Jurnal P4I

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GOOGLE CLASSROOM TEACHING TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' COGNITIVE-BASED ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION WRITING SKILL

SUMARTINI
Open University
e-mail: sumartinismkn7@smkn7bandung.sch.id

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to explore whether there are some differences in the students' analytical exposition writing skills taught by using Google Classroom and conventional technique, to analyze some differences in the student's analytical exposition writing skills between field-independent cognitive learning and field-dependent of cognitive learning style, and to find out whether there is a relationship between the Google Clasroom technique and the students' cognitive learning style. The research used a true experimental method by pretest, posttest and questionnaire. There are two classes involved in the research achievement, taught by Google Classroom and by conventional technique. The researcher only took randomnly 74 of 430 students, consisting of 37 students for experimental class who are taught by using Google Classroom and 37 students for controlled class, who are taught by conventional technique. The data analyzed in this research was gathered through test for experimental class, and controlled class. The result gained from the research proved the differences in the students' analytical exposition writing skills taught by using Google Classroom and conventional technique. It was supported by average of experimental class improving higher 79,56 to 84,78 than the controlled class from 79,94 to 81,08. The significant level of test can be seen from the normality test is 0,357. It shows that the ability of analytical exposition writing skills by using Google Classroom better than conventional technique. The differences in the students' analytical exposition writing skills between field-independent and field-dependent of cognitive learning style can be seen from the average of the significance score is 0,00. It means the null hypothesis is accepted and there was no significance relationship between class using Google Classroom and cognitive independent field learning style class. Thus, the teaching technique by using Google Classroom is effective in improving on students' cognitive–based analytical exposition writing skill.
Keywords: *Google Classroom, writing skill, analytical exposition and cognitive style.*

INTRODUCTION

Knapp & Watkins (2005, p. 17) state that when teaching students to write in English, it is important for the teacher and the student to have a fundamental understanding of how English operates and functions as writing and how is considerably different from speech. When students first start to write, their attempts strictly feature their expression. Consider the types of writing students first learn to control; texts like recounts, which are formally similar to expression. The importance of writing can be seen in people's daily activities when they need to write short text such as memos, invitation letters, sympathy notes, brochures, articles, business letters, application letters. It also goes to the genre text like recount text, narrative text, report text, analytical exposition, and many others. Most of them always feel difficult when students are asked to write them. Their understanding of English writing especially, they have to apply it by giving some ideas through their arguments. In learning about arguments, it is more focused on the students in Senior High School. (Knapp & Watkins, 2005, p. 193) state that the argument phase follows the thesis. With texts produced by former authors, this may consist of only one point and translation. Most times, it contains this in one sentence. As students develop in writing arguments, this stage becomes more complex. It is the 'core' of the argument. The points may expand in number, along with feature in the translation. The ordering of the points or the logic

is very important for the effectiveness of the argument. Often, more mature authors will consist of a contradiction at this stage as a rhetorical device to position the reader.

The final stage of the exposition is the concluding statement where the statement reiterates the thesis, often literally, in the texts of younger authors. In more complex texts, it also provides a summary at this point. New paragraphs have marked each of these stages. It is useful to encourage students to arrange their texts in paragraphs to highlight the various generic stages of the exposition (Knapp & Watkins, 2005, p. 188). In school, writing arguments focus on two key types: exposition and discussion. In teaching this genre, therefore, it is advisable, to begin with, exposition, a text type that focuses students on the purpose of argument; putting forward a viewpoint and providing evidence to support it. Based on the curriculum, the material of arguments related to the text. It teaches the texts in Senior High School are recount, narrative, procedure, exposition, and descriptive. One of the text types which is taught in the eleventh-grade of Senior High School is analytical exposition. In learning this material, students sometimes find difficulties in understanding the requirements of analytical exposition. It can be seen from the students' scores of English proved last semester the eleventh-grade students in the school where the researcher is doing research at the intermediate level of proficiency in English. The students' scores of English proved it in the school's last semester report card in the third semester. Based on the last semester in 2019/2020 shows that the number of students who reach the minimum completeness criteria for an English subject at Secondary School has not reached 75 percent. One of the media that facilitates students to learn in here by online is Google Classroom. The advantages of GCR are easily accessible, the task can be checked based on the time, the students need not use papers, their files can be put in Google Drive, the students missing in the task, can be seen, and the teachers and students can take part in an online classroom discussion. Meanwhile, facilitating students with questions may also enhance students' thinking skills in delivering responses orally by creating interactions in class as stated by Chen cited in Nova (2020, p.3). It is the same as stated by Osman (2017, p. 3) that GCR application depends on Google documents and cloud storage and the Gmail email service to complete the required functions, research and follow-up with students, this service also provides tools for teachers to continue to enable them to publish assignments, homework, questionnaires and tests for students and get answer for them directly. It intends to Google services from these circumstances that diminish the use of paper products and keep part of the education process to a fully electronic through the creation of jobs through the service and sent to students and receive answers and corrected and the results recorded it all electronically.

The students who are ready to take part in GCR. They are field-independent and field-dependent students. In solving a problem or finishing the task, the field- independent students will do well if I give them freedom. Sims & Sims (2006, p. 4) stated that the field-independent is more analytical and independent than the field-dependent learners. These students are characterized by an analytical approach and their ability in problem solving. They are more intrinsically motivated and task-oriented in their learning processes. In GCR, the field-independent students can do writing well because they can express their ideas through their writing. They do the task-based on the time given in GCR. Also Sims & Sims (2006, p. 4) add that the field-independent are more concentrated and disciplined learners. Pithers (2002, p. 4) stated that a cognitive style based on a global analytical continuum. He determines the extent to which individuals can overcome the effects of disturbing background elements (fields) as they try to distinguish relevant aspects of certain situations. The more independent the person is from the disturbing element, the more analytic. They say people who can operate analytically to become field independent, and people who operate more globally are field-dependent. In a cognitive approach, I see students as active participants in the learning process, learning to use a variety of mental strategies to resolve the language system.

Google Classroom Teaching Technique

Google Classroom Teaching technique is a technology in the classroom application that is designed to provide a single dashboard to unite instructors' use of other Google applications (Janzen, 2014) cited in Mafa (2018, p. 4). Google Classroom's goal is to facilitate paperless communication between teachers and students to streamline educational workflows. Classroom allows teachers to create classes, post assignments, organize folders, and view work in real-time. One of the best features is that it fully integrates the Classroom with all other Google applications, so students and teachers can share information instantly instead rather than having to go through various obstacles to send job. In short, Google Classroom offers a one-stop platform to facilitate digital production, workflow, and communication between teachers and students.

Learning Conventional Technique

Conventional learning can be interpreted as learning for teachers to students according to daily habits. Conventional learning is patterned specifically for each material. Usually teachers are only limited by applying the lecture method, questions and answers, and assignments. With conventional learning monotonous learning situations that can cause boredom for students (Li, 2016, p. 3). Learning techniques that are classified as conventional are learning techniques that have been relatively great common. Among them are lectures, questions and answers, group discussions, demonstration assignments, role playing, practice, visitation, and internships. Although the techniques are techniques that have been used by people for a long time, they can still be used today. That is because there are certain advantages to the techniques in question (Sunendar, 2018, p. 66).

METHOD

The type of research used is true experimental. *The true experimental research was analysed using the scoring technique to assess the students' writing as Heaton (1990, p. 146) said that classroom evaluation of learning is best served through analytic scoring.* This study aims to explain whether there are differences in the analytical exposition writing skills of students who are taught using Google Classroom and conventional techniques, to explain whether there are differences in students' analytical exposition writing skills between field-independent cognitive learning styles and field-dependent cognitive learning styles, and to explains whether there is an interaction between Google Classroom techniques and students' cognitive learning styles.

The subjects in this study were students of SMK Negeri 7 Bandung for the 2020/2021 academic year, by taking two classes as samples and in determining which of the seven classes were selected as samples. The data research method used is cluster random sampling. Two classes were selected as samples of this study, based on the consideration that each class had 37 students. While the participants in this study were 74 students who took English class. The two classes are XI APL 4 and XI APL 5, both of which have 37 students. XI APL 4 as the experimental class and XI APL 5 as the control class.

The data collection technique uses a scoring technique to assess student writing. To see differences in students' analytical exposition writing abilities before and after using Google Classroom, researchers used Man Whitney. Then, to analyze the questionnaire, this study used descriptive procedures, the Guttman scale, and the Kuder–Richardson scale. There are two types of these statistics; parametric statistics and nonparametric statistics. Parametric statistics are used to test population criteria by using sample data if it is normally distributed or not. While nonparametric statistics are used to test the distribution. In this study, parametric statistics consist of a t-test, but to meet the requirements, the data must be tested with a

normality test. Then, non-parametric statistics were used to see the difference between students' analytical exposition writing on the posttest or pretest. Correlation analysis using Pearson correlation, is used to see if there is a significant relationship between classes using Google Classroom and cognitive independent field learning style classes.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
FINDINGS

In the research results to answer some of the problems that have been discussed in the previous chapter, namely how students' analytical exposition writing skills are taught using Google Classroom and conventional techniques, how different are students' analytical abilities? exposition writing skills between field-independent and field-dependent cognitive learning styles and how the Google Classroom technique relates to students' cognitive learning styles.

Based on the results of normality test is obtained that both of classes are from samples that are not normally distributed, so the difference test of two averages uses *Mann- Whitney* test by hypothesis taken as follows:

H_0: $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ (there is not significant difference of the initial ability of analytical exposition between *Google Classroom* class and the conventional class).

H_1 : $\mu_1 \neq \mu_2$ (there is significant difference of he initial ability of analytical exposition between *Google Classroom* class and the conventional class). Testing criteria: if the score of sig. > 0,05 so H_0 is accepted. The following is a table using the test results of *software SPSS 24.*

Table 1. The Test Difference of Two Averages Pretest Data Analysis Capabilities of
Google Classroom Class and Conventional Class

Class	Sig.	Interpretation
Google Classroom	0,357	H_0 accepted
Conventional		

As shown in table 1.1, it can be seen that the table above the score is sig. 0,357 > 0,05. According to testing criteria that H_0 is accepted, means that there is not significant difference of the initial ability of analytical exposition between *Google Classroom* class and the conventional class. It shows that both of classes have the same initial ability of analytical exposition.

Table 2. Correlation Test Google Classroom Class and Cognitiove of Independent Field
Learning Style Class

Class	*Statistic*	Sig.	Interpretation
Google Classroom	0.233	0.200	H_0 is accepted
Cognitive of Independent Field Learning Style			

Based on the table 1.2, it can be seen that the significance score is 0.200. The score is more than 0.05 thus H_0 is accepted. It means, there is not significance relationship between Google Classroom Class and cognitive of independent field learning style class.

The processing quantitative data using assistance of *software microsoft excel 2013* and *SPSS 24*. To complete the results of the analysis, a comprehensive description of the performance of students during learning took place and at the time of the pretest-posttest. The

following is the result of descriptive recapitulation of the research results shown in the following of table 1 and 2:

Table 3. Results of the Value of the Analysis Capabilities of Google Classroom Teaching Teachnique of Anlytical Exposition and Conventional Teaching Technique

Ability	Statistics	*Google Classroom* Teaching Technique			Conventional Teaching Technique		
		Pretest	*Posttest*	N	*Pretest*	*Posttest*	N
Analytical Exposition	$\bar{x}$	80.21	84.76	38	80.84	81.08	38
	Maks	88	93		88	88	
	Min	75	80		78	78	
	Sd	3.410	3.183		2.510	2.487	

It can be seen from Table 1.3 that the average score of the pretest learning classes using Google Classroom and conventional classes learning have the ability to analyze exposition is not much different. It shows that the initial abilities of the two classes are the same. Meanwhile the average posttest scores of the two classes were quite far apart for the ability to write exposition analysis. It shows that the ability to analyze the exposition of learning classes using Google Classroom is better than conventional learning classes.

Tabel 4. Results of the Value of the Ability of Exposition Analysis of Independent Field of Cognitive Learning Style and Field Dependent of Cognitive Learning Style

Ability	Statistics	Independent Field of Cognitive Learning Style			Field Dependent of Cognitive Learning Style		
		Pretest	*Posttest*	N	*Pretest*	*Posttest*	N
Analytical Eksposition	$\bar{x}$	79.56	84.78	32	79.94	80.38	32
	Maks	85	90		85	84	
	Min	75	80		78	78	
	Sd	2.313	3.210		1.664	1.601	

It can be seen also from table 1.4 shows the same results. The average score of class pretest using independent field cognitive learning style and dependent field cognitive learning style the ability of exposition analysis ability is not much different. For the posttest scores the ability of independent field of cognitive learning style exposition analysis skills is better than the dependent field of cognitive learning style. However, to see whether the difference is significant or not, a statistical test is performed.
.

DISCUSSION
Students' ability to write analytical exposition texts can be seen from the pretest conducted in the experimental class and the control class. In the pre-test, all students wrote about exposition analytical texts based on the themes provided through learning media using Google classroom with online and conventional techniques which were carried out directly in the classroom. The results of the study show that by using Google Classroom media students can express their ideas freely, learn together with classmates and teachers. This is supported by Knapp & Watkins (2005:18) that teaching writing is giving students the knowledge to become

effective users of written English. When students write about knowing, they can explore several ideas, review, attach, rearrange, and revise. *It is supported by Knapp & Watkins (2005:18) that teaching writing, therefore, is giving students the knowledge to become effective users of written English. When students write about the knowing, they can explore some ideas, review, attach, rearrange, and revise.* In addition, Google Classroom for students is easily accessible anywhere and anytime. They are more active in the learning process. *Janzen (2014) supports that Google Classroom is easily accessible and usable by both instructors and students in both face-to-face and fully online learning environments.* Whereas by using conventional techniques students feel bored because there is no variation. *This is supported by Li (2016, p.3) that conventional learning is a monotonous learning situation that can cause boredom for students*. The teacher becomes the center of learning and asks students to be active in the learning process.

At the end of the research meeting, students in all classes were given a posttest to find out the students' final ability after learning. The posttest results showed that students' analytical exposition skills in the Google Classroom experimental class had a higher average than the conventional control class. *Shaharanee (2017) stated in his previous study that Google Classroom as a learning initiative. Most students satisfy with the Google Classroom's tool that was introduced in the class where all ratio above averages.* It is known that the average analytical exposition pretest ability for the Google Classroom experimental class was 80.21 while the conventional technique for the control class was 80.84. However, after getting the treatment, the average posttest ability of the analytical exposition class for the Google Classroom experimental class was 84.76, while the average for the conventional technique control class after the treatment was 81.08. It can be seen that the posttest in Google Classroom is bigger than the conventional class. *It is suitable as Amilia (2016) said that the treatment, the result of the independent sample t-test used by the researcher, showed that there was a significant difference between the post-test of the control group and the experimental group.*

The results from the tests revealed that students made significant improvements in their post writing. There was a positive significant difference between their pre-writing and post-writing and it was confirmed by the t-test results using SPSS software. It was concluded that Google Classroom is effective for improving students' analytical exposition writing skills. The student portfolio shows several improvements made by students at each stage of implementing Google Classroom. In each activity, students showed several different responses but most of them showed positive responses which brought them to a conducive learning environment which also contributed to the improvement of their writing skills. They learn to be brave, confident, and active during teaching and learning activities.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the data analyses in the previous chapter in this study, several conclusions can be drawn. First, there are significant differences in the student's analytical exposition writing skill taught by Google Classroom and the conventional technique. The test is significant, it can be seen from the normality test is 0,357. It means *Google Classroom* class is more significant than conventional class. It means after having much learning, the ability of analytical exposition uses *Google Classroom* learning significantly better than the conventional learning. Second, there are significant differences in student's analytical exposition writing skills between those with the field-independent and field-dependent cognitive learning style. Therefore, it is done by one side testing, so the result is $\frac{sig\ (2-tailed)}{2} = 0,000$. The score is less than 0,05, which means H_0 is rejected. Thus, the student's posttest score of cognitive field-independent class is better significantly than the cognitive field-dependent class. It means after learning, "The ability of analytical exposition of cognitive field independent class is better

significantly than cognitive field dependent class". Third, there is no significant relationship between Google Classroom and the cognitive of independent field learning style class. It can be seen that the significance score is 0.200. The score is over 0.05 thus H_0 is accepted.

REFERENCES

Ary, Donald., Jacobs, Lucy, Cheser., Sorensen, Chriss., & Razaveh, Ashgar. (2010). *Introduction Research Design.* Canada. Nelson Education, Ltd.

Herman A. Witkins., & Goodenough, Donald P. (1976*). Field dependence and Interpersonal Behaviour*. Educational Testing Service. Priceton. New York.

Janzen, M. (2014). Hot Team: Google Classroom. Retrieved April 16, 2019, from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327417783_Effectiveness_of_Google_Classroom_Teachers'_Perceptions.

J.B, Heaton. (1990). Longman Handbooks for Language Teacher. *Writing English Language Text.* Produced by Longman Group (FE) Ltd. Published in Hongkong.

Karacam, Sedat. (2015). Independent Cognitive Styles and Motivational Styles on Students'Conceptual Understanding about Direct Current Circuits. *Asia-Pacific Forum on Science Learning and Teaching,* Volume 16, issue 2, article 6, p.1.

Knapp, P., & Watkins, M. (2005). Genre, Text, Grammar Technologies for Teaching and Assesing Writing. Sidney: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Li, Yap Wei. (2016). Transforming Conventional Teaching Classroom to Learner-Centered Teaching Classroom Using Multimedia-Mediated Learning Module. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology, Vol 6, No.2: 1-8*

Mafa, K.R. (2018). *Capabilities of Google Classroom as a Teaching and Learning Tool in Higher Education,* (November), 3-8.

Osman, Shahinaz Abdeirahmah. (2017). The Impact of Google Classroom Application on The Teaching Efficiency of Pre-Teachers.

R.T, Pithers. (2006). Cognitive Learning Style: A Review of the Field Dependent – Field Independent Approach. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training.*

Shaharanee, Izwan Nizal., Janil, Jastini Mohd., & Rodzi, Sarah Syamini Mohamad (2017). The Application of Google Classroom as A Tool for Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Telecommunication, Electronic and Computer Engineering Vol. 8 No. 10.*

Sims.R.Ronald & Sims.J.Serbrenia. (2006). Learning Styles and Learning: A key to Meeting the Accountability Demands in Education. Nova Science Publishers. New York.

Sinta, Dona Kumala., & Filia., (2020). Improving Student's Arguments through Collaborative Learning. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, Vol 10, No.2.*

Sunendar, Dadang., & Iskandarwassid. (2018). *Strategi Pembelajaran Bahasa*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.