Reverse Transfer of Writing Rhetorical Structures by Indonesian EFL Learners

Rusfandi

English Education, Faculty of Language and Literature, Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang, Malang, Indonesia

0706057601@unikama.ac.id

Reverse Transfer of Writing Rhetorical Structures by Indonesian EFL Learners

Rusfandi

0706057601@unikama.ac.id

English Education, Faculty of Language and Literature, Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang, Malang, Indonesia

Abstract: The reverse transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 involves reusing and reshaping prior knowledge. However, research on this issue generally focuses on the former rather than the latter. Further investigation is needed to understand how individual (writing and language proficiency) and social factors (writing audience) interact dynamically during L2 and L1 writing and affect the reverse transfer. This study investigates the potential transfer of rhetorical structures from L2 English to L1 Indonesian as a result of L2 instruction in a tertiary Indonesian EFL context by comparing the presence of argument-counterargument features in the students' L1 and L2 essays. This quantitative study was conducted at a private Indonesian university, involving students from English Education (N=89) and Indonesian Language and Literature (N=100) study programs. The study found evidence of reverse transfer in the use of argument-counterargument structure among third-year English majors deemed to be skillful writers. However, the occurrence of it is not automatic, mediated by factors such as the writer's writing proficiency, L2 proficiency, and perceived audience expectation. This finding shows that the reverse transfer of writing knowledge is dynamic and influenced by both the student's writing ability development and L1 and L2 writing traditions.

Key words: reverse transfer, argument-counterargument structure, argumentative writing, conceptual knowledge of writing

Abstrak: *Fenomena reverse transfer pengetahuan menulis dari bahasa kedua (L2) ke bahasa pertama (L1) melibatkan proses reuse (menggunakan kembali) dan reshape (membentuk kembali/memodifikasi) pengetahuan/konsep menulis yang diperoleh sebelumnya. Namun, penelitian tentang reverse transfer kemampuan menulis umumnya masih berfokus pada aspek reuse dan belum banyak pada aspek reshape, utamanya dalam konteks pembelajaran EFL di Indonesia. Sehingga, penelitian lanjutan perlu dilakukan untuk memahami bagaimana faktor individual (kemampuan menulis dan level kemahiran bahasa) dan faktor sosial (writing audience) berinteraksi secara dinamis ketika pembelajar EFL menulis dalam L2 dan L1 dan mempengaruhi proses reverse transfer. Penelitian ini mengkaji potensi transfer pengetahuan struktur retorika menulis dari L2 (bahasa Inggris) ke L1 (bahasa Indonesia) sebagai hasil dari pembelajaran menulis dalam L2. Dalam penelitian ini, peneliti berfokus pada bentuk elaborasi fitur argumen-kontraargumen pada esai argumentatif yang ditulis dalam L2 dan L1. Menggunakan metode kuantitatif, penelitian ini dilakukan di sebuah perguruan tinggi swasta di Indonesia dan melibatkan partisipan dari program studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (N=89) dan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia (N=100). Penelitian ini menemukan bukti adanya reverse transfer dalam penggunaan struktur argumen-kontraargumen pada esai argumentatif L2 dan L1 yang ditulis oleh partisipan dari Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris tahun ke tiga dengan kategori penulis mahir (skilled writers). Akan tetapi, terjadinya reverse transfer tersebut tidaklah bersifat otomatis karena dimediasi oleh beberapa faktor seperti kemampuan menulis,*

kemahiran berbahasa, dan pemahaman tentang audience. Temuan ini menunjukkan bahwa reverse transfer pengetahuan menulis bersifat dinamis dipengaruhi oleh perkembangan kemampuan/pengetahuan menulis dari pembelajar L2 dan pemahamannya tentang tradisi menulis dalam L1 dan L2.

Kata kunci: *transfer terbalik, struktur argumen-kontraargumen, tulisan argumentatif, pengetahuan konseptual menulis*

INTRODUCTION

Reverse transfer of prior writing knowledge learned from a second language (L2) to a first language (L1) has been a focus of research for the last two decades (e.g., Forbes & Fisher, 2020; Kecskés & Papp, 2000). The main aim is to understand the interrelation between L1 and L2 knowledge and how L2 writing development, resulting from L2 instruction or experience, contributes to learners' L1 writing.

Studies on reverse transfer of writing knowledge are generally motivated by theories such as intercultural rhetoric (Connor, 2011), multicompetence (Cook, 2016), and a dynamic view of transfer (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016). These theories posit that L2 learners do not develop distinct conceptual systems for writing in each language they know, but rather a combined system encompassing all the writing knowledge they have gained through L1 and L2. This implies that when L2 learners receive more writing instruction and practice in L2 than in L1 (such as studying L2 as a field of study in university), their writing abilities and knowledge will improve and overlap between the two languages.

Recent literature on reverse transfer of writing knowledge also suggests that the term reverse transfer should be seen not only as the use and reuse of certain aspects of L2, such as rhetorical structures in L2 learners' L1 writing, but also as a process of shaping and reshaping their writing knowledge (DePalma & Ringer, 2014; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016). This is because L2 learners might also go through a cognitively more complex process in their efforts to reuse, and reshape aspects of L2 knowledge they have learned through, for example, L2 learning.

For instance, although many students in the study conducted by Rusfandi (2015) elaborated an argument-counterargument structure in their L1 essays, an opposing view was sometimes developed without its rebuttal. In addition, the counter-argument was frequently positioned in the introduction section of the students' essays and used to introduce the main claim. The students' novice understanding of the argument-counterargument structure and possible different audience/reader expectations of writing in L1 and L2 are assumed to be the main factors behind the less persuasive example of argumentation. The elaboration of this type of argument-counterargument structure is considered weak and less convincing within the English academic tradition (Ramage et al., 2021) because the writer does not provide sufficient justification for the opposing view and the rebuttal of it supported by clear and convincing grounds.

Theoretically, an improved understanding of the reverse transfer phenomenon of writing knowledge among bilingual writers can shed light on the viability of bilingual theories, which contend that bilinguals' linguistic knowledge and literacy (i.e., reading and writing) are not unique but interdependent. It is believed that a bidirectional cross-linguistic and cross-literacy transfer occurs, especially for conceptual aspects such as abstract reasoning, reading/writing

strategies, and the utilization of prior knowledge (Cook, 2016; Cummins, 2021). In this study, the term reverse transfer refers to the incorporation (reuse) and modification (reshape) of L2-specific rhetorical features (e.g., refutation) in the participants' L1 writing. These occur as a result of their experience with L2 and L2 writing instruction at the university level.

From a pedagogical standpoint, understanding the efforts of Indonesian EFL learners to elaborate an argument-counterargument structure, the challenges they face in writing in both L2 and L1, and the potential for developing cross-language writing knowledge could be valuable for teachers. This understanding can help in developing the learners' higher-order thinking skills (Qin & Karabacak, 2010) by providing better instructional strategies and methods.

Despite the importance of the theoretical and pedagogical aspects mentioned above, there have been only a few studies (e.g., Arsyad, 1999; Rusfandi, 2013) conducted on the possibility of transferring writing knowledge from L2 to L1 in a less familiar EFL context like Indonesia. The existing research primarily focuses on examining the reasoning and quality of argument structures in Indonesian EFL learners' writing (El Khoiri & Widiati, 2017; Fajrina et al., 2022), as well as the instructional strategies that can help improve their ability to write an English argumentative essay (Murtadho, 2021). However, the previous studies on the reverse transfer of writing knowledge particularly in the Indonesian EFL context predominantly focused on the reusing rather than the reshaping aspects of the reverse transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1. Consequently, further research is needed to investigate how individual factors (writing and language proficiencies) and social factors (perceived writing audience) dynamically interact during L2 and L1 writing process, and how they impact the reverse transfer process.

In response to this gap, the present study aims to understand how reverse transfer occurs and how individual and social factors can influence this transfer process. To achieve this goal, the researcher will compare and contrast the use of argument-counterargument structures in L2 (English) and L1 (Indonesian) essays written by third- and first-year English majors. Additionally, the researcher will compare L1 essays written by English majors with those written by third-year Indonesian majors to determine if certain rhetorical features used by English majors are specific to English and not commonly used in Indonesian essays. This research will also identify the various patterns of the use of the refutation feature in L1 and L2 essays. The purpose is to understand whether the transfer process, as argued by DePalma and Ringer (2011) and Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016), is dynamic and mediated by individual factors such as L2 proficiency and general writing proficiency, as well as social factors such as perceived audience expectations.

The study aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Does an argument-counterargument structure present in the students' L2 and L1 essays?

2. Is there evidence of a transfer of writing rhetorical structure from L2 to L1 in the students' argumentative essays? If so, what is the pattern of the transfer?

LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Argumentative Writing: Indonesian vs. English

Writing in all languages is a dialogic process between a writer and readers, as the purpose is to communicate meaning through writing. However, there are differences concerning the

explicitness of idea transaction between English and other languages (Čmejrková & Daneš, 1997). English typically takes a more explicit approach in argument structures, often employing rhetorical features such as refutation (counter-argument and rebuttal) in argumentative writing (Wyrick, 2022). In contrast, other languages like Chinese and Indonesian tend to use an indirect and implicit form of dialogue between the writer and the imagined audience, utilizing varying degrees of indirectness and implicitness in conveying information (Fajrina et al., 2022; Hinkel, 1999). Consequently, Indonesian argumentative writing may not feature an explicit use of the argument-counterargument structure, as it is not considered an essential aspect to elaborate on.

Regarding paragraph development, Bahasa Indonesia is commonly seen as having an inductive rhetorical structure, as opposed to a deductive one (Fajrina et al., 2022; Kuntjara, 2004). In addition, the rhetoric in Bahasa Indonesia is reader-responsible rather than writer-responsible. The responsibility for clarifying the meaning of a statement lies more with the reader rather than the writer (Hinds, 1987). In Indonesia, an individual, especially in formal contexts like speeches or formal writing, tend to use the pronoun 'We' instead of 'I' when referring to him/herself. This is typically done to sound more polite and to minimize personal responsibility for what is being said. This indicates that in the context of writing, Bahasa Indonesia culturally embraces a reader-responsible approach rather than a writer-responsible one.

There is no theoretical explanation available that explicitly specifies the unique Indonesian rhetorical structures. Typically, an Indonesian essay consists of three basic structures: an introductory paragraph with a thesis statement, developmental paragraphs, and a concluding paragraph (Numertayasa et al., 2013). A literature review of the superstructure of Indonesian argumentative writing indicates that refutation is not yet considered an important aspect that requires elaboration in Indonesian argumentative writing. For example, research conducted by Rusfandi (2013) and Arsyad (1999) found minimal inclusion of the refutation section in argumentative essays written by third-year students majoring in Indonesian. Meanwhile, English writing has a writer-responsible rhetoric. An English writer must provide unified information along with appropriate transitional signals to allow readers to capture the logic, argumentation, and persuasion developed in the text and to make the writing comprehensible for readers (Hinds, 1987).

An online writing resource developed by the Purdue Online Writing Lab (2023) suggests that an English argumentative essay should include four main components. The first component is an introductory paragraph with a clear, concise, and defined thesis statement. Within this section, a writer should provide a brief review of the topic, explain why it is important to discuss the topic, and finally state the thesis statement of the argumentative text.

The second part consists of the body of the text, which contains paragraphs supporting the main claim (thesis statement). Each paragraph in the body should provide evidence and have a logical connection to the thesis statement. The evidence can be in the form of illustrations, facts, opinions, and statistics. The next component is a refutation, where the writer discusses an opposing view (counterargument) to the writer's claim and provides a rebuttal in response. The writer needs to demonstrate that the opinions of the readers are unacceptable. If the opinion is acceptable, it needs to be demonstrated (within the writer's perspective) that it is not convincing enough to provide an antithesis to the issue discussed (Wyrick, 2022). The fourth part is the concluding paragraph, where the writer summarizes the arguments presented in the previous paragraphs and provides some discussion.

B.   Reverse Transfer of Writing Knowledge

Motivated by the dynamic view of transfer, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016) offer a model of bilingual writing text construction in which several conceptual knowledge of writing, which include knowledge of the topic, L1/L2 writing, disciplinary, and genre, are perceived to be interacting with individual and social factors. A bilingual writer usually draws upon multiple sources of knowledge when writing a text. This includes the writer's knowledge of L1 and L2 writing, genre knowledge, and disciplinary knowledge. This kind of knowledge is typically acquired through previous writing instructions in either L1 or L2. This repertoire of knowledge, along with individual factors (perceptions, attitude, and language proficiency), and social factors such as audience, task, and topic, influences the writer's decisions on how to frame his or her overall writing and the specific text features he or she utilizes. As a result, the writer's written output is produced based on such decisions.

Central within this model is that bilinguals' writing knowledge is evolving and not separating which means that as students gain more writing instruction across different languages, their writing knowledge improves and overlaps. The instruction in their L1 and L2 writing help them recognize similarities, differences, and overlapping aspects of text features. Novice writers typically have less overlap between their L1 and L2 writing as they receive more training in their L1. However, as they gain more writing experience and training in their L2, the overlap between their L1 and L2 writing increases.

For Indonesian learners studying English as a major, they must have received instructions on English writing, including argumentative writing. Their understanding of structuring ideas in English argumentative writing, including the use of rhetorical features such as refutation, is part of their overall knowledge of writing, alongside their understanding of Indonesian writing. Hence, it's possible that this understanding of L2 writing will be applied when they write in Indonesian (reverse transfer). This is because, as Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016) argue, the conceptual knowledge of writing overlaps instead of forming a distinct system. However, this does not mean that incorporating English argumentative writing concepts into the students' L1 argumentative writing is automatic, as there are mediating factors for reverse transfer to occur. These factors include the student's perception of the Indonesian audience in his Indonesian writing and his general writing ability. For example, even though they know it is necessary to explicitly include an opposing view and its rebuttals in an English argumentative essay to strengthen the writer's argument, they may not elaborate on this rhetorical feature as explicitly in their Indonesian writing compared to what they write in English. They may think that the use of this feature will not help convince their Indonesian readers of the argument. Therefore, as Rusfandi (2015) found, they briefly include the refutation feature, primarily in the introduction section, restructuring its presentation.

Studies have been conducted to confirm and understand the potential for reverse transfer of writing knowledge from learners' L2 to L1. Kobayashi and Rinnert (2007) conducted a study on three groups of Japanese learners of English. The groups had different levels of experience with L2 written instructions. Group 1 had only received instruction at a Japanese university level, Group 2 had two semesters of university instruction in an English-speaking country, and Group 3 had three or more years of postgraduate instruction/experience in an English-speaking country.

The study found that the overall rhetorical structures of the participants' L1 and L2 essays were similar across the three groups. However, there were differences in the presence of a

counterargument or refutation section, especially in the essays written in their L1. The percentage of counterargument presence in the L1 essays written by the groups with writing instruction/experience in an English-speaking country was higher than that found in the essays produced by the group without such instruction. Moreover, the analysis revealed that the participants with longer L2 writing instruction/experience overseas more successfully elaborated the introduction section of their L1 and L2 essays. They did so by including contrasting views of a topic before presenting their position and providing clarification of particular terms used in the essays.

An indication of reverse transfer of writing knowledge was also identified by Rusfandi (2015) in the Indonesian EFL context. He studied the argument-counterargument structure used in third-year English major students' argumentative essays written in both L2 English and L1 Indonesian. He specifically looked at the inclusion of opposing views and their rebuttal (collectively called refutation), rhetorical features assumed to be specific to the English academic tradition. The results showed that although most of the participants developed a one-sided model of argumentation, which was evident in the absence of a refutation in their L2 (35%) and L1 (51%) essays out of the 45 essays studied, over 25% of the students who did not provide a refutation in their English essays included this feature in their Indonesian essays. The researcher attributed the inability to provide the refutation section in the English essays to the students' novice English proficiency. The students may also have simplified the rhetorical structures in their L2 essays by only stating their main claim and providing relevant justification for it to compensate for their difficulty in expressing ideas in English. However, when they wrote in L1, they were no longer constrained by their limited L2 proficiency and were able to include this feature.

However, early studies on the reverse transfer of writing knowledge between languages mainly adopt a fixed or static concept of transfer by focusing only on the reusing of certain aspects of writing knowledge obtained from L2 writing instruction when writing in L1. Bilingual writers often go through a cognitively more complex process when writing, as they struggle not only to reuse the writing knowledge obtained from their previous L2 instructions but also to reshape this knowledge by adapting it to perceived audience expectations (Rinnert et al., 2015), compensating for limited knowledge about certain rhetorical aspects of writing (Rusfandi, 2015), or managing the complexity of conveyed information (Qin & Karabacak, 2010; Wolfe et al., 2009).

METHOD

A.   Research Design

This research used quantitative content analysis (Krippendorff, 2019), which involved six stages: unitizing, sampling, coding, reducing, inferring, and narrating. The quantitative content analysis in this study focused on computing coding units (availability and frequency) of rhetorical features in argumentative essays classified as dialogic structures (situation, problem, refutation, solution, and evaluation) and monologic structures (claim/sub-claim, justification, and induction). The coding units, participants' L2 proficiency scores, and L1 and L2 writing scores were used as data for the statistical analysis conducted in the study.

B.   Participants

This study was conducted at a private Indonesian university, involving students from two study programs: English Education and Indonesian Language and Literature (see Table 1). Four groups of students were involved: first-year English (N=44), first-year Indonesian (N=50), third-year English (N=45), and third-year Indonesian students (N=50). The selection of participants from two different language study programs and years of study would strengthen the results of data analysis, especially with the L1 Indonesian essays because the analysis was done across fields and years of study.

Table 1:
Categorization and Number of Participants

Participants' major	Year	Sem/Class	Number	Perceived Category
English	First	2A	20	Novice L1 and L2 writers
		2B	24	
	Third	6A	25	Proficient L2 writers
		6B	20	
Indonesian	First	2B	25	Novice L1 writers
		2C	25	
	Third	6B	25	Proficient L1 writers
		6C	25	

C.   Instruments

Two instruments were used to collect the data: an L2 proficiency test and writing tasks. The English proficiency of the participants was assessed using an adapted version of the Michigan English Language Assessment Battery (MELAB) model test (Spaan, 2007, pp. 46-58), except for the third-year Indonesian major group. English proficiency scores are not needed for third-year Indonesian majors because the focus is on how the development of writing skills in English might transfer to Indonesian writing. The MELAB test consisted of grammar and cloze, vocabulary, and reading sections. The composition and listening sections were excluded due to difficulty obtaining permission to access the language lab. Additionally, the researcher prepared an English writing task to evaluate the students' writing skills. The participants had 90 minutes to complete the test, and no monolingual or bilingual dictionaries were allowed to use. Table 2 shows that the participants mostly had low English proficiency levels, even among third-year English majors.

Table 2:
Participants and their English Proficiency Levels

Participants (N=139)	Level of English proficiency* (frequency)													
	1	%	2	%	3	%	4	%	5	%	6	%	7	%
1st-year Indonesian major (N=50)	32	64	16	32	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1st-year English major (N=44)	2	4.5	27	61.3	9	20.4	3	6.8	3	6.8	0	0	0	0

| 3rd-year English major (N=45) | 1 | 2.2 | 20 | 44.4 | 10 | 22.2 | 9 | 20 | 2 | 4.4 | 3 | 6.6 | 0 | 0 |

*1 = Elementary; 2 = Advanced Elementary; 3 = Low Intermediate; 4 = Intermediate; 5 = Advanced intermediate; 6 = Advanced; 7 = Comparable to Educated Native Speakers of English

The students majoring in English wrote a total of 178 essays, with 89 in Indonesian and 89 in English. Meanwhile, the students majoring in Indonesian only wrote essays in Indonesian. The present study focuses on how the development of writing in L2 among Indonesian EFL learners may transfer to their L1, so there is no reason for them to write in English. It is also possible that they would be reluctant to do so since they study Indonesian, not English, at the university. Still, it does not close the possibility that they may also have sufficient English proficiency, which enables them to write in English as they learn English in senior high schools. This could be a potential bias for the findings of the present study.

The first and third-year Indonesian majors each wrote 50 essays in total. The English majors wrote two essays, one about *'the popularity of Western music'* and the other about *'the fame of Western film in Indonesia'*. The writing sessions and essay topics were counter-balanced to minimize the effects of writing order and topic difficulty.

D.   Data Analysis Procedures

In this study, the quality of the participants' English and Indonesian essays was assessed, as well as the presence of dialogic and monologic rhetorical structures. These structures were initially proposed by Tirkkonen-Condit (1984) and (Connor, 1987). The dialogic structure (DS) involves a writer developing a dialogue with readers through a series of idea structural units: Situation, Problem, Refutation, Solution, and Evaluation. These units are defined as sections or features in this study.

The situation section provides background information on the topic, while the problem section highlights the gap between what readers (hypothetical) know or think and what the writer knows or thinks. The thesis statement, along with justifications to support it, is presented in this section. The writer also acknowledges opposing views and provides a counter-claim with explanations to support it, which is called refutation. The solution section presents the writer's ideal condition to address the issue, and the evaluation section summarizes the sequence of ideas presented in the text. The monologic structure (MS) pertains to the sequence of speech acts in the problem section of DS. This includes elements such as claim/sub-claim, justification, and induction. A claim is a thesis statement followed by a justification that employs facts, statistics, or explanations to support it. Meanwhile, a sub-claim refers to a statement that connects "specific cases or circumstances to the general claim" (Crammond, 1998, p. 235). Lastly, induction is the logical conclusion drawn from the previous parts, namely justification (Toulmin et al., 1984). An example that shows the identification of DS and MS features is included in Appendix 1.

The English essays were scored based on a writing scale developed by Hartfiel et al. (1985), and the Indonesian essays were assessed using an Indonesian writing scale developed by Djiwandono (1996). The reason for using these two scales was that they provided detailed criteria descriptors for every level of writing competence. The coding was done by four raters, including two raters for each language. The Indonesian essay raters were native-speaker lecturers in Indonesian. There were two raters for the English essays. One was a non-native English lecturer at a private university in Indonesia, and the second rater was the researcher himself.

The agreement among raters regarding the presence of DS and MS features in the essays and their inter-rater reliability scores was measured. Out of the 89 English essays, both raters scored 40 essays (20 from third-year and 20 from first-year students). For the Indonesian essays, 80 out of 189 were assessed by both raters (20 from third-year English majors, 20 from first-year English majors, 20 from third-year Indonesian students, and 20 from first-year Indonesian students). The remaining 159 (49 English and 109 Indonesian essays) were rated separately.

Overall, there was an 86.5% agreement on the DS features and a 90% agreement on MS features. The average rater agreement for the 80 Indonesian essays was 86.74% for DS features and 85.9% for MS sections. Since the raters did not reach a 100% agreement, the researcher asked them to discuss and reach an agreement on the essays where they had different evaluations for both Indonesian and English essays. Meanwhile, the English essay overall scores provided by the two raters showed a correlation of .77, which was significant at $p < .001$. Similarly, the overall quality measures for the Indonesian essays showed a correlation of .76 for inter-rater reliability. These scores were considered acceptable as they were above .70 (Multon, 2010).

To anticipate the effect of English proficiency and general writing ability on the reverse transfer of writing knowledge, a high-low split in writing skill analysis was also conducted. English majors, who scored between 70 and 100 in their English essays and had an intermediate level of English proficiency or higher, were considered high-score writers. Meanwhile, low-score writers achieved an essay score below 60 and had a low intermediate level of English proficiency or below. If discrepancies were found between the occurrence of specific DS and MS features, such as a refutation, in the Indonesian essays produced by the two groups, it would indicate the transfer of writing rhetorical structures from English to Indonesian and the roles of L2 proficiency and writing proficiency in accommodating the transfer.

RESULTS

A. The Argument-counterargument Structure Developed in Students' L1 and L2 Writing

Table 3 shows that refutation was the least supplied feature in English essays written by first-year and third-year English majors. It was found in less than 20% of first-year essays and about 35% of third-year essays. Evaluation, on the other hand, differed considerably between the two groups. Almost 50% of third-year students provided an evaluation, while only around 20% of first-year students did. The frequency and percentage of other DS features were relatively similar between the two groups. A *chi-square* test was used to assess these differences because the data were categorical. The two-year differences were significant for refutation $\chi^2 (1) = 3.41$, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 2.48) and evaluation ($\chi^2 (1) = 8.22$, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 3.94). However, less than 50% of students in each group provided these two features.

For the presence of MS, a significant difference between the two groups only emerged for sub-claims and inductions (see Table 3). Approximately 50% of third-year students provided a sub-claim, while only about 20% of first-year students did the same. Similarly, around 50% of essays written by third-year students elaborated on an induction, whereas only 20% of first-year students did so. A *chi-square* test indicated a significant difference for sub-claims and inductions: ($\chi^2 (1) = 6.39$, $p < .5$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 3.52 for sub-claim, and $\chi^2 (1) = 9.08$, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 4.06 for induction). This means that third-year students were 3.52 and 4.06 times more likely to provide sub-claims and inductions, respectively, compared to first-year students.

Table 3:
Percentage of the Features of DS and MS Supplied in the English Essays

Category	1st-year (N=44)		3rd-year (N=45)		Total (N=89)	
	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq
DS						
Introduction	93.2	41	97.8	44	95.5	85
Problem	79.5	35	91.1	41	85.4	76
Refutation	18.2	8	35.6	16	27	24
Solution	38.6	17	40	18	39.3	35
Evaluation	18.2	8	46.7	21	32.6	29
MS						
Claim	79.5	35	91.1	41	85.4	76
Sub-claim	15.9	7	40	18	28.1	25
Justification	72.7	32	82.2	37	77.5	69
Induction	20.5	9	51.1	23	36.0	32

The presence of DS in the participants' Indonesian essays showed significant differences among the four groups concerning the presence of a refutation (see Table 4). Third-year English majors had approximately 50% of their L1 essays containing a refutation, compared to only 30% of first-year English majors. However, Indonesian majors showed a different pattern, with only 30% of third-year students providing refutations in their Indonesian essays, while 40% of their first-year counterparts did so. Overall, English majors had a 40% rate of supplying refutations, while Indonesian majors had a 35% rate.

There was also a significant difference in the presence of an evaluation in the Indonesian essays written by first- and third-year English majors, with approximately 49% of third-year students providing evaluations, compared to only 34% of first-year English majors. However, there was no difference between first- and third-year Indonesian majors concerning the presence of evaluations. A three-way log-linear analysis was conducted to determine the significance of these frequency differences because the data were categorical for the independent variables (year of study and major) and the dependent variables (the presence of each rhetorical feature in the essays).

The analysis found only one significant three-way variable interaction involving the participants' inclusion of a refutation feature, year of study, and major (χ^2 (1) = 4.25, p < 0.5, odds ratio = 1.32). This interaction suggests a transfer of rhetorical structure from L2 to L1, but further analysis is needed as discussed later. Nonetheless, the study discovered two significant two-way variable interactions. One occurred between the participants' major and their inclusion of an introduction in essays (χ^2 (1) = 4.31, p < 0.5, odds ratio = 4.30). The other was between the participants' year of study and the presence of a problem ($\chi2$ (1) = 5.02, p < .05, odds ratio = 2.78). No significant association with either year of study or major was found for the other two DS features (solution and evaluation).

Table 4:
Percentage of Participants' Indonesian Essays Containing Features of DS

Participants*	Introduction		Problem		Refutation		Solution		Evaluation	
	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq
1st EM (N=44)	96	42	84	37	32	14	36	16	34	15
3rd EM (N=45)	100	45	91	41	51	23	33	15	49	22
1st IM (N=50)	96	48	80	40	40	20	42	21	30	15
3rd IM (N=50)	86	43	94	47	30	15	44	22	34	17
Total (N=189)	94	178	87	165	38	72	39	74	37	69

*1st EM = First-year English majors; 3rd EM = Third-year English majors; 1st IM = First-year Indonesian majors; 3rd IM = Third-year Indonesian majors

Regarding the inclusion of MS in the Indonesian essays (Table 5), many students in all groups provided a claim. The third-year groups in each major used a larger number of claims compared to their first-year counterparts. When it came to sub-claims, however, a higher percentage of the third-year English majors included a sub-claim in their essays compared to their first-year counterparts (58% vs. 43%). Slightly more first-year Indonesian majors included a sub-claim than the third-year Indonesian majors, although the difference is not substantial, about 4%. A large majority of the participants in all four groups included a justification, ranging from 75% of the first-year Indonesian students to almost 90% of the third-year English majors. There was a 7% difference between the first- and third-year English majors, while a larger difference (14%) was evident between the first- and third-year Indonesian students. The inclusion of induction by the third-year English majors (about 56%) was considerably higher than that of the other groups, all of whom supplied this element around 35% of the time.

The *log-linear* analysis did not find any significant association in the three-way variable interaction. However, it discovered significant two-way variable interactions for two features: claim and justification. The inclusion of claim and justification in the students' Indonesian essays was associated with their year of study (χ^2 (1) = 4.22, p < .05, odds ratio = 2.6 for the year of study vs. claim interaction and χ^2 (1) = 3.94, p < .05, odds ratio = 2.2 for the interaction of year and justification variables). Disregarding the major, this suggests that the longer the participants studied in the departments, the higher the probability was of providing claim and justification in their essays. The analysis for the other two features of MS (sub-claim and induction) yielded no significant association with either year or major.

Table 5:
Percentage of Participants' Indonesian Essays Containing Features of MS

Participants	Claim		Sub-claim		Justification		Induction	
	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq
1st EM (N=44)	84.1	37	43.2	19	81.8	36	34.1	15
3rd EM (N=45)	91.1	41	57.8	26	88.9	40	55.6	25
1st IM (N=50)	82	41	54	27	74	37	36	18
3rd IM (N=50)	94	47	50	25	88	44	34	17
Total (N=189)	87.8	166	51.3	97	83.1	157	39.7	75

B.   The Evidence for Reverse Transfer: Rhetorical Structure and Quality of L1 and L2 Essays

The researcher conducted multiple data analyses to reveal the reverse transfer of writing rhetorical structure. The analyses included examining the correlation between the scores of L1 and L2 essays written by third-year and first-year English major participants, analyzing the consistency of DS and MS feature usage in their L1 and L2 essays, and comparing the overall quality and use of DS and MS features in L1 and L2 essays written by participants deemed high-score and low-score English writers.

The first analysis was about the relationship between the total scores of the Indonesian and English essays composed by the first-year and third-year groups. The analysis found insignificant correlations for both groups (r = .129, p > .05 (2-tailed), R^2 = .017 for the first-year group and r = .129, p > .05 (2-tailed), R^2 = .017 for the third-year group). This finding suggests that participants who had high scores in the Indonesian essays in both groups were not necessarily those who received high scores in the English essays and vice versa. This finding may reflect the more general nature of the essay quality measures based on both structural (organization) and non-structural aspects, such as content, vocabulary, and language use. Additionally, the participants' relatively low English proficiency may have hindered the Indonesian high-score writers from producing similar quality essays when they wrote in English.

The second analysis focuses on the consistent use of DS and MS features in the students' L1 and L2 essays. Table 6 presents the results, where "+" represents "supplied" and "-" indicates "not supplied." Less than 25% of the third-year students included a refutation in both their L2 and L1 essays, while nearly 40% did not include one. Furthermore, almost 40% of the students showed inconsistent usage of a refutation between the two essays. Notably, more students in this group struggled to express ideas in English, as they had novice English proficiency. This is evident in the higher number of students who did not provide a refutation when writing in English compared to when writing in Indonesian. Regarding the solution and evaluation, a significant number of students did not include these features in both essays, with the number reaching almost 45%. Among the third-year students, there was a high mismatch in the inclusion of an evaluation, accounting for over 50% of the essays. Conversely, only around 10% of students provided an evaluation in both essays or did not provide it at all.

Table 6:
Percentage of the Presence of Features Categorized as DS in the Third-Year and First-Year English Majors' Indonesian and English Essays

Features 3rd EM (N=45 pairs)	+ English + Indonesian		+ English - Indonesian		- English + Indonesian		- English - Indonesian	
	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq
Introduction	97.8	44	0	0	2.2	1	0	0
problem	82.2	37	8.9	4	8.9	4	0	0
Refutation	24.4	11	11.1	5	26.7	12	37.8	17
Solution	17.8	8	22.2	10	15.6	7	44.4	20
Evaluation	22.2	10	24.4	11	26.7	12	26.7	12

1st EM (N=44 pairs)								
Introduction	88.6	39	4.5	2	6.8	3	0.0	0
problem	68.2	30	11.4	5	15.9	7	4.5	2
Refutation	9.1	4	9.1	4	22.7	10	59.1	26
Solution	12	27.3	11.4	5	9.1	4	23	52.3
Evaluation	11.4	5	6.8	3	22.7	10	59.1	26

The analysis also found a positive relationship between the use of introduction and problem features in the first-year students' L2 and L1 essays. However, there was a relatively high percentage of mismatched use, almost reaching 30%. On the other hand, for refutation, the number of students who did not include this feature in either essay was much higher than those who included it in both essays, with almost 60% of students not including it at all. Furthermore, there was a high percentage of students with mismatched use of refutation, exceeding 30%. Less than 10% of students provided a refutation in both their Indonesian and English essays. These results suggest a negative association between refutation inclusion, indicating that those who did not include it in their English essays also did not include it in their Indonesian essays. However, more students did not use refutation in their English essays than in their Indonesian essays. The analysis also identified negative associations between the inclusion of solution and evaluation features in the participants' Indonesian and English essays. More than 50% of students did not include a solution in either essay, and approximately 20% and 30% of students had mismatched inclusion of solution and evaluation, respectively, in their L1 and L2 essays.

For MS, claim and justification features were consistently included in the L2 and L1 essays of third-year students (see Table 7). Over 80% of the students included a claim in both essays, with less than a 20% mismatch in claim inclusion. Moreover, over 70% of the students provided a justification feature in both essays, with less than a 30% mismatch in justification inclusion between the Indonesian and English essays. However, for sub-claims and induction features, there was a higher percentage of mismatch in inclusion compared to the complete presence and absence of these features in the students' Indonesian and English essays. This suggests that the presence or absence of these features was generally random.

Table 7:
Percentage of the Presence of Features Categorized as MS in the Third-Year and First-Year English majors' Indonesian and English Essays

Features 3rd EM (N=45 pairs)	+ English + Indonesian		+ English - Indonesian		- English + Indonesian		- English - Indonesian	
	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq
Claim	82.2	37	8.9	4	8.9	4	0	0
Sub-claim	26.7	12	13.3	6	31.1	14	28.9	13
Justification	71.1	32	11.1	5	17.8	8	0	0
Induction	28.9	13	22.2	10	26.7	12	22.2	10
1st EM (N=44 pairs)								
Claim	65.9	29	13.6	6	15.9	7	4.5	2

Sub-claim	11.4	5	4.5	2	31.8	14	52.3	23
Justification	61.4	27	11.4	5	20.5	9	6.8	3
Induction	9.1	4	11.4	5	25.0	11	54.5	24

The analysis also found relatively consistent use of claim and justification features in the first-year participants' L1 and L2 essays. Around 65% of the students included a claim in both essays, with less than 5% of students not including a claim in either essay, and approximately 30% of participants used it inconsistently. Similarly, over 60% of the students consistently provided a justification feature in their Indonesian and English essays. However, more than half of the students did not include sub-claim and induction features in either their Indonesian or English essays. The percentage of mismatched inclusion was also high, reaching almost 40%, with more students not including the two features when writing in English.

The final analysis examines how high-score and low-score English writers used DS and MS features in their L1 and L2 essays (please refer to the methodology section for details of these classifications). A descriptive analysis was carried out due to the small number of participants categorized into high-score (N=10) and low-score (N=13) groups, making an inferential statistical analysis unreliable. The objective is to investigate the relationship between L2 proficiency, writing proficiency, and the presence of reverse transfer.

The analysis found a significant difference between the two groups' inclusion of refutation and evaluation features in their English essays. The high-score group had 80% of their essays containing a refutation, while none of the low-score essays did. Moreover, most students in the high-score group provided an evaluation in their essays, whereas less than 25% of the low-score students did. However, there was not much difference in the presence of problem and solution features in the essays produced by the two groups. Less than 50% of the students in either group came up with a solution.

Regarding MS, there was a significant difference between the two groups in terms of sub-claim, justification, and induction inclusion in their English essays. The high-score group had a higher percentage of students who provided a sub-claim compared to the low-score group, where fewer than 10% of students provided one. The high-score group also had a higher percentage of students who provided evidential support for their claims, while only about half of the low-score writers did. In terms of induction inclusion, about 70% of essays written by the high-score group had this feature, while the low-score group included it only about 15% of the time. All students in the high-score group provided a claim, while only about 70% of the low-score group did.

The Indonesian essays from both groups differed regarding their inclusion of DS, except for the introduction feature. The high-score group had slightly more problem and evaluation features compared to the low-score group. However, more students from the low-score group included a solution in their L1 essays than those in the high-score group. The only substantial difference between the two groups' essays was the inclusion of a refutation. While less than 25% of the essays from the low-score group had a refutation, 70% of high-score students included it. This positive relationship between the inclusion of a refutation and writing quality indicates the presence of a reverse transfer of rhetorical structure. Upon closer examination, six out of ten high-score students included a refutation feature in both their English and Indonesian essays.

Generally, more students in the high-score group included MS in their Indonesian essays in all aspects than the low-score group did. However, the analysis only revealed a significant

difference in terms of the inclusion of an induction. Only 20% of the essays written by the high-score group did not elaborate on an induction, whereas more than 60% of the low-score group did not include one. It was discovered that six out of thirteen students included an induction in both their English and Indonesian essays.

DISCUSSION

This study found the general absence of refutation in both L1 and L2 essays across different years and fields of study. However, the results of the research do confirm that there is a reverse transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1, especially in the essays produced by participants who are considered proficient L2 writers. Students in the skilled group provided more refutation and induction in both their English and Indonesian essays compared to those in the less-skilled group.

These findings are important because they suggest that conceptual knowledge of writing, such as rhetorical structures, can be interdependent and transferable across languages. However, this process is not straightforward as the occurrence of reverse transfer is influenced by various factors such as general writing proficiency, L2 proficiency, and perceived audience expectations in both L1 and L2. Consequently, these findings support the dynamic concept of transfer, as proposed by Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016), which suggests that the interaction between writing knowledge developed through L1/L2 writing instruction along with individual and social factors, influences a bilingual writer's decision-making process in producing L1/L2 writing.

The occurrence of reverse transfer of writing knowledge is influenced by the understanding of L2 writing concepts, particularly the argument-counterargument structure. This structure is cognitively demanding as it requires transforming knowledge rather than simply describing or stating what the author knows (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 2013; Qin & Karabacak, 2010). This higher-order thinking process is typically developed later and is pursued by skilled writers, not novice writers. This argument structure is challenging not only for English L2 learners but also for native learners who, in general, are not constrained by English (Felton et al., 2015; Wolfe & Britt, 2008). Even when students do anticipate an opposing position, they do not address it appropriately.

Although the percentage of students who provided a refutation in their L2 and L1 essays was significantly higher in the third-year English group compared to those in the other groups, its mode of delivery does not correspond to what the English academic tradition would have expected. Most of the refutations were placed in the introduction and generally functioned as a way to introduce the thesis statement. This type of refutation is weak and lacks elaboration (Ramage et al., 2021; Rusfandi, 2015), indicating that the students have a novice understanding of the concept of refutation in English argumentative writing. This weakness may be due to the lack of sufficient explanations to support readers' opposing views. Although the writers acknowledged opposing views, they did not effectively address them. If the students mentioned the reasons, the explanation generally involved only one or two sentences. However, if the students had provided detailed information as evidential support for the opposing views, the essay introduction would have been excessively long. This type of argumentation is also less persuasive because the evidential support for the writer's claim and the readers' opposing views is not given equal attention. Additionally, as the refutation was presented in the thesis statement,

the body paragraphs only provided explanations to support the thesis statement. Consequently, the discussion was more of a monologue than a dialogue.

This less effective form of using refutation indicates the students' novice understanding of the argument-counterargument structure, as it is consistently elaborated in both their English and Indonesian argumentative essays. As they were also writing an essay in their native language without linguistic constraints, a more effective form of refutation could have been produced. Unfortunately, this likelihood was unconfirmed in their L1 Indonesian essays.

The second mediating factor is the students' L2 proficiency. Although the third-year English majors had been learning English for a longer period of time in the English department, they mostly had an intermediate level of English proficiency. This relatively low English proficiency probably constrained them linguistically because the study found that the third-year English majors tended to provide a refutation when they wrote in Indonesian. In other words, although the students recognized the importance of presenting an opposing view and its rebuttals to make the argument more persuasive, they chose not to include this feature in their English essays due to the processing cost and their limited English proficiency.

Perceived audience expectations may also influence the reverse transfer of writing knowledge. In the study, 11% of the students elaborated on a refutation in their English essays but not in their Indonesian essays. Furthermore, 20% of the third-year English majors in the high-score group included a refutation in English but not in their Indonesian essays even though they are no longer constrained by Indonesian linguistically. This finding suggests that the writer's awareness of his/her audience also affects reverse transfer from L2 to L1. Idea organization in writing is not just about using the rhetorical structure taught in the English writing class, but also involves selecting and reshaping it (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2014). Some students may distinguish between specific rhetorical structures required for writing in English and Indonesian. However, this interpretation should be treated cautiously since the present study did not interview the participants to elicit their views on their inability to include the refutation in their Indonesian essays.

Several implications can be drawn from the results of the study. Firstly, the study demonstrates that bilingual learners can transfer writing knowledge from their L2 to their L1, even in non-dominant English contexts like Indonesian EFL. However, this process is influenced by factors such as understanding quality of the argument-counterargument structure, L2 proficiency, and perceived reader expectations in L2 and L1. In other words, students generally reshape their writing to compensate for limited L2 proficiency, complex arguments, idea development, and audience expectations in both languages.

A reverse transfer of writing knowledge (argument-counterargument structure) may occur if bilingual learners have a proper understanding of this conceptual knowledge of L2 writing in the first place. Therefore, teaching intervention is necessary, and strategies for elaborating on argument-counterargument integration in argumentative writing should be provided. For example, Wyrick (2022) developed a model of argument-counterargument integration that could serve as a guideline.

In the first pattern, the writer discusses supporting evidence for their thesis statement before addressing possible opposing views and providing rebuttals in separate paragraphs. The second possibility is that the writer allocates some paragraphs to discuss possible opposing views and counterarguments first, followed by supporting evidence for the thesis statement in separate

paragraphs. Thirdly, the writer could provide justification for their thesis statement while addressing opposing views and providing rebuttals in the same paragraph. It is up to the students to choose the strategy that will help them communicate their ideas in the most convincing way.

Concerning teaching strategies, the English writing teacher can adopt or modify the five cycles or steps of teaching argumentative writing suggested by Feez and Joyce (1998) and Bacha (2010). These cycles consist of: building the context, modeling the text, writing collaboratively, writing independently, and linking related texts and understanding language in context.

Another implication of the present study is that students should have at least an intermediate level of L2 proficiency before enrolling in academic English writing courses. This will help them write effectively and incorporate the conceptual knowledge they have acquired during L2 writing instruction. A strong command of English allows students to use complex structures, such as the argument-counterargument structure, when writing in English. This ability will eventually transfer to their writing in L1, as they are not limited by language constraints. Consequently, students will be able to develop an argument-counterargument structure in essays regardless of the language they are writing in.

Finally, perceived reader expectations should also be taken into consideration as a factor in understanding the dynamicity of reverse transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1. Unlike English, Indonesian adopts a less explicit approach in argument structures, utilizing a varying degree of indirectness in conveying information (Fajrina et al., 2022; Hinkel, 1999). Therefore, the inclusion of a refutation feature, which usually includes rhetorical moves that present possible opposing views and their rebuttals, might not be preferred by Indonesian students of English. These moves may be considered too direct in criticizing others' arguments (Fajrina et al., 2022; Kuntjara, 2004). As a result, Indonesian students often focus on stating their main claim and providing relevant justification for it. This interpretation is supported by the finding that approximately 11% of students did not include refutation when writing in Indonesian but included this feature in their English essays.

In addition, students should be made aware of the potential similarities and differences in audience/reader expectations when writing in their L1 and L2. English writing teachers in Indonesia need to discuss with their students the rationale and the role of using the argument-counterargument structure in making their English argumentative writing convincing, as well as its possible lack of relevance in Indonesian argumentative writing. Then, the students should decide if the rhetorical moves align with their audience's expectations, or if modifications are needed for their L2 and L1 writing.

CONCLUSION

The study found evidence of the transfer of rhetorical features from English L2 to Indonesian L1 among the third-year students who were considered skilled English writers. This suggests that conceptual knowledge of writing can be interdependent and transferable across languages. However, this transfer process is not automatic and depends on the writer's level of proficiency and writing ability in English. It also depends on the writer's understanding of his/her audience's expectations for both their L1 and L2 writing. However, this does not rule out the possibility of other factors being involved.

English teachers need to provide better instructional interventions for argumentative writing. This can be achieved by engaging students in higher-order thinking processes and teaching them different forms of argument-counterargument integration for their writing. Teaching strategies developed by Wyrick (2022) and Bacha (2010) can serve as useful guidelines. It is important to note that the acquisition of this conceptual knowledge of writing in English can be transferred into Indonesian writing and improve their writing in both languages. Additionally, students should be aware of the similarities and differences in audience expectations between English and Indonesian argumentative writing. Cultural issues surrounding argumentative writing in the two languages should also be considered. Students should decide whether specific rhetorical features or moves agree/disagree with their audience expectations or if modifications are needed for their L2 and L1 writing.

The results of this study were limited in several ways. The study focused only on describing and comparing the students' writing products, without assessing their writing processes such as pre-writing, composing, and revising activities in both their L1 and L2. The results of these comparisons were then used to determine if there was a possibility of reverse transfer of writing knowledge from English to Indonesian. Future studies should address this limitation by examining the writing processes. It would also be valuable to investigate whether there is a reverse transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 through these instructional interventions. If transfer cannot be found through these activities, it would be important to identify the factors that could affect its possibility.

REFERENCES

Arsyad, S. (1999). The Indonesian and English argument structure : A cross-cultural rhetoric of argumentative texts. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *22*(2), 85-102. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.22.2.06ars

Bacha, N. N. (2010). Teaching the academic argument in a university EFL environment. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, *9*(3), 229-241. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.05.001

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (2013). *The psychology of written composition*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203812310

Čmejrková, S., & Daneš, F. (1997). Academic writing and cultural identity: The case of Czech academic writing. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 41-61). Mouton de Gruyter.

Connor, U. (1987). Argumentative patterns in student essays: Cross-cultural differences. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 texts* (pp. 57-71). Addison Wesley.

Connor, U. (2011). *Intercultural rhetoric in the writing classroom*. The University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.3488851

Cook, V. (2016). Premises of multi-competence. In V. Cook & L. Wei (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence* (pp. 1-25). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107425965.001

Crammond, J. G. (1998). The uses and complexity of argument structures in expert and student persuasive writing. *Written Communication*, *15*(2), 230-268. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088398015002004

Cummins, J. (2021). *Rethinking the education of multilingual learners: A critical analysis of theoretical concepts*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800413597

DePalma, M.-J., & Ringer, J. M. (2011). Toward a theory of adaptive transfer: Expanding disciplinary discussions of "transfer" in second-language writing and composition studies. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *20*(2), 134-147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2011.02.003

DePalma, M.-J., & Ringer, J. M. (2014). Adaptive transfer, writing across the curriculum, and second language writing: Implications for research and teaching. In T. M. Zawacki & M. Cox (Eds.), *WAC and second language writers: Research towards linguistically and culturally inclusive programs and practices* (pp. 43–67). The WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551

Djiwandono, M. S. (1996). *Tes bahasa dalam pengajaran*. Penerbit ITB.

El Khoiri, N., & Widiati, U. (2017). Logical fallacies in EFL learners' argumentative writings. *Dinamika Ilmu*, *17*(1), 71-81. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v17i1.638

Fajrina, D., Everatt, J., & Sadeghi, A. (2022). Rhetorical pattern of the Indonesian EFL undergraduate students' writings. *Studies in English Language and Education*, *9*(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v9i1.13640

Feez, S., & Joyce, H. D. S. (1998). *Text-based syllabus design*. National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.

Felton, M., Crowell, A., & Liu, T. (2015). Arguing to agree: Mitigating my-side bias through consensus-seeking dialogue. *Written Communication*, *32*(3), 317-331. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088315590788

Forbes, K., & Fisher, L. (2020). Strategy development and cross-linguistic transfer in foreign and first language writing. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *11*(2), 311-339. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2018-0008

Hartfiel, V. F., Jacobs, H. L., Zinkgraf, S. A., Wormuth, D. R., & Hughey, J. B. (1985). *Learning ESL composition*. Newbury House.

Hinds, J. (1987). Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology. In U. Connor & R. B. Kaplan (Eds.), *Writing across languages: Analysis of L2 text* (pp. 141-152). Addison Wesley.

Hinkel, E. (1999). Objectivity and credibility in L1 and L2 academic writing. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 90-108). Cambridge University Press.

Kecskés, I., & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2007). Transferability of argumentative writing competence from L2 to L1: Effects of overseas experience. In M. Conrick & M. Howard (Eds.), *From applied*

linguistics to linguistics applied: Issues, practices, trends (Vol. British Studies in Applied Linguistics, pp. 91-110). British Association for Applied Linguistics.

Krippendorff, K. (2019). *Content Analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (4 ed.). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781071878781

Kuntjara, E. (2004). Cultural transfer in EFL writing: A look at contrastive rhetoric on English and Indonesian. *K@ta*, 6(1), 13-29. https://doi.org/10.9744/kata.6.1.13-29

Multon, K. D. (2010). Interrater reliability. In N. J. Salkind (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of research design* (pp. 627-629). SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/ https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412961288

Murtadho, F. (2021). Metacognitive and critical thinking practices in developing EFL students' argumentative writing skills. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(3), 656-666. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31752

Numertayasa, I. W., Sutama, I. M., & Rasna, I. W. (2013). Analisis wacana esai kajian struktur supra, mikro dan makro pada esai hasil pelatihan menulis esai sekolah menengah se-Kecamatan Rendang tahun 2011. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Indonesia*, 2, 1-10. https://ejournal-pasca.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/jurnal_bahasa/article/view/704/489#

Purdue Online Writing Lab. (2023). *Argumentative essays.* Purdue University. Retrieved 29 July 2023 from https://owl.purdue.edu/owl/general_writing/academic_writing/essay_writing/argumentative_essays.html

Qin, J., & Karabacak, E. (2010). The analysis of Toulmin elements in Chinese EFL university argumentative writing. *System*, *38*(3), 444-456. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.06.012

Ramage, J. D., Bean, J. C., & Johnson, J. (2021). *Writing arguments: A rhetoric with readings* (11 ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

Rinnert, C., & Kobayashi, H. (2016). Multicompetence and multilingual writing. In R. M. Manchón & P. K. Matsuda (Eds.), *Handbook of second and foreign language writing* (pp. 365-386). De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781614511335-020

Rinnert, C., Kobayashi, H., & Katayama, A. (2015). Argumentation text construction by Japanese as a foreign language writers: A dynamic view of transfer. *The Modern Language Journal*, *99*(2), 213-245. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12210

Rusfandi. (2013). *Transfer of L2 English rhetorical structures of writing to L1 Indonesian by Indonesian EFL learners* [Dissertation, The University of Queensland Australia]. Brisbane.

Rusfandi. (2015). Argument-counterargument structure in Indonesian EFL learners' English argumentative essays: A dialogic concept of writing. *RELC Journal*, *46*(2), 181-197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688215587607

Spaan, M. C. (2007). *A student's guide to the MELAB* (2 ed.). The University of Michigan Press.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1984). Toward a description of argumentative text structure. In H. Ringbom & R. Malti (Eds.), *Proceedings from the second Nordic conference for English studies* (pp. 220-236). Abo Akademy.

Toulmin, S., Rieke, R., & Janik, A. (1984). *An introduction to reasoning* (2 ed.). Macmillan Publishing.

Wolfe, C. R., & Britt, M. A. (2008). The locus of the myside bias in written argumentation. *Thinking & Reasoning, 14*(1), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/13546780701527674

Wolfe, C. R., Britt, M. A., & Butler, J. A. (2009). Argumentation schema and the myside bias in written argumentation. *Written Communication, 26*(2), 183-209. https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088309333019

Wyrick, J. (2022). *Steps to writing well with additional readings* (11 ed.). Cengage Learning.

APPENDIX:

An Example of the Identification of Dialogic and Monologic Rhetorical Features Applied to a Student's Essay

Topic: The popularity of Western movies in Indonesia
An essay written by a 3rd year English student

Dialogic	Monologic	Paragraph and Sentences
Introduction (INT)	-	Western movies are very popular in Indonesia. There are some reasons why Indonesian people feel more interested in watching western movies than Indonesian movies. First, western countries use modern technology to make the films, so the movie look more alive, real and interesting. Second, the movie plots tend to be more various than the plots of Indonesian movies [INT].
Problem (PR) and Refutation (RF)	Claim (CL)	Although western movies offer many good things, some people in Indonesia believe that western films can give many bad effects. People believe that western films will affect negatively people's mind and behaviour because they may encounter different perception, way of thinking and attitude from Indonesian values in the films. [Readers' possible different opinion]

Western culture and Indonesian culture are different; however, it doesn't mean that western culture will give bad impacts to our young generation. [PR, CL and RF] |
| | Justification (JF) for the claim | There are lots of information that we can adopt or get from western movie, not only for adult, but also for teenagers and kids. As you know that western countries produce many animation movies. From those movies we can find moral values that can be adopted by Indonesian children. They can learn many good things from those films. Since the movies teach children more interestingly, they will get the moral values more easily. They can also learn how to speak English since English is very essential nowadays [JF]. |

	Subclaim (SB) 1 and its justification	Western movies give some information about tourism places; take for example, Devil Wears Prada [SB]. This movie shows us many beautiful tourism places that can give us good inspiration on where we want to spend our holiday if we want to go abroad. We can also find some information about western food and drink in the western films [JF].
	Subclaim (SB) 2 and its Justification (JF) (?)	Western films give us lots of variation that we can enjoy like animation movie that can be watched by all ages (children, teenager, and adult), romantic movie, action movie, horror movie and comedy movie [SB]. We can choose which one is good and appropriate for us [JF?].
No solution (SL) offered	No Induction (ID) provided	-
No evaluation (EV) provided	-	-

* Spelling, expression, and serious grammar mistakes in the essays have been corrected for presentation only and not for analysis