INCORPORATING LS-BASED GROUPING IN CP OF TEACHING WRITING TO OPTIMIZE STUDENTS' INTERACTION AND WRITING ABILITY

Fefiyana, Ag. Bambang Setiyadi, Ari Nurweni
Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris FKIP Universitas Lampung
email: mrs.satria@gmail.com; Telp: 085768363409

Abstract: The aims of this research are to investigate the students' writing ability and interaction after incorporating learning style-based grouping in cooperation procedure of teaching writing. This research was carried out quantitatively and qualitatively and involved two classes who took English 1 subject as a compulsory subject at IBI Darmajaya. The two classes served as the experimental class 1 (X_1) and experimental class 2 (X_2). The used instruments were writing test, observation of documented videos, and learning styles questionaires that served as the important measument for grouping of both two experimental classes. It was found that there was a significant difference in the students' writing ability and their interaction between the two experimental groups after the implementation of incorporating learning style-based grouping in cooperation procedure of teaching writing. The findings prove that the implementation of heterogenous grouping based on learning styles benefits succesfully in optimizing students' writing ability and producing the constructive and promotive interaction.

Keywords: *Cooperation procedure, interaction, learning style-based grouping, writing ability.*

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengukur kemampuan menulis dan interaksi mahasiswa setelah diterapkannya system pengelompokkan berbasis gaya belajar (*learning style-based grouping*) dalam prosedur kerjasama (*cooperative procedure*) yang digunakan pada pengajaran kemampuan menulis (*writing*). Pendekatan kuantitatif dan kualitatif digunakan untuk meneliti dua kelas mahasiswa yang mengambil *English 1* sebagai mata kuliah wajib di IBI Darmajaya. Kedua kelas tersebut masing-masing berperan sebagai kelas eksperimen 1 (X_1) dan kelas eksperimen 2 (X_2). Instrumen penelitian yang digunakan mencakup tes kemampuan menulis, observasi video dokumentasi, serta serangkaian kuesioner *learning style* yang berfungsi sebagai dasar utama pengelompokkan mahasiswa di kedua kelas tersebut. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan adanya perbedaan signifikan pada kemampuan menulis serta interaksi antara kedua kelompok eksperimen setelah diterapkannya pengelompokkan berbasis *learning style*. Temuan ini membuktikan bahwa implementasi system pengelompokkan heterogen berdasarkan *learning style* sangat berperan positif dalam mengoptimalkan kemampuan menulis serta memacu interaksi yang konstruktif dan saling menguntungkan.

Kata kunci: *Interaksi, kemampuan menulis***,** *pengelompokkan berbasis gaya belajar, prosedur kerjasama.*

INTRODUCTION

Simply putting students in groups in cooperation procedure of cooperative learning did not guarantee positive results. One of the studies that found this kind of phenomena was a study conducted by Mahmoud (2014) who summarized his problems and challenges in applying cooperative learning in his study in which some students complained that members in their groups were somewhat inactive as well as indifferent when one of the group wanted to do the whole task or when members of the group found that a good chance to them to do nothing. Teachers could not simply place students together and expect them to work well with each other. One of central components—heterogeneity principle could be in place so that students could come to feel that they were positive contributors, not only to their teams, but to the class as a whole.

Most teachers or lecturers are faced with large heterogeneous classes, making it difficult to serve the needs of all students in the class. Cooperative learning takes advantages of this heterogeneity, by encouraging students to learn from one another and from more and less knowledgeable peers and they demonstrate more confidence in writing and decrease their apprehensions towards writing. In the respect to this problem, another strong justification could be made dealing with the way the teacher in putting the students into groups. There must be basic consideration to divide the students into small groups in order to meet real heterogeneity in the license to cooperative learning. Unfortunately, there is still no study which applies the measurements of the distribution of the students' learning style as the basic consideration and information to group the students in teaching writing through cooperative learning. So, the researcher assumes that the distribution of students learning style is needed before grouping the students. It will fulfill the need of making heterogonous group which will maximize the students' strengths as what had found by Melser as cited in Adodo and Agbayewa (2011) who stated students working in heterogeneous group increase in self-esteem and by Shield as cited in Adodo and Agbayewa (2011) who stated students' of all ability exhibited greater academic self confidence in heterogeneous group. Thus, it is assumed that by having high self-esteem and greater academic self-confidence, the students will have active interaction in groups of cooperation.

To respond the researcher's point of view above, Felder-Silverman learning style model was used as the basis for learning style measurement, which was assessed using Index of Learning Styles (ILS). This model was selected with consideration as stated by Litzinger et al. (2007) who stated that a reliable and valid instrument which measures learning styles and approaches could be used as a tool to encourage self-development, not

only by diagnosing how people learn, but by showing them how to enhance their learning. The information gathered through the students' distribution of learning style is one of consideration in grouping the students in teaching writing using cooperative learning. For the type of writing, descriptive was selected because the form of descriptive writing is principally present in most, if not all, forms of writing. It has been an inherent part of types of text such as narrative, exposition, and recount, and therefore, is likely to contribute to writing competence in general.

This study focused on the impact of using the cooperative language learning approach grouped based on the students' dominant preferences of their learning styles on developing students' writing ability and interaction inside an EFL classroom. Grouping the students based on their dominant preferences of learning styles which focused on their personality and interaction mode was considered more beneficial in teaching writing through cooperative learning activities. It was assumed that the previously random grouping of cooperative learning still gave actually the chance to have the homogenous groups otherwise the heterogeneity itself had been clearly defined.

Furthermore, the researcher suggested that what happened in the actual class of cooperative learning activities when the students did not want to cooperate and get the benefits of cooperative learning activities were because of the grouping procedure. Some students did not feel comfortable within the groups in some possibilities which needed to be solved. One of the possibilities that can be illustrated as the example is they meet the students which actually have the same personality in learning called learning styles in which strong active students meet the other strong active students in one group that make them compete each other to be the most dominant participant instead of working cooperatively and supportively each other. In the other hand, it is possible that the strong intuitive students meet the other strong intuitive students that make them work too far back from the topic because the characteristic of intuitive students is they like to concept many things, to plan, and even to predict the good concept but they hardly put the a lot of ideas into the "earth". They think much but they hesitate to make it concrete in paper or even only to write down their idea. They badly need the supplementary ability of the other learning styles spectrum; they are sensing students as their help. Sensing students do not like to think much about what behind the "wall", but they do something realistically. They directly put their idea ignoring whether it is true or not.

Based on the illustration above, it is clear that the heterogeneity should be defined first before grouping the students in cooperative learning activities in order to make the cooperative learning activities run smoothly based on its principles. In line with the background, the

researcher would like to seek answers to research questions presented as follows:

1. Which grouping of cooperation procedure in teaching writing optimizes students' writing ability?
2. Which grouping of cooperation procedure in teaching writing produces more students' interaction?

METHODS

This research used the design of *experimental groups pretest posttest design* (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 22). It took two classes which served as experimental class 1 (heterogeneous grouping) and experimental class 2 (homogeneous grouping). This research used both quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Both of them were partially used to answer two research questions. In the license to answer the first research questions, it needed quantitative analysis to see the comparison of the students' writing ability between two classes before and after treatments. Then, descriptive qualitative method of analysis was to see the students' interaction during the treatments using direct observation and video recording.

A questionnaire survey was employed to explore the distribution of learning styles among the students of experimental group. Two questionnaires, Index of Learning Styles (ILS) suggested by Felder and Silverman (2002), and Grasha-Reichmann Student Learning Style Scales (GRSLSS) by Grasha and Reichmann as cited in Felder and Henriques (1995), were reproduced in Indonesian and delivered to the students. These questionnaires seek to explore the students' information processing modes and social interaction modes respectively, which influence learner-to-learner interaction patterns. The data on students' learning styles helped the grouping process in both experimental classes.

To find out the students writing ability, the researcher conducted a pretest and a posttest. The pretest was administered to the experimental and control group in 100 minutes. It was to find out the students' entry point of both groups before giving the treatments. The posttest was administered in order to find out the students' ability in writing descriptive text. In line with the pretest, the posttest was administered in 100 minutes. The validity of the writing test focused more on the construct validity in which the researcher developed and based the writing test on the Jacobs' construction in writing test from Jacobs as cited in Ghanbari et al (2012), besides the researcher also concerned on content and face validity. For the reliability, the researcher used interrater reliability which was calculated using SPSS by seeing the cooficient of Kappa value which determined the reliability of pretest and posttest.

Direct observation was applied during the treatments to observe the teaching and learning process to capture the students' interaction. It was done to confirm and enhance

the reliability of the later analysis of the video recording done after the treatments.

Independent group T-Test was used to answer the first hypothesis. The means of the test of two classes were computed using the SPSS. The hypothesis was analyzed at the significant level of 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Then, to answer the second hypothesis, the researcher used the percentage parameter of the successful interaction indicators in which if the percentage of the appearances of the indicators in experimental class 1 is more than 60% and higher than experimental class 2, the hypothesis is accepted. The indicators were based on four requirements of successful interaction which were formulated by Herteis, Wright, and MacInnis (1994). The indicators are paraphrasing other's words to ensure and verify comprehension (occurrence target: 25), giving and receiving feedback (occurrence target: 30), allowing everyone to contribute ideas (occurrence target: 30), and refraining from taking over the group or allowing another to do so (occurrence target: 15).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

In order to establish the homogeneity of the samples in term of their writing ability, an *Independent Group T-test* was conducted to examine the difference between writing ability of both classes on writing test before treatment. The mean score of the pretest for the experimental class 1 was 52.29 and for experimental class 2 was 49.05. The results also showed that there was no any significant difference between the mean scores of the samples in the experimental class 1and class 2. Two tailed significance showed that $p>0.05$ ($p=.31$). It indicates that the writing ability of the two classes was homogenous at the beginning of the research. Therefore, It can be concluded that both of classes had the same entry behavior or capability in writing ability at the beginning of the research.

At the end of the research, after two meetings of treatments, the mean score of the posttest for experimental class 1 was 80.98 while in experimental class 2 was 71.16 . Hence, the hypothesis of this research was approved since the results of the posttest between the two classes were significantly different ($p<0.05$; $p= 0.00$). The results are presented in the following tables

Table 1: Result of Statistical Analysis on Homogeneity Test of the Sample

	Mean	N	S.D	Std. Error Mean	Sig. (2 tailed)
Experimental class 1	52.29	22	12.22	2.60	.31
Experimental class 2	49.05	22	8.21	1.75	.31

Table 1: Result of Statistical Analysis on Homogeneity Test of the Sample

	Mean	N	S.D	Std. Error Mean	Sig. (2 tailed)
Experimental class 1	52.29	22	12.22	2.60	.31
Experimental class 2	49.05	22	8.21	1.75	.31

To sum up, the finding of the first research question represented that the cooperation procedure of teaching writing which is heterogenously grouped by students' distribution of learning styles optimized the students' ability in writing descriptive text especially in describing a table or graph. It could be justified by comparing the mean of writing scores of both classes using Independent T-test.

The finding for the second research question was taken from the analysis and interpretation of the observation which was done by the researcher and her colleague during teaching and monitoring the process of teaching and learning during the treatments and observed from the documented video recording. The result was the experimental class benefits more in generating and producing the interaction during the treatments.

The researcher referred to Herteis, Wright, and MacInnis's theory (1994) to analyze the group interaction.

According to their theory, the skills required for successful group interaction are as follows:

1. paraphrasing other's words to ensure and verify comprehension; (Target: 25 occurrences)
2. giving and receiving feedback; (Target: 30occurrences)
3. allowing everyone to contribute ideas (Target: 30 occurrences); and
4. refraining from taking over the group or allowing another to do so. (Target: 15 occurrences)

After observing the students directly and watching the video recordings, it was discovered that the skills required for successful group interaction were mainly demonstrated by experimental class 1 (heterogeneous grouping). The results of the video analysis can be seen in the following table:

Table 3: The result of the Interaction based on the Indicators

No.	Indicators of Interaction	Experimental class 1 (heterogeneous)		Experimental Class 2 (homogeneous)		Occurrence Target of Successful Interaction	Percentage Target of Successful Interaction
		Appearance	Percentage (%)	Appearance	Percentage (%)		
1	Paraphrasing other's words to ensure and verify comprehension	18	72%	0	0%	25	60%
2	Giving and receiving feedback	25	83%	10	33%	30	60%
3	Allowing everyone to contribute ideas	24	80%	13	43%	30	60%
4	Refraining from taking over the group or allowing another to do so	10	67%	0	0%	15	60%

The researcher explained in detail the results of the study on the students' interaction as the following elaboration:

A. Experimental Class 1 (Heterogeneous Groups)

The researcher analyzed the video recordings and found that 72% of occurrences of paraphrasing others' words to ensure and verify comprehension as the first requirement for successful interaction. To illustrate this, the researcher presented the dialogue happened between moderate sensing student (MS) and strong active student (SA) in Indonesian.

MS : *"Describe graph ini maksudnya gimana sih?"*
("I don't know how to describe a graph.")

SA :*"Gini loh jadi kita itudisuruh menjelaskan tentang grafik ekonomi ini gimana maksudnya gitu?"*
("We are asked to explain this economy graph and you asked how to describe it?")

The dialogue indicates that the strong active student tried to paraphrase the words to help the moderate sensing student comprehended them.

In addition, the researcher found 83% of occurrences of giving and receiving feedback as the second requirement for successful interaction. The example of these phenomena was shown by the students in Group 4. One of students classified as strong reflective (SR) tried to answer her friend's question (F).

F : *"bahasa inggrisnya perkembangan ekonomi itu apa"*
("What is the English for Economy development?")

SA : "Economy development"
("Economy development")

It can be seen that the strong reflective student presented the

feedback to her friend. On the other hand, the friend who asked the question received the feedback.

Moreover, the researcher found 80% of occurrences fulfilling the third requirement for successful interaction; that is allowing everyone to contribute ideas. The researcher found these phenomena on the interaction of the students in Group 3. One of the students classified as moderate active took one writing task and said, "*gimana kalau kita bahas dari grafik yang ini dulu?"* ("What if we start to discuss this graph first?"). This indicates that the moderate active student tried to contribute his ideas.

Furthermore, 67% of occurrences of refraining from taking over the group were found. The results of the analysis showed that some strong active students refrained themselves from talking when the other friends delivered their ideas. It can be implied that the fourth requirement of successful group interaction was fulfilled by the students in the experimental class.

B. Experimental class 2 (Homogenous Groups)

In relation to the experimental class 2 (Homogeneous groupings), the researcher discovered that the students did not paraphrase others' words to ensure and verify comprehension. In addition, the students did not participate actively in doing the writing task. It might be caused by many factors. One of them might be the way of grouping in which they were homogeneously grouped based on their learning styles.

Furthermore, it was revealed that there were only 33% of occurrences of giving and receiving feedback. The researcher found one of the examples of these phenomena on the interaction of the students in Home Group 2. One of the students classified as moderate sensing (MS) asked something to the other moderate sensing student (MS).

MS1 : *"ekonomi bahasa inggrisnya gimana tulisannya?"*

("How do we write the word Economy in English?*)*

MS2 : *"biasa aja sama kayak bahasa Indonesia tapi k nya diganti c."*

("It's the same with the Indonesian one but you change K into C.")

It can be seen that MS student 2 gave the feedback. On the other hand, the MS student 1 received the feedback.

Moreover, the results of the analysis showed that 43% of occurrences were observed on the phenomena of allowing everyone to contribute ideas. As the example, it could be discovered on the interaction of the students in group 3. One of the members (moderate active student) in this group said "*Ini kita bandingin aja secara umum ekonominya nggak usah dijelasin satu-satu gimana?"* ("What if we compare and contrast the economy of each country in general not one by one, what do you think?"). This illustration indicates that the moderate active student delivered his idea to his group.

Related to the fourth requirement of successful interaction, there were no occurrences of refraining from taking over the group in the experimental class 2. One of these phenomena was proved by data from video. It showed that most of students were passive. Most of them were not dominant to take part in the group discussion. They were mostly silent during process of writing task. In the other words, refraining phenomena in groups' discussion could have happened, if the students were deliberately active in taking turn to communicate within their groups. So we could state that in this case, the fourth requirement of successful interaction which was stated by Herteis, Wright, and MacInnis (1994) was not attained.

Since, the groups in this class were homogenously grouped, this way formed a homogenous group which all the members were the active students. They were group 3. It was inferred that the probability of the appearance of the fourth requirement of successful interaction would appear within this group. But as matter of fact, this group still tended to passive and silent. There should be other factors to be explored to investigate and answer this phenomenon.

DISCUSSION

According to Jolliffe (2007), cooperative learning has two main prerequisites. He stated that tasks need to be structured to ensure pupils are interdependent and individually accountable; just putting pupils into groups does not mean they will work together cooperatively. Considering this view, teacher should select the groups to reflect a diversity of abilities, learning styles, viewpoints, gender, race, and even consistency of attendance, which will be particularly relevant for groups working on a project over time. Heterogeneous groups produce the greatest opportunities for peer tutoring and support as well as improving cross-race and cross-sex relations and integration. Kagan and Kagan (2009) stated that the rationale for heterogeneity is simple: If all students on a team had exactly the same skills and knowledge, they would have nothing to learn from each other. He imposed that to a degree, the greater the team heterogeneity, the greater the learning potential. According to Cooper as cited in Herteis, Wright, and MacInnis (1994), letting the students choose their own groups can result in a homogeneity which reduces the acquisition of social skills and increases the possibility of a lack of focus on the learning task. Suggested groups contain fewer than six most likely four. The group of around five or four is large enough to contain a diversity of perspectives, yet small enough to facilitate useful interaction (Millis) in Herteis, Wright, and MacInnis (1994).

Moreover, some proofs of the findings also support some experts' theories and previous research findings. Then, the discussion leads to the relationships of the grouping

method using the distribution of the students' learning styles to the elements of cooperative learning itself in which the relationships reveal the benefits of incorporating the cooperative learning grouped by learning styles in terms of students' writing ability and interaction.

As a matter of facts, the results confirm the theory of Johnson and Johnson (1994) which stated that the first requirement for an effectively structured cooperative lesson is that students believe that they "sink or swim together." Within cooperative learning situations, students have two responsibilities: 1) learn the assigned material, and 2) ensure that all members of the group learn the assigned material. The technical term for that dual responsibility is *positive interdependence*.

In this case, the researcher points out that Positive interdependence exists when students perceive that they are linked with group mates in such a way that they cannot succeed unless their group mates do (and vice versa) and/or that they must coordinate their efforts with the efforts of their group mates to complete a task. Positive interdependence promotes a situation in which students: 1) see that their work benefits group mates and their group mates' work benefits them, and 2)work together in small groups to maximize the learning of all members by sharing their resources to provide mutual support and encouragement and to celebrate their joint success. When positive interdependence is clearly understood, it establishes that:

1. Each group member's efforts are required and indispensable for group success (i.e., there can be no "free-riders").
2. Each group member has a unique contribution to make to the joint effort because of his or her resources and/or role and task responsibilities.

In this study, the researcher found through her monitoring and observation with her colleague during the treatments and also the documented video recording that in completing the writing task, the experimental class performs better in the elements of individual interdependence than the experimental class 2 does. It is asssumed because the groups for the home groups consist of heterogonous individuals in term of learning styles. They truly come from the different personality and mode of interaction. They suffice each other weaknesses and strengths by coordinating actively in completing the task. It is noticed in experimental class that each preference of the dimensions of learning styles contributes actively and continuously in their home group discussion while in the experimental class 2 group it is less seen even they tend to be more passive. The instructor should monitor them and remind them very frequently to force them to have a good contribution to their home group. It seems that they prefer to do everything individualistically.

Concisely, the results of this research support the idea reviewed by the expert who stated that positive interdependence which is built through the cooperative learning results in promotive interaction. He added also that promotive interaction

may be defined as individuals encouraging and facilitating each other's efforts to achieve, complete tasks, and produce in order to reach the group's goals (Johnson and Johnson, 1994). It was clearly seen during the treatments, in the experimental class each member of the groups played an important role to constuct active interaction in the home groups. They all tried to generate some questions and initiate the discussion. They tried to pay attention on the other members' suggestion and opinion. It is different from the experimental class 2 which was seen that the interaction in the home groups was hardly structured even the instructor had reminded the members of the groups to work cooperatively and communicate the task given to them. They tended to be passive. There were some pauses in the interaction. They hardly initiated the communication among the members of the groups. The two different phenomena were suggested as the result of the different pattern of how the researcher grouped the class as it is proposed in this research. Those were the result of grouping them heterogonously or homogenously.

Furthermore, the findings confirmed and developed the outcomes model proposed by (Johnson and Johnson, 2001) in which the positive interdependence in and of itself may have some effects on outcomes, they are the face-to-face promotive interaction among individuals fostered by the positive inter-relationships, and psychological adjustment and social competence.

Considering Johnson and Johnson's figure (2016) of the outcomes model, it is assumed that the more the positive interdependence is built up, the greater positive promotive interaction occurs which results in positive realtionship between the individuals and greater efforts to achieve the learning goals. Ultimately, psychological adjustment and social competence could be easily derived. However, in this case the researcher promotes that the psychological adjustment itself should be clearly defined and specified. Furthermore, it is quite generalized when the question comes concerning what kinds of psychology are defined to be changed during the cooperative learning activities. That is why the researcher promoted to define and specify the term into learning styles acknowledgement. It is because the learning styles were taken into a count in this research in which the learning styles itself were closely related with the psychological pattern which were easily to be assessed and monitored during the teaching learning process in cooperative learning.

Furthermore, in this research, after the students' learning styles were assessed the instructor give them a short training and consultation about their preferences in learning styles. It was done to make them aware of their learning styles and know the way to maximize their preferences to get the benefits in their learning especially in their cooperative groups. Fortunately, the index of the learning styles used in this research defined individual personality, perception, and psychology. It is so easy to be assessed that makes the

instructor of the cooperative learning have the diagnostic document about their personality, perception and psychology and give chance to the instructor to monitor and acknowledge their pattern in the interaction based on their learning styles. Having the diagnosis of the students' learning styles, the instructors obtained the advantages of monitoring the cooperative sessions in the groups easily because they recognized their students well—through their labels in their learning styles name tag, knew who they are in terms of their learning styles from their personality and mode of interaction, and finally promoted them to maximize their interaction based on their preferences. One thing for sure, however, they should be heterogonously grouped based on their prefences like in the experimental class in this research to make them take the supplementary benefits among the different preferences.

As the illustration, when the instructor monitored each home group discussion and found the reflective student within group, the instructor could promote reflective to be more constructive by motivating her/him to imitate little bit way of the active student in the group. Unfortunately, it was hardly happened in the experimental class 2 because the groups are homogonous in the preferences of learning styles which made them have no model of the other preferences to take the different supplementary benefit among the member of the group.

The researcher believes it makes sense to propose her model of outcomes since in the previous model from the experts is still too general in describing what kinds of psychology will be adjusted from the individuals in their groups in cooperative learning activities. So it is wise for the researcher to choose learning styles as one of the alternatives to define the students psychology by using learning styles instead of only predicting the individual psychology without any certain measurement.

The findings confirm the theory of the next element of cooperative learning recorded by Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (1998) who stated that Individual accountability/personal responsibility is the key to ensure that all group members are, in fact, strengthened by learning cooperatively. He also added that after participating in a cooperative lesson, group members should be better prepared tocomplete similar tasks by themselves. He suggested to ensure that each student is individually accountable, the student should be asked to do his or her fair share of the group's work. It was proved by the result of the posttest of the experimental class which was significantly increased from the pretest to posttest and also significantly different from the experimental class 2. The researcher counted eagerly in finding the difference between their pretest to posttest in which in pretest they were even hard to generate their ideas so they made the poor descriptive writing to describe a table or graph. Then, in posttest they became accountable to write better and even creatively by providing the additional information of the interpretation

from the table or graph that they would like to describe.

The finding also reveals the confirmation to the theory about the fourth essential element of cooperative learning which was stated that there is the appropriate use of interpersonal and small-group skills. In order to coordinate efforts to achieve mutual goals, students must: 1) get to know and trust each other, 2) communicate accurately and unambiguously, 3) accept and support each other, and 4) resolve conflict constructively (Johnson, Johnson and Smith, 2013). They added that placing socially unskilled students in a group and telling them to cooperate does not guarantee that they have the ability to do so effectively. We are not born instinctively knowing how to interact effectively with others.

That is why the researcher agreed that interpersonal and small-group skills do not appear magically when they are needed. Students must be taught about the social skills required for high quality collaboration and be motivated to use them if cooperative groups are to be productive. Training and giving them consultation in experimental group about their preferences of the learning styles before conducting the treatments are the suffient ways to make them aware of their interpersonal skills and social skills in the side of their personality and interaction mode diagnosed from their learning styles. The researcher encouraged them to maximize their own prefences by letting them know what they should act or do based on their prefences. It was assumed that it made the interaction in the experimental class active. Thus, the findings supported Johnson and Johnson's theory (2001) which stated that the whole field of group dynamics is based on the premise that social skills are the key to group productivity (Johnson and Johnson, 2001). It means the more socially skillful students are and the more attention teachers pay-to teaching and rewarding the use of social skills, the higher the achievement that can be expected within cooperative learning groups.

Discussing the methods of grouping in cooperative learning, the researcher found that the findings support Johnson, Johnson, and Smith (2013) who categorized the types of grouping in cooperative learning. They divided them into three types: 1) formal cooperative learninggroupconsists of students working together, for one class period to several weeks, to achieve shared learning goals and complete jointly specific tasks and assignments, 2) informal cooperative learning groupconsists of having students work together to achieve a joint learning goal in temporary, ad-hoc groups that last from a few minutes to one class period, and 3) cooperative base groupsare long-term, heterogeneous cooperative learning groups with stable membership. The three types of cooperative learning complement and support each other (Johnson, Johnson, and Smith, 2013).

However, they preferred cooperative base groups for the students of university level. It is because Base groups give the support, help, encouragement, and assistance each

member needs to make academic progress (attending class, completing all assignments, and learning) and develop cognitively and socially in healthy ways. Base groups are permanent (lasting from one to several years) and provide the long-term, caring peer relationships necessary to influence members consistently to work hard in their academic life. Considering this idea, the researcher found that grouping using learning styles suits the idea of cooperative base grouping. Even though it takes time in assessing the students learning styles, once the students are assessed, it could be time well spent in the long run. Once the preferences of learning styles are diagnosed and gathered, the instructor of cooperative learning can group the students accordingly. Ultimately, the heterogeneity could be well defined.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In relation to the results of the research, It is inferred that incorporating learning style-based grouping in cooperation procedure of teaching writingcan optimize the students' writing ability and produce more interaction. Then, grouping using learning styles in cooperative learning is one of the best ways to promote the principle of heterogeneity and it can be used to get long run groups that benefit the students to enhance their academic purpose especially writing class. Moreover, the grouping method of cooperative learning is placed as the prominent part overall to structure and ensure all the elements of cooperative learning run smoothly and ultimately achieve the goal of teaching especially in promoting students' interaction and writing ability. The grouping method using learning styles might be taking long time but it is worthy. Once it is assessed, the information can be documented and used for long run to make the variety of heterogeneous grouping in cooperative learning.

With regard to the results of the research, the researcher provides several suggestions for English teachers or lecturers. Firstly, the distribution of students' learning styles should be taken into a count as the prominent part before grouping the students in cooperative learning activities. In addition, formal training should be applied for making students aware of their styles before putting them into groups in cooperative learning activities in order to make them easy to take the benefits by maximizing their learning styles in generating the interaction within the groups (especially the Sensing/Intuitive dimension and Active/Reflective dimension). Secondly, considering the benefit of grouping the students based on their learning styles in cooperative learning, periodic measurements of learning styles are also needed to make the students aware of their learning styles and to make them appreciate such individual differences. They must be provided with clear information that none of the learning styles is worse or better than the others; these styles are just different. This will help them benefit optimally from their strengths and weaknesses, from their learning environment, from their peers, and

from learning to embrace the other styles.

Additionally, the researcher provides some suggestions for other researchers who are interested in conducting relevant research. First of all, for the future researchers who would like to deal with the same variables of the research may include the rest two dimensions of the learning styles— Visual/Verbal (the way individual gets input) and Sequential/Global (the way the individuals gets their understanding. Since this research focused only on Sensing/Intuitive dimension (Perception and personality) and Active/Reflective dimension (the process of the interaction mode). It is believed that it will make groups have the more choices to be heterogonous and believed to have more benefits in cooperative learning. Futhermore, researchers who are interested to do the same study dealing with cooperative learning in other English skills besides writing may consider to use the same grouping procedure which concerns more in heterogeneity principle besides learning styles such as gender, linguistic competence, proficiency, or learning strategies.

REFERENCES

Agbayewa, S. O. and Adodo. 2011. Effect of Homogenous and Heterogeneous Ability Grouping Class Teaching on Student's Interest, Attitude and Achivement in Integrated Science. *International Journal of Psychology and Counselling.* 3 (3): 48-54.

Felder, R. M. and Henriques, E. R. 1995. Learning and Teaching Styles in Foreign and Second Language Education. *Foreign Language Annals*. 28 (1): 21–31.

Felder, R. M. and Silverman, L. K. 2002. Learning and Teaching Styles in Engineering Education. *Engineering Education*. 78(7): 674–681.

Ghanbari, B., Barati, H., and Moinzadeh, A. 2012. Rating Scales Revisited: EFL Writing Assessment Context of Iran under Scrutiny. *Language Testing in Asia.* 2 (1): 83 – 96.

Hatch, E. and Farhady, H. 1982. *Reseach Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics.* London: Newburry House Publisher.

Herteis, M. E., Wright, A. and MacInnis, R. 1994. Cooperative Learning. *Focus on University and Learning.* 3 (5):1-10.

Johnson, D. W. and Johnson R. T. 1994. *An Overview of Cooperative Learning.* Baltimore: Bookes Press.

Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. 2001. Learning Together and Alone: an Overview. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*. 22 (1): 56-72.

Johnson, D. W., and Johnson, R. T. 2016. Cooperative Learning and Teaching

Citizenship in Democracies. *International Journal of Educational Research.* 76 (5): 162 – 177.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., and Smith, K. A. 1998. Cooperative Learning Returns to College: What Evidence is There That It Works?. *Journal on Excellence in University Teaching*. 30 (4): 27-5.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., and Smith, K. A. 2013. Cooperative learning: Improving University Instruction by Basing Practice on Validated Theory. *Journal on Excellence in University Teaching*. 1 (2): 1- 15.

Jolliffe. 2007. *Cooperative Learning in the Classroom Putting It into Practice*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.

Kagan, S. and Kagan, R. 2009. *Cooperative Learning.* San Clement: Kagan Publishing.

Litzinger, T. A, Lee, S. H., Wise, J. C., and Felder, R. M. 2007. A Psychometric Study of the Index of Learning Styles. *Journal of Engineering Education*. 96 (4): 309-319.

Mahmoud, W. A. M. M. 2014. The Effectiveness of Using the Cooperative Language Learning Approach to Enhance EFL Writing Skills among Saudi University Stdents. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research.* 5 (3): 616 – 625.