Explicit Technique for Teaching Writing to Students with Sociological Learning Style

Arifuddin Balla
arifuddin.balla@parahikma.ac.id
Institut Parahikma Indonesia, Gowa, Indonesia

Abstract

The objective of this research was to find out the influence of explicit technique in teaching writing to the students whose learning preference is sociological learning style. This research was a pre-experimental study with a pre-test and post-test conducted at English Education Department of UIN (Universitas Islam Negeri) Alauddin with 30 students as respondents. They were divided into two groups: individual sociological learning style (ISLS) and group sociological learning style (GSLS). The data were collected through an essay test and Sociological Learning Styles Inventory. The results of students' essay tests were analyzed by using SPSS version 20. The data analysis and interpretation indicated: 1) there was a significant difference for students whose learning preference ISLS before and after treatment. 2) there was a significant difference for students whose learning preference GSLS before and after treatment. 3). there was a significant difference for students whose learning preference between ISLS and GSLS before and after treatment. In conclusion, there is no significant difference between students whose learning preference ISLS and ISLS before and after treatment. Sociological learning style does not have any influence on students' achievement score in teaching writing by using explicit technique. The achievement gained was probably caused by the treatment by using explicit technique. In the end, explicit technique can increase students' writing ability for both ISLS and GSLS students.

Keywords: explicit technique; coherence; Individual Sociological Learning Style; Group Sociological Learning Style

Introduction

Most of the students still take writing as the most difficult skill in language teaching, especially in English writing. This phenomenon also occurred in English Education Department at UIN Alauddin. From some informal and unstructured interviews, the researcher found that most students in English Education Department of Tarbiyah and Teaching Science Faculty at UIN Alauddin Makassar are fully enthusiastic to learn about writing, but they cannot improve their skill to the level as expected by enacted curriculum which expects the fifth semester students to achieve certain level in writing essay. In writing, one of the main problems is coherence. The lack of coherence makes readers unable to get the idea. By considering this, coherence should be learnt and taught and given serious attention by giving proper method.

Related to achieving coherence in writing, explicit technique can be an effective technique to solve students' coherence difficulty in writing. On the other hand, it is inseparable that the success of certain technique is also supported by the other factors. One of the factors is learning style.

Learning style influence in studying is also supported by Oxford in Pei-Shi (2012) who determines learning style and strategies are the main factors helping determine how language learners learn a second or foreign language. It seems that learning style plays a crucial impact in teaching students.

It is necessity to find out certain technique that deal with certain preference. This research aims at comparing explicit technique as one teaching writing technique to a particular learning style.

Explicit techniques are defined a writing technique that focuses on clear markers in order to identify the coherence. That technique employees transition signals/signposts to help the coherence and cohesive in writing.

Meanwhile, Dunn (2009) defined sociological learning style a preference to receive, analyze, and store information in social interaction by individual, team, pair, small group, varied group. This learning style is divided into Individual Sociological Learning Style (ISLS)and Group Sociological Learning Style (GSLS).

Mardiana (2012) stated that Individual Sociological Learning Style (ISLS) is defined as a learning style individually that tend to be analytic, actual, and factual. The students who are ISLS also think inductively, non-gestalt, more theoretic or less practice. They are more logic than and put higher attention to the fact than feeling or intuitive in taking decision, less creative, clumsier in working, formal and non-spontaneous, more competitive, and less cooperative and have tendency to work by their own selves.

In addition, Mardiana (2012) also mentioned that Group Sociological Learning Style (GSLS) is defined as a learning style involves peer more than 2 students. The students who have this learning style tend to be more intuitive and sensitive than logic in taking decision. In working, they are more creative and dynamic. They are more less discipline, spontaneous, social, more cooperative, and less competitive. In brief they like to work in a team than individual.

In this research, the result of students' writing score for coherence by using explicit technique was compared between students with sociological learning style, which are divided into both ISLS and GSLS. The higher score of either ISLS or GSLS will be assumed to be matched with explicit technique.

Literature Review

Nowadays, we can find some cross-sectional studies between teaching technique and learning style in case of teaching second or foreign language. Xu in Dastjerdi and Shizard (2010) applied explicit technique (Xu called it as metadiscourse) and found interesting finding in a study of metadiscourse used by 200 students across four years of an undergraduate course in English at a Chinese university. In his research, students of final two years employed more formally complex and precise interactive metadiscourse (*consequently, therefore, as a result*) than those the first two years, who preferred form such as *but, then*, and *and.*

Martinez (2004) also investigated the use of explicit technique or discourse marker in expository composition of Spanish undergraduate. The students employed a variety of discourse markers, with some types used more frequently than others. As conclusion, there was a significant relationship between the number of discourse markers and the students' scores.

Dastjerdi and Shizard (2010) also applied this technique of University of Isfahan in EFL students. There are 94 EFL students as the respondents and aged between 20-23 years old. There were 32 elementary level. For intermediate and advanced students for each were 32 and 30 students. All the groups were exposed to the same explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers in successive sessions. The result showed that elementary learners improved significantly after explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers, intermediate learners had the highest improvement. In other words, explicit instruction showed to be the most effective method for this group of learners and advanced learners showed the least improvement after explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers.

By looking at the findings above, it is clear that explicit technique can be used to improve students' writing ability. From some studies, it can be concluded that explicit technique has a high contribution to improving students' writing ability. Oshima and Hogue (1991) mentioned four ways to achieve coherence. Those ways include repeating key nouns frequently in a paragraph, using consistent pronoun, using transition signals, and arranging the sentences in a logical order. Those techniques are defined as explicit technique (Ulfiati, 2011).

On the other hand, it is inseparable that the success of certain technique is also supported by the other factor. One of the factors is learning style. Yaumi (2012) states learning style also can influence process and learning result. He mentioned that learning style jointly with the other aspects including general characteristics, prior knowledge, learning style and multiple intelligences determine students' characteristic.

Learning style influence in studying also is supported by Oxford in Pei-Shi (2012) who determines learning style and strategies are the main factors helping determine how language learners learn a second or foreign language. It seems that learning style plays a crucial impact in teaching students. In addition, Dunn & Dunn (1978) adds that in every case, students who were matching with method, resource, and environment that complemented their reported strong preferences achieved statistically higher; they achieved statistically less when they were mismatched with their preference.

Another positive result is backed up by De Bello study (1990). De Bello employed Learning Styles Inventory that proved that students indicated better writing skills and attitude towards writing tasks when their sociological learning style suited their tasks. In addition, a study by Cole (1990) found that the appropriation between learning technique and learning style preference

could lead to the better quality of writing, the increasing self-confidence and decreasing anxiety in completing writing tasks.

Furthermore, Mardiana had conducted a research on the influence of cooperative learning (CWRG-SE and CS) and social learning style (GSLS and ISLS) to students' writing ability (2012). The result showed CWRG-SE (Cooperative Writing Response Group and Self-Evaluation) is matched with Group Sociological Learning Style (GSLS). CS (Cooperative script) is matching with Individual Sociological Learning Style (ISLS).

However, the research between explicit technique and learning style is still very limited. From this point, the researcher conducted this research to examine the use of explicit technique in writing related to ISLS and GSLS.

Therefore, the researcher formulated three research aims.
1. To find out students' writing ability in ISLS by using explicit technique
2. To find out students' writing ability in GSLS by using explicit technique; and
3. To find out comparison of students' writing ability between in ISLS and GSLS by using explicit technique.

Methodology

This research applied Pre-Experimental Design with pre-test and post-test group design (Setyadi, 2006). The researcher asked the students to write an essay and counted as a pre-test. Then, the students were given treatment (X). After that, the students would be asked again to write an essay and apply the explicit technique. The result was counted as post-test. The design can be described as proposed by Arikunto (2010) below:

O1 X O2

O1= observation before experiment (pre-test)
O2= observation after experiment (post-test)
X= Treatment

There were 33 students involved, but 30 of them became respondents. Specifically, there were 15 students whose preference ISLS and 15 students whose preference GSLS.

This research was conducted for six meetings. First meeting was introducing to the material and spreading the students learning style questionnaire sheet. The second was conducted in order to know students' writing ability before treatment as counted pre-test. The third to the fifth was conducted to give students' treatment. The last meeting was conducted to get the final task and counted as post-test.

There were two kinds of data in this research, discrete data and continuum data. District data which is information that can be categorized into a classification was sociological learning style data, and continuum data was students' writing essay coherence assessment. District data was collected by given students questionnaires. From this, students' preference was identified. They were divided based on their preference into Individual Sociological Learning Style (GSLS) and Group Sociological Learning Style (ISLS).

Continuum data was collected by using these below scoring classification. In this research, the researcher proposed the scoring classification as suggested by Mardiana (2012) as below:

Table 1

Coherence Criteria in Writing

No	Component	Indicator	Composition	Score
1	Idea/ Theme	Developing logic, systematic, and accurate idea	30%	1 – 5
2	Organization	Formation of internal structural writing which is included analysis-synthesis writing followed by rational deductive and factual inductive to draw conclusion.	20%	1 – 5
3	Expression	Concurrence between idea and or argument with theme and audience	10%	1 – 5
4	Diction	Concurrence of word or expression diction	10%	1 – 5
5	Sentence fluency	Formation of the cohesive and coherence sentence	20%	1 – 5
6	Convention	The usage of marks, spelling, and quotation	10%	1 – 5
Percentage and maximal score			100%	30

In order to measure the quality of writing, it can be identified as proposed by Mardiana (2012) as on the table below:

Table 2

Quality of Writing Criteria

Rubrics	Ability		
	5 Strong	3 Maturing	1 Beginning
Ideas	The paper is clear and focused. It thoroughly answers a well-defined key question in understandable, convincing, and expansive terms.	The paper addresses an identifiable key question by offering the reader general, basic information.	The writer has not yet clarified an important question or issue that this paper will address.
Organization	A strong internal structure gives purpose and direction to the main idea. The organization propels the reader toward the key point(s) or logical conclusions the writer wants to emphasize through a set of reasoning process, deductively and inductively.	The organizational structure is strong enough to move the reader through the text without undue confusion.	The organizational structure needs a stronger sense of purpose and direction. The reader may feel confused about what to focus on or what conclusions to draw.
Voice	The writer addresses the audience in a voice that is	The writer projects a tone and voice that seem	The writer seems indifferent to either

	lively, engaging, and wholly appropriate to the topic and purpose of the paper.	sincere, pleasant, and generally appropriate for the topic and audience.	topic or audience, and as a result, the tone may be distant, flat, jargonistic, stilted, or just inappropriate.
Word Choice	Well-chosen words convey the writer's message in a clear, precise, and highly readable way, often taking the reader to a new level of understanding.	Words are reasonably accurate and make the message clear on a general level.	The writer struggles with a limited vocabulary that restricts what he or she is able to convey, or the writing is so technical and difficult to penetrate that the reader feels shut out.
Sentence Fluency	The writing has an easy flow and rhythm when read aloud. Sentences are well built, with strong and varied structure that invites expressive reading.	The text hums along with a steady beat, but is more pleasant or businesslike than musical, more mechanical than fluid.	The reader has to practice in order to give this paper a fair interpretive reading.
Conventions	The writer demonstrates a good grasp of standard writing conventions and uses specialized conventions (titles and subtitles, footnotes, a table of contents, a bibliography) effectively to enhance layout and readability.	Errors in writing conventions, while not overwhelming, begin to impair readability.	Numerous errors in writing conventions consistently distract the reader and make the text difficult to read. One or more of the following problems may be evident.

In order to analyze the data, the researcher used t-table and SPSS version 20 to find out mean, standard deviation, and probability level with @= 0,05.

Findings

The gained data of this research result including students' writing ability before and after treatment by using explicit technique for students whose preference ISLS and GSLS. In detail, the research result includes the score with respect to first, the students' score writing ability before and after treatment by using explicit technique for students whose preference ISLS. Second, the students' score writing ability before and after treatment by using explicit technique for students' whose preference GSLS. And third, the comparison students writing score before and after treatment by using explicit technique for students' whose preference ISLS and GSLS. The results are shown in the following.

1. **The Analysis of Data Obtained from the Test**

   To analyze the data, the researcher provided six components to be evaluated as assessment of coherence in writing including idea/theme, organization, expression, diction, sentence fluency, and convention.

 a. **The ISLS Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Score**

Table 3

The Students' Score in Idea (30 %)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	24-30	4	26.67	13	86.67
2.	Maturing	2-3	12-18	11	73.33	2	13.33
3.	Beginning	1	6	-	-	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Table 3 shows a significant difference between pre-test and post-test. In pre-test, most of the students' score were in maturing level and others were in strong level. On the contrary, in the post-test, the majority of students were in strong and others were in maturing.

Table 4

The Students' Score in Organization (20%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	16-20	-	-	13	86.67
2.	Maturing	2-3	8-12	15	100	2	13.33
3.	Beginning	1	4	-	-	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Based on the Table 4, all of the students in pre-test were in maturing and mostly got in strong level in post-test. It indicates significant achievement.

On Table 5 below, there was a little bit increasing number for strong level and decreasing for maturing level that shown pre-test to post-test. It indicates there is an improvement.

Table 5

The Students' Score in Voice (10%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	8-10	3	16	5	33.33
2.	Maturing	2-3	4-6	12	84	10	66.67
3.	Beginning	1	2	-	-	-	-
	Total			15	100%	15	100%

Table 6

The Students' Score in Diction (10%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	8-10	3	16	4	26.67
2.	Maturing	2-3	4-6	11	73.33	11	73.33
3.	Beginning	1	2	1	0.67	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Based on Table 6, there was no improvement in maturing level, however there was a little bit improvement for strong level. It indicates there is a difference between pre-test and post-test.

Table 7

The Students' Score in Sentence Fluency (20%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	16-20	-	-	3	16
2.	Maturing	2-3	8-12	13	86.67	12	84
3.	Beginning	1	4	2	13.33	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Table 7 describes a difference where mostly students got in maturing level in pre-test and even though maturing score still be majority in post-test yet there was an improvement for strong level. In pre-test, there was no student get strong, but then there were 3 students on strong after given post-test.

Table 8

The Students' Score in Convention (10%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	8-10	4	26.67	8	53.33
2.	Maturing	2-3	4-6	8	53.33	7	46.67
3.	Beginning	1	2	3	20	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Table 8 shows that mostly students got maturing in pre-test and 3 students got beginning. On the contrary, mostly students got strong score in post-test and none got beginning.

b. The GSLS Students' Pre-Test and Post-Test Score

Table 9

The Students' Score in Idea (30%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	24-30	1	6.67	10	66.67
2.	Maturing	2-3	12-18	13	86.67	5	33.33
3.	Beginning	1	6	1	6.66	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

This table shows that majority students only got score in strong level in pre-test but in post-test, mostly got score in strong level. There was a great improvement for strong from pre-test to post-test.

Table 10

The Students' Score in Organization (20%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	16-20	-	-	9	60
2.	Maturing	2-3	8-12	13	86.67	6	40
3.	Beginning	1	4	2	13.33	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Table 10 shows a great number of increasing point from none to be majority for strong level and even none of the students got score in beginning level in post-test.

Table 11

The Students' Score in Voice (10%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	8-10	-	-	8	53.33
2.	Maturing	2-3	4-6	15	100	7	46.67
3.	Beginning	1	2	-	-	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

As seen on Table 11, none of the students got score is strong and beginning level, all students only got score in maturing in pre-test. In post-test, there was significance number for strong level where mostly got score in strong level.

Table 12

The Students' Score in Diction (10%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	8-10	-	-	3	20
2.	Maturing	2-3	4-6	9	60	12	80
3.	Beginning	1	2	6	40	-	-
Total				15	100%	15	100%

The table indicates mostly students got score in maturing and the other got score in beginning in pre-test. However, the majority still got score in maturing level in pot-test but the others got score strong and none was in beginning level.

Table 13

The Students' Score in Sentence Fluency (20%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	16-20	-	-	-	-
2.	Maturing	2-3	8-12	12	80	13	86.67
3.	Beginning	1	4	3	20	2	13.33
Total				15	100%	15	100%

On the table, it describes that there was no high improvement from pre-test to post-test. Even though there was a big an improvement in maturing level and less on beginning.

Table 14

The Students' Score in Convention (10%)

No	Level of ability	Ability point	Total score	Pre-test		Post-test	
				F	P (%)	F	P (%)
1.	Strong	4-5	8-10	1	6.67	4	26.67
2.	Maturing	2-3	4-6	4	26.67	9	60
3.	Beginning	1	2	10	66.66	2	13.33
Total				15	100%	15	100%

Based on the table, there was a high improvement in post-test. In pre-test mostly students got beginning as the lowest level. Yet, in post-test, the majority of the students got maturing and left for 2 students in beginning level.

By using SPSS 20 and t-table where @ 0.05, the result could be described in the following table:

Table 15

Mean Score of ISLS Pre and Post-test and GSLS Pre and Post-test.

Sociological learning style	Mean Score
ISLS Pre-test	54.80
ISLS Post-test	75.73
GSLS Pre-test	43.60
GSLS Post-test	65.60

As shown on Table 15, there was a significant difference both ISLS Pre and Post-test and GSLS Pre and Post-test. Even though there was a bit difference achievement both ISLS and GSLS, but in general, both of these sociological learning styles were getting increased.

In the following in table 16, provides t-test value and probability level among ISLS and GSLS Pre-test, ISLS and GSLS Post-test, ISLS Pre-test and ISLS Post-test, and GSLS Pre-test and GSLS Post-test.

Table 16
Paired Sample Test Statistic

Category	t-test value	Probability level
ISLS and GSLS Pre-test	3.077	0.008
ISLS and GSLS Post-test	2.366	0.033
ISLS Pre-test and Post-test	7.200	0.000
GSLS Pre-test and Post-test	7.705	0.000

Where t-table value is 1.761 and @ is 0.05. The difference is significant if the t-test value is higher than the t-table value and @ 0.05 is higher than probability level or probability level is lower than @ 0.05.

Table 14 describes that among the paired sample test statistics are significant since all of t-test value of each category is higher than t-table and @ 0.05 of each category is higher than probability level.

Discussion

On this part, the researcher highlighted the data found in the Finding part concerning matters during the research based on the six components as stated in the previous chapter. In the following, the researcher analyzed the point found both ISLS and GSLS Students.

With respect to idea, idea plays main role in any kind of writing. Idea is the nuclear point that the writer wants to deliver to the reads (Mardiana, 2012). Idea is the main topic that will be developed in sentences. Therefore, coherent of idea plays the meaningful part of writing quality. The ability as proposed in Mardiana (2012) from beginning to strong or grade of 1 to 5 could be one measurement which takes 30 % of whole assessment. The total score from 6 to 30. For ISLS students in pre-test, mostly students have proposed good enough idea as indicated most of them got maturing score. It means that the paper addresses an identifiable key question by offering the reader general and basic information. It is not surprised since the researcher has proposed the topic will be elaborated in students' essay. However, mostly got satisfied result in post-test that showed better score became strong level. However, even though the topic has been proposed by the researcher, there was still one student got beginning level in GSLS Students' pre-test. But in post-test, there was no more students classified as beginning level even mostly classified as strong level.

Regarding with organization, it is not only organization of structural aspect but also the organization of idea. For many experts such as Oshima and Hogue (1991) put organization as one important element in writing. The ability level from beginning to strong level or score 1 to 5 and takes 20 % of whole assessment or score from 4 to 20. For ISLS students, it was shown that all students were in maturing level which meant the organizational structure is strong enough to move the readers through the text without any confusion. Meanwhile, in the post-test, only two students were at the maturing level and others were at a strong level. Meanwhile, for GSLS students, mostly got maturing level in post-test and in post-test mostly got in strong level and others were in maturing level. It means there was a significant difference.

Then, in the term of voice, it reflects how the writer expresses what he wants to deliver. It is related to the concurrence between idea and or argument with theme and audience. The ability from beginning to strong level or score 1 to 5 and takes 10 % of whole assessment or score from 2 to 10 as proposed Mardiana (2012). Based on the data of ISLS students, it was shown that voice was not a big trouble for students since they were maturing and strong. It was the same in post-test, but there was an improvement of the number. Meanwhile, from GSLS data, it describes that all students were in maturing level in pre-test and in post-test more than half of them were in strong level.

In the sense of diction, it is related of word choice. The word should be appropriate and accurately match with the topic. The appropriate word with the topic addresses in a clear point of message. As proposed by Mardiana (2012), the ability level from beginning to strong level or score 1 to 5 and takes 10 % of whole assessment or score from 2 to 10. As the data shown in the pre-test for ISLS Students', there was a similar score of maturing level. However, in the pre-test, there was one student still got beginning yet in the post-test, there was no student got beginning level. On the contrary for GSLS Students, there were six students got in beginning level, and the others were in maturing level. But in post-test, there was no student any more got in beginning level and in most got in strong level.

Regarding with sentence fluency, this component concerns with the fluency of sentences that support idea unity in paragraph. The sentence should be connected with clear meaning, which is leading the readers to catch the points. Celce-Murcia and Olshtain in Cahyono and Mukminatein (2011) stressed that incoherence idea in sentences will make the readers get confusing. The ability level from beginning to strong level or score 1 to 5 and takes 20 % of whole assessment or score from 4 to 20. Based on the data for ISLS Students, there was no student got strong level and mostly got maturing level. In post-test, mostly they were in maturing level and no one got beginning. Meanwhile, for GSLS students, both pre-test and post-test were similar. However, there was a bit improvement where 13 students got in maturing level in post-test compared within pre-test only were 12 students.

Finally, with respect to convention or mechanic, it is related to the use of marks, spelling and quotation. It is external aspect but has an important role in writing. Basically, it is a basic indicator in writing. However, it is still a big deal for most students even though they are language students. In order to evaluate the convention, the research proposed the ability level from beginning to strong level or score 1 to 5 and takes 10 % of whole assessment or score from 2 to 10 (Mardiana, 2012). For ISLS Students, even though more than a half students got maturing level but there were still 3 students got beginning level. But there was a significant difference in post-test where most students got strong level and other were in maturing level. In contrast, there were 10 GSLS Students got in beginning level in the pre-test. it was a seriously trouble since convention is one of the main element in writing. However, there was a significant difference in achievement in post-test wherein majority got maturing level only two students were in beginning level. Moreover, in table 13 and 14 lead the researcher in brief that both ISLS and GSLS Students got a great achievement after giving explicit technique in treatment. It is in line with the research result of Xu in Dastjerdi and Shizard who had conducted and applied explicit technique in Chinese University and showed satisfied result. Besides, each category of paired sample test statistics was significant. It means there was no significant influence of sociological learning style in writing by using explicit technique. Therefore, explicit technique may be used for ISLS and GSLS Students.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Based on the findings and discussion, the researcher concluded some points. First, there was a significant difference for students whose learning preference ISLS before and after treatment. Second, there was a significant difference for students whose learning preference GSLS before and after treatment, and third, there was a significant difference for students whose learning preference between ISLS and GSLS before and after treatment.

As shown on the data, it concluded that there is no significant difference between students whose learning preference ISLS and ISLS before and after treatment. Sociological learning style does not have any influence on students' achievement score in teaching writing by using explicit technique. The achievement gained probably caused by the treatment by using explicit technique. In the end, explicit technique can increase students' writing ability for both ISLS and GSLS students.

Considering the findings of this research, the researcher offers three suggestions. Firstly, explicit technique is recommended to apply in teaching writing for both ISLS and GSLS students. Secondly, explicit technique may be used for the other skills of English. And thirdly, there must be continued research with true experiment using 2 x 2 factorial design to dig more the effect of explicit technique and sociological learning style in teaching writing since this research only used pre-experimental design.

References

Arikunto, S. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian*. Rineka Cipta.

Cahyono, B. Y. & Mukminatein, N. (2011). *Technique and strategies to enhance English language learning*. State University of Malang Press.

Cole, R. R. (1990). *The effect of writing activities in students' preferred learning styles on writing achievement and student satisfaction.* A *Doctoral Dissertation of* West Virginia University.

Dastjerdi, V. & Shirzad, M. (2001). *The impact of explicit instruction of metadiscourse markers on EFL learners' writing performance.*
http://ecc.isc.gov.ir/ShwFArticle.aspx?aid=140915

De Bello, T. C. (1990). Comparison of eleven major learning styles models: Variables, appropriate populations, validity of instrumentation, and the research behind them. *Reading, Writing, and Learning Disabilities*, *6*(3), 203-222.

Dunn, R. S., & Dunn, K. J. (1978). *Teaching students through their individual learning styles: A practical approach*. Prentice-Hall.

Forlini, G. (1991). *Grammar and composition*. Prentice Hall.

Mardiana. (2012). *Pengaruh teknik pembelajaran kooperatif dan gaya belajar sosiologis terhadap kemampuan menulis ilmiah.* A Dissertation of UNJ Jakarta.

Martínez, A. C. L. (2004). Discourse markers in the expository writing of Spanish university students. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, (8), 63-80.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1991). *Writing academic English*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Pei-Shi, W. (2014). The effect of learning style on learning strategy by EFL learners. *Journal of Social Sciences 8 (2): 230-234.*
http://www.thescipub.com/abstract/10.3844/jssp.2012.230.234

Setyadi. (2006). *Metode penelitian untuk pengajaran bahasa asing*. Graha Ilmu.

Ulfiati, L. (2011). *Explicit technique to achieve coherence in essay writing*. State University of Malang Press.

Yaumi, M. (2012). *Desain pembelajaran efektif.* Alauddin Press.