LEMBAR HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH

Judul karya ilmiah (article) : The Exploration of Skilled and Less-Skilled EFL Graduate Students' on Ll and L2 Writing Strategies

JumlahPenulis : 1 orang

Dr. Syaadiah Arifin M.Pd. Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof.Dr. Hamka

Status Pengusul : Penulis pertama/penulis ke…/ penulis korespondensi **

Identitas Jurnai Ilmiah :

a. Nama Jurnal : JPI
b. Nomor ISSN : p-ISSN: 2303-288X, e-ISSN: 2541-7207
c. Volume, nomor. bulan, tahun : Vol 9, No 3 (2020)
d. Penerbit: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia
e. DOI artikel : 10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i3.28495
f. Alamat web Jurnal:
https :/ejournal,undiksha. ac. Id/index.php/JP/issue/view/ 1 5 60
g. terindeks di Sinta 2

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah :
(beri ✓pada kategori yang tepat)

[ ] Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional /internasional bereputasi.**
[√] Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi
[ ] Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional/ Nasional terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPERNICUS**

Hasil Penilaian *Peer Review* :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh
	Internasional/internasional bereputasi** [ ]	Nasional Terakreditasi [√]	Nasional *** [ ]	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi artikel (10%)		2.5		2.2
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)		7,5		7
c. Kecukupan dan kemutahiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)		7,5		7
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan/jurnal (30%)		7.5		7
Total = (100%)		25		23.5
Nilai Pengusul: Hanya satu penulis: 100%X…23….= 23.5				23.5

Artikel ini memberikan gambaran yang jelas mengenai strategi yang digunakan oleh mahasiswa dalam menulis bahasa Indonesia (L1) dan bahasa Inggris (L2), akan tetapi dikarenakan partisipan yang terbatas hasil temuan tidak begitu komprehensif. Untuk penelitian selanjutnya partisipan harus lebih banyak lagi.

Jakarta, 11 January 2021,
Reviewer 1

(Dr. Roslaini M.Hum)

NIDN:0006076041

Jabatan Akademik : Lektor Kepala

Unit Kerja: Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka

LEMBAR HASIL PENILAIAN SEJAWAT SEBIDANG ATAU PEER REVIEW
KARYA ILMIAH : JURNAL ILMIAH

Judul karya ilmiah (article) : The Exploration of Skilled and Less-Skilled EFL Graduate Students' on L1 and L2 Writing Strategies

JumlahPenulis : 1 orang

Dr. Syaadiah Arifin M.Pd. Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof.Dr. Hamka

Status Pengusul : Penulis pertama/penulis ke…./ penulis korespondensi **

Identitas Jurnai Ilmiah :
    a. Nama Jurnal : JPI
    b. Nomor ISSN : p-ISSN: 2303-288X, e-ISSN: 2541-7207
    c. Volume, nomor. bulan, tahun : Vol 9, No 3 (2020)
    d. Penerbit: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia
    e. DOI artikel : 10.23887/jpi-undiksha.v9i3.28495
    f. Alamat web Jurnal:
    https :/ejournal,undiksha. ac. Id/index.php/JP/issue/view/ 1 5 60
    g. terindeks di Sinta 2

Kategori Publikasi Jurnal Ilmiah : (beri ✓pada kategori yang tepat)
- [ ] Jurnal Ilmiah Internasional /internasional bereputasi.**
- [✓] Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional Terakreditasi
- [ ] Jurnal Ilmiah Nasional/ Nasional terindeks di DOAJ, CABI, COPERNICUS**

Hasil Penilaian *Peer Review* :

Komponen Yang Dinilai	Nilai Maksimal Jurnal Ilmiah			Nilai Akhir Yang Diperoleh
	Internasional/internasional bereputasi** [ ]	Nasional Terakreditasi √	Nasional *** [ ]	
a. Kelengkapan unsur isi artikel (10%)		2.5		2.5
b. Ruang lingkup dan kedalaman pembahasan (30%)		7,5		7
c. Kecukupan dan kemutahiran data/informasi dan metodologi (30%)		7,5		7
d. Kelengkapan unsur dan kualitas terbitan/jurnal (30%)		7.5		7.5
Total = (100%)		25		24
Nilai Pengusul: Hanya satu penulis: 100% x 24 = 24				24

Startegi-startegi penulisan yang digunakan mahasiswa hendaknya ditulis secara sistimatis agar lebih mudah dipahami oleh pembaca. Sebaiknya dibuat daftar strategi apa saja yang umumnya efektif dalam menulis dan tidak efektif agar dapat diaplikasikan di dalam kelas.

Serang, 6 Januari 2021
Reviewer 2

Dr. Yayu Heryatun M.Pd
Jabatan Akademik : Lektor Kepala
NIP:2007017304
Unit Kerja: Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten

Syaadiah Arifin_The Exploration of Skilled and Less-Skilled EFL Graduate Students' L1 and L2 Writing Strategies

by Syaadiah Arifin Uploaded By Nisa

The Exploration of Skilled and Less-Skilled EFL Graduate Students' L1 and L2 Writing Strategies

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore writing strategies applied by EFL graduate students when composing in Indonesian (L1) and English (L2). This study primarily investigated the similarities, differences, and transferability of student writers' strategies while they wrote the texts in L1 and L2. The participants, involving two males and females, were categorized into skilled and less-skilled writers. The data were collected over periods of four months using various data collecting methods: think-aloud protocols (TAPs), retrospective, and semi-structured interviews. The research shows that students employed similar personal strategies while they wrote in Indonesian (L1) and English (L2). The discovery highlights that students transferred L1 strategies to L2 writing strategies. Though students' strategies were similar, there were also some variances between the strategies applied by skilled and less-skilled ones. The skilled writers viewed writing as a process of planning, writing, reading rereading their text, rehearsing, and finally revising their writing. Meanwhile, less-skilled writers tended to employ linear and less recursive strategies. From the research findings, some suggestions are given for the future study of this kind.

Keywords: *writing strategies, similarities, and differences, transferability, skilled and less-skilled writers*

1. INTRODUCTION

Writing is viewed as a problematic language skill as it needs different skills and procedures (Harmey, 2020). Writing in L2 is more challenging than in L1, considering that writing in L2 needs some abilities in some parts such as spelling, vocabulary, usage, and sentence structure (Alfaki, 2015; Eliwarti & Maarof, 2014). Other intricacies of writing in L2 might also stem from some shreds of evidence; they had to confront cultural discrepancies, appropriate writing strategies, the familiarity with writing genres, and the attainment of academic proficiency in target languages (Al-Gharabally, 2015; Ortega, 2015). Nonetheless, writing strategies have substantial roles in the writing process. If appropriately utilized, writing strategies can affect students' writing quality, and distinguish between skilled and less-skilled writers (Khongput, 2020).

The writing literature on the progression of L2 writing skills in the Indonesian context is rare. Some research has already addressed the difficulties confronted by Indonesian students while writing in English (L2). The problems might be the applications of a product-based approach rather than the process-based approach that has still been implemented in Indonesian schools (Widodo, 2008), and the way of teaching implanted by Indonesian writing teachers.

Many Indonesian English teachers/ lecturers only focus on the final result without guiding them the process of generating text using systematic stages. They only ask students to write several paragraphs on the assigned topic and mark their writing and correct some grammatical mistakes. Teachers overlook the significant phase of writing, which is the process (Miftah, 2015). Writing is not merely about vocabulary, structures, sentences, and paragraphs. However, writing requires a process in which students formulate their thoughts, develop their ideas, explore ideas by reading books and articles, and discuss their ideas with their friends and teacher. The real process of writing certainly needs much effort and time both for the learners and the teachers.

The writing process also involves some stages that students have to go through: pre-writing/ planning, writing/ drafting, and reviewing consisting of revising and editing (Flower & Hayes, 1981; Widodo, 2008). Therefore, the writing process is cyclical and reflective. While writing, the students might encounter some problems. To overcome those difficulties, they can use some writing strategies in each stage.

Knowing the kinds of strategies used by skilled writers may greatly benefit for writing teachers as they can train less skilled writers to use appropriate strategies used by the skilled ones. However, students have limited exposure to writing strategies because teachers ignore the significance of using writing strategies. There were only a few studies in Indonesia regarding writing strategies that have been done by some Indonesian researchers (Ardila, 2020; Junianti, Pratolo, & Wulandari, 2020; Mistar & Parlindungan, 2014)

However, most of those studies only concentrated on the strategies applied by students when they wrote in L2. There has been inadequate comparative analysis in L1 and L2 between skilled and less-skilled writers in EFL contexts, specifically in the Indonesian context. Therefore, this current study intended to describe the similarities and differences writing strategies applied by skilled and less skilled students while composing in Indonesian and English, and tried to determine whether there are writing strategy transfers from L1 to L2 as similarities in L1 and L2 closely related to the transferability.

Theories of Writing Processes

A body of literature has suggested the models of cognitive process in L1 writing. The writing process models have been introduced since the beginning of the process approach. The most influential ones were introduced by many researchers, among others by (Flower & Hayes, 1980, 1981), who initially introduced the cognitive model; the other leading researchers were Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987). Their findings have been often quoted in English writing research as they directly shaped writing research of L2 students.

Flower & Hayes' cognitive model embodies the real writers' mental behavior while writing. Their research revealed various stages that writers have to go through: planning, drafting/ translating, and reviewing. The process also illustrates how the writing process begins, continues, and finishes in detail. When conducting their research, they relied on protocol analysis through which the researchers described the cognitive processes of the subjects used while performing the task. Their cognitive model postulates a concise depiction of the process, and their study is the most significant one despite some shortcomings of this model. One of them is expressed by Zimerman (1998) who stated that the model barely describes how writers' writing processes improvement, how the text might be produced, and what linguistic limitations might carry out. This model focuses more on planning and revising, but less consideration is given to the writing process. In response to the criticism, Flower and Hayes have revised the model of their writing process. Flower (1994) includes a social element to the model, and Hayes (2000) adds social and affective parts that include the emphasis on working memory. However, their initial model is still the most widely used and cited by researchers , and among others are (Abas & Abd Aziz, 2018; Ashrafiany, Hasanuddin, & Basalama, 2020).

Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) also offered the cognitive model, which is a 'knowledge telling' and a 'knowledge transforming' describing writers who possess diverse writing skills write differently. Skilled writers use considerably varied and complex writing strategies than

less-skilled writers; skilled writers spent more time resolving the content and rhetorical difficulties.

Based on L1 writing models, many scholars explored the typical L2 process with different participants since the 1980s (Raimes, 1987; Zamel, 1983). Their research discussed specific concerns such as the similarities and dissimilarities in L1 and L2 writing strategies, the application of L1 when writing in L2, and the transferability of L1 strategies when writing in L2 which affect the writing process. There are researchers (Ana Frankenberg-Garcia, 2010; Shofiya, 2013) highlighting several similarities and dissimilarities between L1 and L2 writing strategies which accordingly may affect the way students write in L2. The close connection between L1 and L2 writing strategies may support the writing strategies transfer from L1 to L2

Scholars view the terms strategy and process from different perspectives. Flower & Hayes (1980, 1981) did not use the word strategy instead of the term process and sub-process reciprocally to specify the strategies used by writers. In the writing process, writers need to undergo: pre-writing, while writing/ drafting, and reviewing. In each stage, writers use particular writing strategies to cope with the difficulty while writing. Students' writing strategies are individual actions and activities; the writer purposely used them when managing their writing assignment to unravel a problem or to attain a goal throughout the writing process (Shapira & Hertz-Lazarowitz, 2005). In this research, students' writing strategies refer to conscious actions or thought to develop the writing task or to overcome their difficulties encountered during the writing processes. In this situation writers took several actions such as, rereading a sentence(s) or a paragraph to generate ideas, pausing several times to think how to connect the new ideas to the previous sentence, planning globally to write the writing more systematically and efficiently. Every student has their respective strategies. Shapira and Lazarowitz (2005) also clustered strategies in writing into meta cognitive, cognitive, social, and affective strategies. Since the student writers wrote the task individually, the strategies focused only on cognitive and metacognitive strategies.

A growing interest in how people learn to write has generated numerous writing theories that also investigate strategies employed by writers to handle difficulties throughout the writing process. Some studies were conducted with native speakers of English while others in ESL/ EFL contexts. Some research only asked the research participants to write only in L2 to identify the role of L1 writing strategies while writing in L2 such as the transferability of writing strategies from L1 to L2, the use of their L1 when writing in L2 (Stapa & Majid, 2006). Therefore, for cognitive operations, they could utilize their L1 and L2 when they wrote in L2.

However, there has been insufficient comparative analysis of Ll and L2 writing processes between skilled and unskilled writers in the EFL context. To our knowledge, there is limited research which had examined the writing strategies applied by Indonesian graduate students in finishing their L1 versus L2 in different writing tasks (comparative studies).The studies (Arifin, 2020; Widiati & Cahyono, 2001) only focus on students' strategies while writing in L2. However, they did not observe the kinds of strategies applied by students while writing in L1. L1 used during the process of writing might affect their L2 writing quality.

Therefore, the present study fills this niche by investigating and comparing EFL student writers' strategies in real-time processing. Two research questions were formulated to examine the issues of similarities, differences, and transferability.

1. What are the differences and similarities of the writing strategies applied by the skilled and less-skilled students while writing in L1 and L2?
2. How do EFL students transfer the strategies from L1 to L2?

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. The Subjects of the Research

There were four graduate students in the first semester of 2019/2020 majoring in English Education. The students were thoroughly selected over purposeful sampling for in-depth case studies, Aldy, Dinna, Rita, and Ren (all pseudo names). To determine skilled and less-skilled subjects, they all had to write argumentative essays about particular themes in English and Indonesian within three hours in English (70 minutes) and Indonesian (70 minutes) on different days. Two experienced raters ranked the students' writing. The marks corrected by the raters to each of the essay were grouped; the grades were the major indicators used to rank students: skilled and less-skilled student writers. Less skill writers demonstrated difficulties in writing English profoundly while skilled writers could direct their ideas and deliver their meaningful meanings to readers clearly. Moreover, Student writers unveiled a good knowledge of grammar, applied proper and wide ranging vocabulary, and wrote a comprehensive paper. This could be owing to their education. However, the real contents of less-skilled writers writings were, however, still elusive and superficial.

For the second indicator, the researcher had a discussion with the lecturer teaching Academic Writing Course to find out some information about the students' performance in L2 writing. Four students were classified as L2 skilled writers. However, only two were eligible to join the research as the other two students could not do think-aloud procedures as they had to verbalize and write their thoughts simultaneously. Two less skilled writers were chosen based on the first indicator and their portfolios as the second indicator.

In this research, all of the students were relatively-skilled Indonesian writers as they studied Indonesian for a long time. The researcher focused on students'L2 writing to determine skilled and less-skilled writers. The reason to ask the students to write in L1 was to see whether their L1 writing strategies had effects on their L2 writing.

1.2. Data Collection Procedures

The qualitative data were gathered from multiple data analysis methods: think-aloud protocols (TAPs), direct observations, and interviews. These four participants were asked to write two texts in Indonesian and English under think-aloud conditions. "Homeschooling is better than the public school educational system", and "Pengaruh Televisi terhadap Perkembangan Anak."

The TPAs were employed to allow the collection of data on students' cognitive processes in writing. In TPAs, students were to verbalize what they were thinking of and feelings while writing. Therefore, this enabled the implicit procedure and mental activities of specific tasks explicit and helped us capture the students' cognitive activities, and processes and strategies (Latif, 2009). In addition to TPAs, students' writing was also collected for the data analysis, and their writing aloud was observed and monitored carefully. The observation was also employed to understand students' writing difficulty, repeated words, paused, revised, rehearsed, read, and reread. A small recorder was placed on the participants' desk, and a video recorded was set on behind them. The data collected from such observations were followed up with retrospective interviews. The students got interviews on the same

day. In the interviews, each writer was to explain his/her choices when writing the text. Thematic analysis was performed to analyze the collected data from the interviews.

Data collected from TPAs were analyzed using coding taxonomies, adapting from Wong's (2005) as Wong differentiates between revising and editing and what activities students do while doing those as in Table 2 below:

Table 2. The coding scheme of the present study for Indonesian (L1) and English (L2)

Writing Stages	Strategies	Individual Strategies
Planning/ Pre-Writing	Meta Cognitive	- To plan (**Pl**) • Global planning (**Plg**) •Local planning (**Pll**) - To organize/ restructure the paragraph (**Op**) - To take position (**Tp**)
	Cognitive	Generating Ideas/ developing the content - To read/reread the prompt (**Rt**) - To read/reread the sentence (s)/ paragraph (**Rd**) - To rehearse (**Rh**) - Pausing (**P**)
Drafting/ While Writing	Meta Cognitive	- Local Planning - To organize/ restructure the paragraph (**Op**)
	Cognitive	Generating Ideas/ developing the content - To read/reread the prompt (**Rt**) - To read/reread the sentence (s)/ paragraph (**Rd**) - To rehearse (**Rh**) - Pausing (**P**)
Reviewing	Meta Cognitive	To evaluate the text (**Ev**): to scan & read the paragraphs
	Cognitive	To revise the text (**Rv**): changing the text affecting meaning - a addition (**Rva**) - o omission (**Rvo**) To Edit the text (Re): changing the word without affecting meaning - adding (**Ea**) - punctuation (**Ep**) spelling error (**Esp**) grammatical mistakes (**Eg**)

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1. The Similarities and Differences of Skilled and Less-Skilled Students' writing strategies in L1 and L2

In the Planning Stage

Data analysis from TPAs indicated that skilled writers adopted similar strategies when they wrote in L1 and L2. As soon as they got the topic, they read and reread the prompt (Rt). Both of them attempted to evaluate the demand for the prompt. After identifying the

problem, both of them devoted some time to planning their essay. They both planned globally (Plg) and organized their paragraph and the content (Op). They wrote detailed outlines, particularly Aldy. They mentioned their stance in the planning stage to agree or disagree with the topic (Tp). To generate more ideas, Dinna read or reread the sentences she has written (Rd) and paused (P), while Aldy depended on rehearsing (Rh) and pausing (P). When rehearsing, students tried to generate or retrieve information on the theme and improve these ideas. Based on the data gathered from retrospective interview, both of them paused (P) because of several reasons: when it was connected to the difficulties of the idea to be stated, they paused a while, while reading or rereading preceding sentences, they paused briefly to reformulate the idea, or while the student writers wanted to plan what to do next. In this research, pausing is classified as one of the cognitive strategies.

However, less-skilled writers had different patterns from skilled writers when planning in L1 and L2. When they got the topic, they read/ reread several times. As observed, Ren only did mental planning when writing in L1 and L2.
Here are some excerpt taken from the interview:

Ren: " *when I write in English or Indonesian…. I always read the topic several times…..then I arrange some ideas in my mind. I always think what I will write before starting to write .....*"
Rita:*" I plan what I am writing…but only the main points…" I used to write short stories in Indonesian when I was still in the teacher training……I wrote in Indonesian fluently without being bothered by ideas generating…..i write whatever comes into my mind about the topic….I am a good writer in Indonesian, so I don't need to plan in detail what I am going to write…..but when writing in English is more complicated……I had a problem to develop ideas….*

Ren and Rita often changed sentences or paragraphs that they had written because they did inappropriate planning. Ren often did local planning (Pll) as soon as he got a new idea while Rita took a limited time to plan her writings. She only wrote her ideas in global, not in detail. Therefore, less-skilled writers often used local planning because they did not have fixed guidance to continue writing their texts.

In the Writing/ Drafting Stage
In this stage, both Aldy and Dinna stuck to their plans consistently while writing in L1 and L2. Dinna frequently relied on reading/ rereading (Rd) what had been written, and rehearsing (Rh) to generate ideas. She paused (P) when writing in L1 and L2 but not as often as Aldy did. She also revised (Rv) and edited the text (Ed) quite often. When writing in L2, Dinna used more reading/rereading (Rd) strategies to generate ideas than writing in L1. Moreover, Dinna revised her text while writing such as omitting the phrase (Rvo) and adding a clause (Rva). Dinna edited (Ed) her writing whenever she found something not appropriate such as spelling error (Esp), or grammatical errors (Eg). As for Aldy, he relied on reading/ rereading (Rd) and rehearsing (Rh) to generate ideas when writing in L1 and L2. He also revised (Rv) his text while writing several times such as omitting a sentence (Rvo) several times. He did pausing (P) a lot when writing in L1 and L2.

However, Ritas's writing was linear as she rarely read/ reread (Rd), stopped to revise and edit, or rehearsed (Rh). She kept writing without any interruptions. Concerning Ren, he

used more writing strategies than Rita did. Ren depended on reading/rereading (Rd) and rehearsing (Rh) to generate ideas. Both of them used their strategies in low frequency. In the reviewing stage, both Dinna and Ren only did surface-level changes, such as grammar (Eg), spellings (Esp), and vocabularies.

In the Reviewing Stage

Aldy and Dinna stated that they usually reread (Rd) their entire texts at least once to examine what they assumed was right. In this study, student writers reread their texts several times when writing in L1 and L2. They reviewed (Rv) their texts comprehensively to discover their essays flow to improve more connected ideas. Dinna went over her essay structure, read the text judiciously, and applied the external revisions/editing (done throughout the writing process), so did Aldy. Aldy and Dinna only did a few internal revisions/ editing (done throughout the reviewing stage). When having retrospective interview, they said that in the writing/ drafting stage, they repeatedly read their text to monitor their writing. Thus, they only did a few internal revisions and editing.

However, Ren and Rita only reread their texts once. After completing their essay, both of them looked through their text and made minor correction. The student writers frequently concentrated on editing basic grammar mistakes, and spellings.

The first significant discovery concerning the student writers' writing processes is that student writers exhibited a similar writing style when writing in both languages (Indonesian and English) with some minor but interesting variations. For example, Aldy, Dinna, Rita went through the same stages: planning, writing/ drafting, and reviewing. Ren did mental planning (he did not write his planning while writing in L1 and L2, but he had planned what to write in his mind). It means that meta-cognitive strategies were used by all writers with various degrees when planning their essays. Meta-cognitive knowledge impacted greatly to the quality of writing. Discoveries prove that writers who spent sufficient time in plan their writing, organized the paragraphs and the content appropriately of their writing were successful writers, but students who did little planning experienced difficulty in processing their writing task. Skilled writers who spent some time to plan globally enabled them to keep track their main ideas; moreover, they followed the direction of their writing(Victori, 1999). Mahmoudi also (2017)stated that sufficient planning can greatly affect the quality one's writing.

The second finding was that both skilled writers used akin patterns when writing/ drafting in L1 and L2. They used reading/ and rereading in high frequency, so they were aware of the nature of writing, which is recursive. While reading/ rereading, they also revised and edited their essays.

Regarding to less-skilled writers, Rita applied a strategy proposed by Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) "what-next-strategy" and "I think…what else". They suggested a knowledge-telling model. Young learners and less-skilled writers usually instigate their writing without or little planning, or they do their planning insufficiently since they just tell what they have to express in an easy technique. This strategy is called "natural" or "unproblematic" since it embraces barely any planning or revision. Rita wrote whatever ideas coming into her mind when she wrote in L1 and L2. She also got some ideas from reading the last sentence silently. Moreover, Rita applied a linear writing style. She rarely rehearsed, repeated the words to generate ideas, or stopped to revise and edit the text. In the same vein, Ren also adopted ineffective writing strategies. He used the strategies in low

frequency. However, since both of them get substantial exposures to their L1 and were used to writing in L1 in their daily activity, they did not have any problem with their L1 writing.

The last, less-skilled writers did minimal revisions as they paid more attention to surface changes than skilled writers. This result is consistent with some researchers (Lei, 2016; Sommers, 1980). Less-skilled writers made fewer global (meaning-changing) revisions and more surface (word) changes than skilled writers. Less-skilled writers stated that they were not aware of the significance of revision, which could help them develop and generate their thoughts. They only fixed their writing only what they knew, mainly dealing with common errors such as vocabulary and grammatical mistakes.

The qualitative analysis results showed that skilled writers adopted similar writing strategies in L1 and L2.. They had a similar planning pattern with some variations: they devoted some time to plan their essay. They both planned globally and organized their paragraph and content. They wrote detailed outlines, particularly Aldy. He also paused more than Dinna. They used similar strategies when planning in L1 and L2. Moreover, both of them were more concerned with global revision (meaning changing).

However, the findings also highlighted differences in writing strategies among the participants. The differences tended to be quantitative. Dinna wrote a more extended text in L1 (598 words), while Aldy only wrote 454 words. Dinna spent 44 minutes in the writing phase, while Aldy only spent 39 minutes when writing in L1. While writing in L2, Aldy took 6 minutes to plan his essay while Dinna spent almost 5 minutes. Aldy used more strategies when writing in L2 than Dinna. It can be concluded that skilled writers using effective writing strategies knew when to pick out the appropriate strategies and apply them efficiently. For example, both knew how to generate ideas, what they were going to write next, and when to do revision and edit. They read/ reread the sentence(s) and paragraph(s) because of several reasons. Skilled writers were aware of that writing was not linear and infrequently wrote repetitive sentences. These present research results were also in agreement with the study of (Flower & Hayes, 1981). However, less-skilled did not experience writing as repeated processes as they could move back and forward to produce ideas and revise the writings to develop their envisioned meanings.

Regarding less skilled writers, Rita devoted spare time to planning her writing when writing L1 and L2. She only wrote a few keywords before writing, while Ren only did mental planning, but they planned their writing in their way. In writing/ translating stage, Rita's writing was linear as she rarely read/ reread, stopped to revise and edit, or rehearsed. She kept writing without any disruptions. As observed, Ren applied more writing strategies than Dinna. They applied the strategies in low occurrence. In the reviewing stage, they only made little changes on the superficial level, such as fixing grammar mistakes, spellings errors, punctuations, and vocabularies.

From the findings above, planning and revising strategies were applied more effectively compared to skilled writers. In Sasaki's research (2000) skilled writers used planning and revising strategies more effectively than inexperienced ones.

The significant discrepancy between the two groups of writers is the recursiveness of their writing processes. Skilled writers used some strategies in high frequency, both in L1 and L2. The consequence of their writing style was highly recursive. Consequently, their writing style is inclined to be linear. Skilled writers appeared to be aware of that writing is recursive. They could deliberately control and direct their writing process. These results show similarities with other scholars' studies (Flower & Hayes, 1981).

3.2 Transferability

Some previous studies proved that similarities in L1and L2 writing strategies indicated that writers transferred their L1 writing strategies while they wrote in L2(Guo & Huang, 2018). Based on the retrospective interview, each student writer said they used similar strategies while they wrote in L1 and L2. However, the transferability of L1 writing strategies may not always be positive and negative transfer (Karim & Nassaji, 2013). The negative transfer was also found in Less-skilled writers. Rita and Ren were reported not to employ effective writing strategies when they wrote in their L1. Rita used a linear writing style. She infrequently rehearsed, read/ reread the previous sentence(s) or paragraph to generate ideas, or paused to revise and edit the text. As observed, Ren also used the writing strategies in low frequency while writing in L1 and L2. However, since both of them got substantial exposures to their L1 and were used to writing in L1 daily, they could still produce an acceptable piece of writing. Nonetheless, when they employed their ineffective L1 writing strategies in L2 writing, those strategies did not work as Indonesian's nature is different from that of English. The transfer of their L1writing strategies to L2 would keep them using ineffective strategies to approach L2 writing tasks even though these methods may work in their L1 writing.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Results of the current research revealed that all student writers applied similar individual strategies. However, skilled writers employed effective strategies in L1 and L2 from the very beginning of their writing. Based on the semi-structured and retrospective interviews, they also transferred their effective L1 writing strategies to L2. On the other hand, less-skilled also transferred their ineffective L1 strategies in their L2 writing.

Aside from some similarities, there were also some differences laid in the recursiveness of their writing. Skilled writers understood that writing was an ongoing cycle, not a one-step process. They used strategies such as reading/ rereading, revising/ editing, and rehearsing in high frequency. However, less-skilled writers were inclined to apply linear and less recursive writing style. Writing is not a straightforward or linear process that should be informed to students by writing teachers that they are allowed to go back and forth to get their ideas.

Thus, writing teachers have to extensively promote effective writing strategies to support the recursive nature of writing and solve students' writing task problems. Teachers can prepare some writing activities, show them how to utilize the strategies in their writing, and then practice. Writing training would be useful in language classes. This activity aims to increase students' and teachers' alertness of the strategies that students tend to use. This activity also enables students to monitor their strategic behavior when carrying out the writing assignment at hand and help them discover their effective writing strategies. Students ought to be taught how to concentrate more on the overall content subjects than to concentrate on minor mechanical concerns, which took up much of their time but are less active and give less productive results. They should be provided with the tools and opportunities to self-explore and self-evaluate the writing strategies they tend to use in different task contexts. Besides, they will also know their preferences of strategies and how strategies work for or against different writing tasks.

Moreover, Students should be given good instruction in their L1 (Indonesian) in their early academic life, including using effective writing strategies. The positive effects of LI

writing, including L1 writing abilities, and writing strategies, on L2 writing, have been documented. The knowledge that students have gained may be transferable to their L2 writing. The students' experiences from their Ll training may facilitate their L2 writing, particularly the strategies to generate and organize ideas for their writings. All the student writers in this study are relatively L1 skilled writers. Based on the interview, the subjects stated that they had got insufficient teaching in Ll writing throughout their whole academic life, including elementary and secondary schooling. Their ability to write in L1 was not from school, but they developed it daily. Some students stated that they could write in Indonesian because they were used to writing in Indonesian in their job.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abas, I. H., & Abd Aziz, N. H. (2018). Model of the writing process and strategies of EFL proficient student writers: A case study of Indonesian learners. *Pertanika Journal of Social*

Sciences and Humanities, 26(3), 1815–1842.

Al-Gharabally, M. (2015). the Writing Difficulties Faced By L2 Learners and How To Minimize Them. *International Journal of English Language and Linguistics Research*, 3(5), 42–49. Retrieved from http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-writing-difficulties-faced-by-L2-learners-and-how-to-minimize-them.pdfwww.eajournals.org

Alfaki, I. M. (2015). University students' English writing problems. *International Journal of English Language Teaching. Published by European Centre for Research Training and Development UK (Www.Eajournals.Org)*, 3(3), 40–52. Retrieved from http://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/University-Students----English-Writing-Problems-Diagnosis-and-Remedy.pdf

Ana Frankenberg-Garcia. (2010). *Do the similarities between L1 and L2 writing processes conceal important differences? Ana Frankenberg-Garcia*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/3260841/Do_the_similarities_between_L1_and_L2_writing_processes_Conceal_important_differences

Ardila, I. (2020). Writing Strategies Used by Indonesian EFL Undergraduate Students across Their Proficiency and Gender. *JLIC (JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE INTELRGENCE AND CULTURE*, 1(2), 138–149. Retrieved from https://jlic.iain-jember.ac.id/index.php/jlic/article/view/20

Arifin, S. (2020). Investigating the L2 Writing Strategies Used by Skillful English Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 53(1), 78. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpp.v53i1.24939

Ashrafiany, Hasanuddin, & Basalama, N. (2020). THE STUDENTS' WRITING DIFFICULTIES IN WRITING AN ESSAY BASED ON COGNITIVE PROCESS. *LINGUA, Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa*, 16(1), 61–69. https://doi.org/DOI: https://doi.org/10.34005/lingua.v16i1.560

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). The Psychology Of Written composition. In *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc*.

Eliwarti, & Maarof, N. (2014). The Effects of types of writing approaches on EFL students' writing performance. *Selt*, 11–12(June), 112–119. Retrieved from file:///C:/Users/user/Downloads/6692-13320-1-SM (3).pdf

Flower, L. (1994). The Construction of Negotiated Meaning: A Social Cognitive Theory of Writing - Linda Flower - Google Books. Retrieved August 26, 2020, from https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=2nemk1Q8GdkC&oi=fnd&pg=PP9&dq=Flower,+L.+(1994).+The+construction+of+negotiated+meaning:+A+social+cognitive+theory+of+writing.+Carbondale:+Sothern+Illinois+University+Press.&ots=YW23UOsGOC&sig=_DObrxvif005nBHo

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1980). The Cognition of Discovery: Defining a Rhetorical Problem. *College Composition and Communication*, 31(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.2307/356630

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365. https://doi.org/10.2307/356600

Guo, X., & Huang, L. S. (2018). Are L1 and L2 strategies transferable? An exploration of the L1 and L2 writing strategies of Chinese graduate students. *Language Learning Journal*, 0(0), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2018.1435710

Harmey, S. J. (2020). Co-constructing writing: handing over the reins to young authors. *Education 3-13*, 0(0), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2020.1732438

Hayes, J. R. (2000). Perspectives on Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice - Google Books. In *Perspective on Writing: Research, Theory, and Practice* (pp. 6–43). Retrieved from

https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=en&lr=&id=iUkHwwUWzUYC&oi=fnd&pg=PA6&dq=Hayes,+J.+R.+(2000).+A+new+framework+for+understanding+cognition+and+affect+in+writing.+Newark,+NJ:+International+Reading+Association.&ots=b08MSq3ZY0&sig=Ja7hgqIF3x8I2YtuaJBFaj05H

Junianti, R., Pratolo, B. W., & Wulandari, A. T. (2020). The Strategies of Learning Writing Used by EFL Learners at a Higher Education Institution Corresponding Email Article's History. *Ethical Lingua*, *7*(1), 64–73. https://doi.org/10.30605/25409190.131

Karim, K., & Nassaji, H. (2013). *Karim K & H Nassaji - First language transfer in second language writing, An examination of current research*. *1*(1), 117–134.

Khongput, S. (2020). Metastrategies Used by EFL Students in Learning English Writing : *LEARN Journal : Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, *13*(2), 93–104. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1258799.pdf

Latif, M. M. A. (2009). *The Problems Identified in the Previous Coding Schemes Used for Analysing L2 / FL Writers ' Think-Aloud Protocols*. 1–19. Retrieved from https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.569.6071&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Lei, X. (2016). Understanding writing strategy use from a sociocultural perspective: The case of skilled and less-skilled writers. *System*, *60*, 105–116. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.06.006

Mahmoudi, A. (2017). Effect of Planning on Iranian Intermediate EFL Learners' Mastery of Writing Skill. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *7*(3), 219. https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0703.08

Miftah, M. Z. (2015). Through Writing Process Approach. *Journal of English as a Foreign Language*, *5*(1), 9–24. https://doi.org/DOI: https://doi.org/10.23971/jefl.v5i1.88

Mistar, J., & Parlindungan, F. (2014). Strategies of learning English writing skill by Indonesian senior hgh school students. *Arab World English Journal*, *5*(1), 290–303.

Ortega, L. (2015). Syntactic complexity in L2 writing: Progress and expansion. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *29*, 82–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2015.06.008

Raimes, A. (1987). Language Proficiency, Writing Ability, and Composing Strategies: A Study of ESL College Student Writers. *Language Learning*, *37*(3), 439–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1987.tb00579.x

Sasaki, M. (2000). 太田さん.Pdf. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *9*(3), 259–291.

Shapira, A., & Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (2005). Opening windows on arab and jewish children's strategies as writers. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *18*(1), 72–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310508668734

Shofiya, A. (2013). WRITING STRATEGIES EMPLOYED BY SECOND. *Lingua Scientia*, *5*(1), 93–103. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21274/ls.2013.5.1.93-103

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision Strategies of Student Writers and Experienced Adult Writers. *College Composition and Communication*, *31*(4), 378–388. https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0653

Stapa, S. H., & Majid, H. A. (2006). The Use Of First Language In Limited English Proficiency Classes: Good, Bad Or Ugly? *E-BANGI : Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *1*(1), 1–12. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255573160_The_Use_Of_First_Language_In_Limited_English_Proficiency_Classes_Good_Bad_Or_Ugly

Victori, M. (1999). An analysis of writing knowledge in EFL composing: A case study of two effective and two less effective writers. *System*, *27*(4), 537–555.

    https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00049-4

Widiati, U., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2001). The teaching of EFL writing in the Indonesian context:the state of the Art. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *13*(3), 139–150.

Widodo, H. P. (2008). Process-Based Academic Essay Writing Instruction. *Jurnal Bahasa Dan Seni*, *36*(1), 101–106.

Wong, A. T. Y. (2005). Writers' mental representations of the intended audience and of the rhetorical purpose for writing and the strategies that they employed when they composed. *System*, *33*(1), 29–47. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2004.06.009

Zamel, V. (1983). The Composing Processes of Advanced ESL Students: Six Case Studies. *TESOL Quarterly*, *17*(2), 165. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586647

Zimmerman, B. B. (1998). *Linda Flower and Social Cognition : Constructing A View of the Writing Process Beverly B . Zimmerman Department of English Brigham Young University 3161 JKHB Provo , UT 84602*. 22(3), 25–37.

Syaadiah Arifin_The Exploration of Skilled and Less-Skilled EFL Graduate Students' L1 and L2 Writing Strategies

Exclude quotes	On	Exclude matches	< 17 words
Exclude bibliography	On		