ABSTRACT

Academic Writing is considered a difficult writing course which can make students exhausted and even frustrated. The more you read, the better you write may be applicable to this course. One way to make students write better is by asking them to read more and giving them some model texts to learn. Asking them to work collaboratively with their peer students can also help. The series of steps are included in Reading to Learn (R2L) teaching method that I developed for my Academic Writing Class in Semester II/2015-2016 Academic Year. This study mainly tried to describe how introverted students of an Academic Writing class of the Faculty of Language and Literature, Satya Wacana Christian University reacted to the phase when they are supposed to work with their peers to produce an outline and an essay. Among other 21 students in the class, five who were found to be introverted, became the respondents of this study. Data were mainly derived from journals that they submitted every time they passed a step. Findings show that the five students showed different affective reactions towards collaborative writing. Two female students preferred to work alone, and two other male students said they benefited from the collaboration. The other male student was neutral in his reaction.
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INTRODUCTION

This paper is intended to describe how five students of introverted personality responded to the fourth phase of Reading to Learn (R2L) – Joint Reconstruction – in their Academic Writing class in Semester II, 2015/2016 Academic Year. This research was conducted in Academic Writing E Class, at the Faculty of Language and Literature, Satya Wacana Christian University, Salatiga, Indonesia. One question was addressed: How do introverted students respond to the fourth phase of R2L? Altogether, there were twenty one students who enrolled this class. They were purposively selected as respondents. They were chosen among another hundred students of other parallel classes. They were selected based on the questionnaires that they filled in December 2015, or in Semester I/2015-2016. These ten students were then put in one class, representing introverted and extroverted students. Findings show that
the tertiary students responded positively to the stages. Data were mainly derived from journals submitted every time they finished each step.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
To begin this study, questionnaires were distributed in Semester I, 2015/2016 Academic Year to 100 students of Argumentative Writing. The purpose was to find out which personality types they were categorized as. For this Academic Writing class Group E, in which Reading to Learn was applied, five introverted students were selected. The phases of R2L were then applied throughout Semester II, 2015/2016 Academic Year. This study specifically focuses on the reactions of introverted students towards a step called joint reconstruction of the model text, or collaborative essay writing based on some models given previously. Data were mainly gathered from dialog journals they wrote after every step.

DISCUSSION
Below are the theoretical foundation for this research and the discussion.

Reading to Learn (R2L)
As a very famous quotation says, “There are many ways to go to Rome”, in Academic Writing classes, the same principle applies. There are so many teaching methods, techniques and strategies to teach this course. One of the method that can be applied in teaching Academic Writing is Reading to Learn or R2L.

Reading to Learn is said to be “one of the world’s most powerful literacy program, which was designed to enable all learners at all levels of education to read and write successfully.” The strategies included in Reading to Learn have been independently evaluated to accelerate students’ learning at twice to more than four times expected rates (www.readingtolearn.com.au). David Rose, the Director of Reading to Learn International Literacy Program, had conducted a project of Scaffolding Reading and Writing for indigenous children in school, with Bryan Gray and Wendy Cowey in 1999. David also worked with teachers of Pitjantjatjara Secondary School students to synthesize genre writing pedagogy and Write it Right research in 1998 and 2000.

From David Rose’s service programs in Australia, teachers reported that a minority of learners are consistently able to be actively engaged in classroom activities, to respond successfully to teacher’s questions, and succeed in
assessment tasks (Rose, *Democratising the Classroom*, 2005: 133).

Rose, therefore, developed a methodology for teaching reading and writing that he developed through long-term action research project with teachers in Australia (Rose, 2005:131). Rose (2005: 145) was thinking of how teachers can support all learners to manage such complexity (processing letter patterns, spelling system which is complex, systems of meaning that wordings realize, layers of structure in then sentences and texts, as well as shorter phases of meaning within each stage that are variable) when reading and writing.

David Rose then designed *Reading to Learn* strategies, which are to be applied at any point in the reading development of sequence, as either repair or part of ordinary teaching practice (Rose, 2005: 140).

**The Cycle of Reading to Learn Curriculum**

The cycle is described as follows.

1. Preparing before reading

   Reading to Learn Cycle consists of six stages (Rose, 2005:146 - 159). The first stage is *Preparing before Reading*. In the first stage of R2L cycle, as initially designed for Aboriginal learners, *Preparing before Reading*, a story or part of it is read aloud with the class, but learners are first prepared to follow the words with understanding, by giving them the background knowledge they need to access it, by telling them what the story is about, and by summarizing the sequence in which it unfolds. Learners’ understanding of the overall meanings of a text then provides a sound context for recognizing the more detailed meanings within each sentence in the *Detailed Reading* stage.

   Besides stories, this first stage, *Preparing before Reading*, may also include more extensive exploration of the overall field. The text is typically embedded in the curriculum topic. Again, the teacher summarizes the topic of the text and the sequence in which it unfolds, in words all learners can understand, but also using some of the terms in the text for learners to key into as it is read aloud. During and after reading, key terms and concepts may also be briefly explained.

   In this stage, complexity is reduced by providing support at the levels of both discourse and graphology (the study of handwriting with the purpose of character analysis). It enables learners to follow the words of a text as it is read aloud, by the teacher first, orally. This is done by summarizing its overall sequence of meanings, in terms all learners can
understand. As a result, students need not struggle to work out what is going on in the text, nor to decode unfamiliar words, as they listen to the words read aloud.

2. Detailed reading

Rose (2005: 159) further explains that general understanding of the text then provides a foundation for the key stage of **Detailed Reading** when learners must read the wordings themselves. This task is made easy by reading a short passage sentence-by-sentence, with the support of meaning cues provided by the teacher. These cues enable learners to actively identify wordings from their meanings, and so to apply what they learn to other texts. **Detailed Reading** enables all learners to read the passage with full comprehension and accuracy, and provides the foundation for the third stage of **Preparing before Writing**.

In **Detailed Reading**, Rose elaborates that meaning cues are more often paraphrases of technical or abstract wordings. These may draw from commonsense, or from previously built up knowledge in the field. Elaborations will tend to be definitions of technical terms, explanations of new concepts or discussion building on students’ field knowledge. In the **Note Making** stage, students take turns to write/scribe on the class board as a dot-point list, the wordings that have been highlighted during detailed reading.

3. Preparing Before Writing

In the next stage, **preparation before writing**, students are given the general framework of genre and field within which to rewrite the text. The teacher then prepares students to imagine new texts, by drawing attention to notes, suggesting alternative wordings, and further discussing the field.

Now instead of identifying literate wordings from commonsense cues, students select more commonsense paraphrases for the literate wordings in the notes. Then the teacher may elaborate by rephrasing the selection, supporting them to check issues such grammar, letter cases, punctuation or spelling, and encouraging critical discussion of the way the original author constructed the field, and how they may reconstruct it. Such high level critical analysis is possible because of the supported practice in deconstructing and reconstructing meanings at all levels of the text.

4. Joint Construction of The Text

The next three stages then move back up to construct patterns of meaning in new texts. Rose (2005) clarifies that
the fourth stage is *Joint Reconstruction* of the text, in which the teacher guides the class to write a new text, with all learners taking turns to scribe on the class board. With story texts, *Joint Reconstruction* uses the same literate language patterns as the original passage, with new content – events, characters, settings and so on. This supports learners to use the literary resources of the accomplished author they have learnt to read, and apply them to a new story. With factual texts, *Joint Reconstruction* uses the same content as the original text, via the notes scribed from it, but the new text is written in wordings that are closer to what the learners might use themselves in assignments.

Following the *whole class joint construction*, the text can be rubbed off and students can practise writing their own text from the same notes, in groups and individually, as a step towards independent research.

In the *joint writing process*, learners take turns to scribe, but the whole class thinks of what to write and how to say it, closely following the original text patterns. This activity supports all learners to use the literate language of the accomplished author they have been reading, at the same time as creating a new story.

5. Individual Reconstruction

In the fifth stage *Individual Reconstruction*, learners use the text patterns or notes they have practiced using with the class to write a text of their own. Again with stories this involves the same text patterns with new content, while factual texts involve the same content with new wordings. Skills developed through each of these supportive stages finally lead to an *Independent Writing* task on which learners can be assessed (Rose, 2005).

6. Independent writing

*Independent writing* then involves using the same text patterns again, but with individual stories, using and expanding ideas discussed with the class. As with all other stages of the curriculum cycle, some students will be able to do this activity more independently, enabling the teacher to provide support for weaker writers in the class.

Techniques for reading and writing factual texts can be used at any level, from primary to tertiary study, in any curriculum area. They support learners to develop skills in reading texts with understanding, identifying key
information, selecting information for notes, and using it to write texts of their own. Along the way they also develop skills in interpreting and critiquing both the content of texts and how they are constructed (Rose, 2005:158), citing from Rose, 2004c).

These writing activities flowing from detailed reading extend and intensify the approach of genre-based writing pedagogies (Rose, 2005, citing from Cope and Kalantzis, 1993; Macken-Horarik, 2002; Martin, 1993, 1999; Martin and Painter, 1986; Martin and Rose, 2005; Rothery, 1989, 1996). This six stage curriculum cycle is schematized in the figure shown on the following page.

According to Rose (2005), techniques for reading and writing stories in primary and junior secondary school support learners to read with engagement and enjoyment, to develop identities as readers, and to recognize and use literate language patterns in their own writing (Rose, 2004b).

![Figure 1: The Cycle of Reading to Learn](image)

**Individual Learner Differences & Personalities**

Previous studies on the correlations and effects of personality types and learning styles on language competence have been done. Rosalind Kopsovich conducted a study in 2001, with the title of *A Study of Correlations between Learning Styles of Students and Their Mathematics Scores on Texas Assessment of Academic Skills Test*. In her dissertation, math scores are the independent variables, while the 22
elements of the learning styles inventory become the dependent variables.

Ismail Erton (2010) also conducted a similar study. He tried to find the relations between personality traits, language learning styles, and success in foreign language achievement. The variables in his study are faculty, success, personality, and language learning styles. Erton concluded from the research which was conducted among five faculties at Bilkent University First Year Students, that there is not a significant statistical relationship between the personality traits (introversion - extroversion) of the learners and in their foreign language achievement (English 101 course). To achieve success in foreign language education, the introverts and the extroverts have a tendency to employ different learning styles.

Another study was conducted by Amal Al-Dujailiy et.al in 2013. In their article “Differential Use of Learning Strategies in First-Year Higher Education: The Impact of Personality, Academic Motivation, and Teaching Strategies”, they found that personality traits like openness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism cannot be overlooked when aiming to explain variance within student learning.

Teachers should also bear in mind that no two individuals comprehend reality in the same manner. This is related to learners’ idiosyncrasy; an unusual way in which a particular person behaves or thinks. The reason is that there are varieties of experiences of the individual, which are influenced by environmental stimuli and affected by the way they program themselves to transform reality into a learning process. The process is also known as an individual’s learning style.

Citing from Keefe (1997), Kopsovich (2001) further says that the National Association of Secondary School Principals adopted a comprehensive definition of learning style. This group defined “learning styles” as the composite of characteristic cognitive, affective and physiological factors that serve as relatively stable indicators of how a learner perceives, interacts with and responds to the learning environment.

One study was also conducted by Samanhudi and Sugiarti in 2013. This study reports the effectiveness of using Reading to Learn program in teaching critical writing to teacher candidates in English Language Teaching Department, Sampoerna School of Education, Jakarta.
The Reading to Learn program implemented in that study allowed the researchers to employ principles from other theories of critical thinking and critical literacy. Embracing the characteristics of a case study and to some extent a program evaluation research design, the researchers obtained data from classroom observations, collection of samples of students’ texts in various stages of the teaching program, and students’ journals written after each teaching session and interviews with the students. Results revealed that students’ ability to write an English text is better than before. This is indicated by their ability to clearly and explicitly explain details of information in the text they write, which surely fulfill the standard outlined in the critical thinking theory used in that study.

Individual Learner Differences

Second language learners vary on a number of dimensions, dealing with personality, motivation, aptitude, learning style, and age. These are what is meant by individual learner differences. These differences may result in differences in the route which learners pass in their second language acquisition. These factors may also influence the rate and success of their SLA (Ellis, 1985:99). Dulay, et.al (1982), strengthens this fact. Even in the same environment, some learners acquire the second language better or even faster than others (Dulay, Burt, and Krashen, 1982:74).

Learning styles and cognitive styles may be mistaken. They seem similar but actually are different. Cognitive styles are defined as individual characteristics of cognitive processing, and this process is particular to certain individuals. While learning styles are the manners in which learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment. Components of cognitive styles are cognitive, affective, and psychological. All of them are strongly influenced by cultural backgrounds. Learning styles, on the other hand, can be classified in three general ways; perceptual modality, information processing, and personality patterns. The one that becomes the focus of this study is perceptual modality. It is defined as how we perceive many aspects of the world; through vision, hearing, or body movements. About the close ties between individual learner differences and learning styles, Mariani (1996) further states that

“Learning styles are one of the many kinds of individual differences which affect learning - age, aptitude, general intelligence, modality preferences (e.g. visual, auditory, kinaesthetic), moti-
Mariani (1996) then draws a figure showing the relationship between learning styles and learning strategies. The complex relationship is summarized in the figure below.

**Figure 2**: Relationship among Personality, Learning Styles, and Learning Strategies

**Personality** is found at the top. It is the “very general basic individual character structure”. **Learning styles** are in the second place after personality. It is defined as how personality works in a learning context, in the classroom, as an example. Styles reflect an individual learner’s **consistent and preferred** learning approach; that is, an approach which he or she exhibits in a wide range of situations and contexts, not only in school contexts. A person’s style affects the kinds of **learning strategies**. A learning strategy consists of a group of **tactics** or **techniques**. This is the only level which can be seen or noticed. This is what we see when we look at what a learner actually does in the classroom.

**The Five Factor Model of Personality**

In her paper, *The impact of personality and approaches to learning on information behavior*, Heinstorm (2000) (citing from Revelle & Loftus, 1992) mentions that during the last years, conformity about the basic personality traits has emerged. It has been stated that they are **extraversion**, **neuroticism**, **agreeableness**, **conscientiousness** and **openness to experience**. These dimensions are stable across the lifespan and directly related to behaviour. They also seem to have a physiological base. The five factors are the following;

1. **Extraversion**
   The extraverts tend to be more physically and verbally active whereas the introverts are independent, reserved, steady and like being alone. The person in the middle of the dimension likes a mix between social situations and solitude. (Howard & Howard, 1998, in Heinstorm, 2000).

Extraverts are adventurous, assertive,
frank, sociable and talkative. Introverts are quiet, reserved, shy and unsociable.

2. Agreeableness
The agreeableness scale is linked to altruism, nurturance, caring and emotional support versus hostility, indifference, self-centeredness and jealousy. Agreeable people are altruistic, gentle, kind, sympathetic and warm. (Boeree, no date, in Heinstorm, 2000).

3. Conscientiousness
The conscientious, focused person is concentrating on only a couple of goals and strives hard to perceive them. He is career oriented, while the flexible person is more impulsive and easier to persuade from one task to another. Conscientiousness has been linked to educational achievement and particularly to the will to achieve. (Howard & Howard, 1998, in Heinstorm, 2000). The more conscientious a person is the more competent, dutiful, orderly, responsible and thorough he is.

4. Neuroticism
The persons with a tendency towards neuroticism are more worried, temperamental and prone to sadness. (Howard & Howard, 1998, in Heinstorm, 2000). Emotional stability is related to calm, stable and relaxed persons, whereas neuroticism is linked to anger, anxiousness and depression. (Boeree, no date). The name neuroticism doesn’t refer to any psychiatric defect. A more proper term could be negative affectivity or nervousness (McCrae & John, 1992, in Heinstorm, 2000).

5. Openness
People with a high openness have broader interests, are liberal and like novelty. This factor relates to intellect, openness to new ideas, cultural interests, educational aptitude and creativity (Howard & Howard, 1998, in Heinstorm, 2000). These individuals are cultured, esthetic, intellectual and open. (Boeree, no date). The openness to experience can be connected to activities like writing, science and art (Wallach & Wing, 1969, in Heinstorm, 2000).

Due to its limitation on the number of respondents, this study focuses on personality type of introversion only. Below is the discussion on the students’ affective reaction towards collaborative writing as a part of a series of stages of Reading to Learn (R2L).

**How students of Different Personalities Reacted to the Fourth Phase of R2L**

Seen from their personalities, there were 5 extrovert and 5 introvert students. There
were 5 introvert students who became the respondents of this study. All came from Batch 2014. The students’ affective reactions are discussed one by one below.

Student A felt that working collaboratively with her peers. Different ideas and disagreement among group members often happened. Other problems included schedule clashes, incompatibility in terms of abilities or competence, and personal problems of the group members which often disturb the process of writing collaboratively.

“I think that making collaborative writing is difficult enough...I do not really enjoy this. We have to make it together which our ideas are different with others and when we reveal the ideas, they sometimes disagree with us and then the ideas are not accepted to put on our task. They just put in their ideas and develop by themselves, it is so annoying because it is hard to combine some different ideas to make one document. Afterward, sometimes we get member of group that are not suitable to work together, it is such self-ego or self-problem with them. It will distract our concentration because we are uncomfortable with them...Group work actually has advantages and disadvantages like my opinion above, but I more like make it by myself.” (Student A Journal, January 4, 2016, unedited)

Student B, on the other hand, was very positive about group work. He admitted that working collaboratively helped him write more easily and he could get lots of new ideas from his friends. Student B stated, “Thing that really helped me in writing my group essay is my comprehension to the topic, and the amount of sources that I read related to my topic. Moreover, the simple and clear inputs from my friends and teacher comfort me in writing the essay.” (Student B’s Journal, February 9, 2016, unedited)

Similar to Student A, Student C found it difficult to work together with her peers. Disagreements and burdens to write a good essay became the main problems for her, although she realized the positive sides of collaborative work. Below are her reactions on it.

“Actually, it was hard for me to combine our ideas in one essay. So, we often debate and argue our ideas in many times...For me, it was hard to find place and time to work together. In the other side, with working together, it was improve our team work. We knew what is bad and good from our partner. In that time, we also encourage each others to do our best for our study. Also, team work taught us to be patient, and responsible with our times, and our efforts”. (Student C’s Journal, February 9, 2016, unedited)

On the same boat as Student B was Student D. He was also very
optimistic about collaborative work. He said that good communication avoids misunderstanding among group members. His group communicated via Line, a social media to help them communicate better. He said that he could combine his ideas with his friends’ and thus, he benefitted from collaborative work, especially when he was stuck and had no idea of what to write.

The last student, Student E, showed his neutral position towards group work. He said that on the one hand, group work is beneficial. That is, if he felt comfortable and suitable with the group, he would feel confident. On the other hand, he would be disadvantageous if the group members are not compatible. The group members would ignore him and his ideas were not accepted. This, Student D claims, could destroy one’s mentality.

Conclusion

Though having the same personality, that is, introversion, these five students showed different affective feelings towards collaborative work. Some students (Student A and C) felt that working collaboratively with peer students was difficult and it made them dislike the activity. Schedule clashes, disagreement, and personal problems within each group member can be a nuisance.

Student B and Student D, on the other hand, were very positive about group work. They enjoyed working collaboratively with their peers. They could get new ideas from friends when they were stuck with theirs. The only student with neutral opinion was Student E. For him, as long as he got partners who were suitable and compatible with him, he felt okay and could enjoy the process.

Whether or not there is a relation between gender and the reaction towards joint reconstruction or collaborative writing process cannot be determined. Further research is thus needed to see this. As a general conclusion, what can be seen is the various reactions of the respondents towards the process of collaborative work.
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