Jhang's(2012:145) states that conversation is messy and does not follow any rules, and this fallacy has contributed to the marginalization of conversation in the field of materials design. Meanwhile, in the comparing task, the result showed this task commonly emphasized the different and similar points. It was fruitful for the students to talk the common points for instance comparing the differences and similarities some pictures. Although the task focused on comparing the common points, it forced the students to discover vary words to compare one picture to another so that the students could have more chances to speak up. Other side, they also made some mistakes but the reflective students were more accurate and fluency and most of the students' conversations had less various situations than the listing task. But the listing task and the comparing task made the students to ask and give information although they did little bit equal problem in making few mistakes in term of grammatical form and tended to spoken language. If we relate with one of main points about task-based is its primary focus is on meaning rather than grammatical form (Ellis, 2003: 16 &Nunan, 2004: 4) and conversation is (primarily) spoken (Thornbury& Slide, 2007: 25). It also indicated that the listing and comparing tasks referred to communicative tasks. If we relate it with what Thornbury (2005: 79) has characterized wholly communicative activities in a number of specific ways: 1) the motivation of the activity is to achieve some outcome, using language; 2) the activity takes place in real time; 3) achieving the outcome requires the participants to interact; i.e. to listen as well as to speak.

From the result, there was a new finding regarding the previous researchers about reflective and impulsive students in language skills except speaking. The result revealed in this study that reflective students were better in speaking than impulsive students. In this case, teachers should tolerate the mistakes in the speaking task done by the students who have different cognitive styles. According to Witkin et al. (1977: 10), the cognitive styles as characteristic self-consistent mode of functioning which individuals show in their perceptual and intellectual activities.

CONCLUSIONS

The result of this research confirms that the use of listing task was effective for teaching speaking of transactional conversation for reflective students. The use of listing task was effective for teaching speaking of transactional conversation for impulsive students. The use of comparing task was effective for teaching speaking of transactional conversation for reflective students. The use of comparing task was effective for teaching speaking of transactional conversation for impulsive students. There was no significant differences of achievement between reflective and impulsive students using the listing task. There was no significant difference of achievement between reflective and impulsive students using the listing task. There was no significant difference of achievement between reflective and impulsive students using the comparing task. There was no significant

interaction among the tasks and the cognitive styles in affecting students' speaking achievement. There was effective feedback in learning transactional conversation by using the tasks for reflective and impulsive students.

This study is expected to be worthy for English teachers' awareness, especially in distinguishing or selecting on appropriate tasks for the reflectivity and impulsivity cognitive styles. So by having the knowledge about understanding of the nature of human differences in learning (the cognitive styles), it will assist them designing and finding proper tasks effectively. It would be nice if another tasksare investigated. Therefore, another researchers are open to further research with a different tasks or larger sample will might show other results.

REFERENCES

Bazargani, D., T. &Larsari, V., N. 2013. Impulsivity-Reflectivity, Gender and Performance on Multiple Choice Items. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World* 4 (2): 194-208.

Celce-Marcia, M. 2001. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. New York: Dewey Publishing Services.

Celce-Marcia, M. 2007. *Rethinking the Role of Communicative Competence in Language Teching*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Eggin, S. 2004. *An introduction to systemis fumctional linguistics*. New York: Continuum.

Ellis,R. 2003. *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis,R. 2012. *Language Teaching Research and Language Pedagogy*. Oxford: Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Jhang, C., J. 2012. Conversation Analysis in Task-Based Instruction – A Pedagogical Activity Design Model. Osaka: *The Asian Conference on Education*. Official Conference Proceeding.

Kagan, J. 1966. Reflection – Impulsivity: The Generality and Dynamics of conceptual Tempo. *Journal of Abnormal psychology* 71 (1): 359-364.

Nunan, D. 2004. *Task-Based Language Learning. Cambridge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rezaei, A., Boroghani, T. & Rahimi, M. A. 2013. Reflectivity/Impulsivity as an Important Individual Factor and Effectiveness of Awareness Raising Activities.*Sino-US English Teaching* 10 (4): 281-286.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thornbury, S. 2005.*How to teach speaking*. England: Pearson Educated Limited.

Thornbury, S. & Diana, S. 2007.*Conversation: From Description to Pedagogy*.

Widdowson, H.G. 1978. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Willis, J. 1996. *A framework for task-based learning*. London: Longman.

Willis, D. 2003. *Rules, Patterns and Words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, D. & Willis, J. 2007. *Doing Task-based Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.