Proceedings

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ICEL 2013

The First International Conference on Education and Language (ICEL)

28,29,30 January 2013
Bandar Lampung University（UBL）
Indonesia

UBL
In Cooperations With

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

EFL University INDIA

INTERNATIONAL ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY MALAYSIA

Indonesia   Australia   India   Malaysia

Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP)
English Education Study Program, Bandar Lampung University (UBL), Indonesia

PROCEEDINGS

The First International Conference on Education and Language

ICEL 2013

28 -30 January 2013

PREFACE

The activities of the International Conference is in line and very appropriate with the vision and mission of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) to promote training and education as well as research in these areas.

On behalf of the First International Conference of Education and Language (ICEL 2013) organizing committee, we are very pleased with the very good responses especially from the keynote speakers and from the participants. It is noteworthy to point out that about 80 technical papers were received for this conference

The participants of the conference come from many well known universities, among others:
University of Wollongong, NSW Australia, International Islamic University Malaysia, Kyoto University (Temple University (Osaka), Japan - Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, India - West Visayas State University College of Agriculture and Forestry, Lambunao, Iloilo, Philipine - Bahcesehir University, Istanbul, Turkey - The Higher Institute of Modern Languages, Tunisia - University of Baku, Azerbaijan - Sarhad University, KPK, Pakistan - Medical Sciences English Language Teacher Foundation Program, Ministry of Health, Oman - Faculty School of Arts and Sciences, Banga, Aklan Philippines - Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa, Banten, - Pelita Harapan University, Jakarta - STIBA Saraswati Denpasar, Bali - University of Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta - Ahmad Dahlan University Yogyakarta - Sriwijaya University, Palembang - Islamic University of Malang - IAIN Raden Fatah Palembang - Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia - Universitas Haluoleo Kendari - State Islamic University of Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung - Tadulako University, Central Sulawesi - Sanata Dharma University - Lampung University and Open University,

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the International Advisory Board members, sponsors and also to all keynote speakers and all participants. I am also grateful to all organizing committee and all of the reviewers who contribute to the high standard of the conference. Also I would like to express my deepest gratitude to the Rector of Bandar Lampung University (UBL) who gives us endless support to these activities, so that the conference can be administrated on time.

Bandar Lampung, 30 January 2013

Mustofa Usman, Ph.D
lCEL 2013 Chairman

PROCEEDINGS

The First International Conference on Education and Language
(ICEL 2013)
BANDAR LAMPUNG UNIVERSITY
Bandar Lampung, Indonesia
January 28, 29, 30, 2013

Steering Committee

Executive Advisors
M. Yusuf S. Barusman
Andala Rama Putra Barusman

Chairman
Mustofa Usman

Co-Chairman
Harpain
Baginda Simaibang

Secretary
Yanuar Dwi Prasetyo

Treasurer
Tissa Zadya

Technical Committee Team
Tissa Zadya
Nadia Dalimunthe
Yanuar Dwi Prasetyo
Bery Salatar
Zainal Abidin

International Advisory Board

Mustofa Usman, Indonesia	M. Yusuf S. Barusman, Indonesia	Jayashree Mohanraj, India
Garry Hoban, NSW Australia	Jan Wright, NSW Australia	Ujang Suparman, Indonesia
S. Mohanraj, India	Harpain, Indonesia	Ahmad HP, Indonesia
Ken Cruickshank, NSW Australia	Hon Wie Leong, Singapore	Baginda Simaibang, Indonesia
Baverly Derewianka, NSW Australia	Raihan B. Othman, Malaysia	Nuraihan Mat Daud, Malaysia
Ahmad F. Ismail, Malaysia	Andala R. P. Barusman, Indonesia	Udin Syarifuddin W, Indonesia
Hery Yufrizal, Indonesia	Khomsahrial Romli, Indonesia	Undang Rosyidin, Indonesia
	Mohamad Sahari Nordin, Malaysia	

Organizing Committee

Chair Person
Tissa Zadya

Vice Chair Person
Baginda Simaibang

Secretary
Yanuar Dwi Prasetyo

Treasure
Samsul Bahri
Dian Agustina

Special Events
Bery Salatar
Nadia Dalimunthe
Siti Rahma Wati
Dina Ika Wahyuningsih
Kefas Ajie
Fajar Ryantika

Transportation and Accommodation
Irawati

Publication and Documentation
Indriarti Gultom, MM.
Dina Ika Wahyuningsih
Noning Verawati
Masitoh
Rifandy Ritonga

Consumption
Yulfriwini
Ni Sayu Kade Lena Widyawati
Miryanti Feralia
Novita
Cornellius Vilardi
M. Agusman Ajijaya
I Gede Ryan Ekki .P.
Qory Fahrunisa ,F.

Facility and Decoration
Zainal Abidin
Sudarto
Tri Suhartono
Sukamto
Suprapto

Table Of Content

EFL WRITING STRATEGIES OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMPIT DAARUL 'ILMI KEMILING BANDAR LAMPUNG

A. Muhammad Rudy[1,*], B. Patuan Raja[1] and C. Rosita Simbolon[1]

[1]Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

*Corresponding email: muhammadrudy6@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is aimed to observe the writing strategies which occur in the writing process. The subjects were managed to do think aloud. The recorded verbalization is used to gain the data. After the analysis process, the result shows that writing difficulties influence the strategies used and lead the subjects to engage several strategies for creating a sentence.

Keywords: Strategy, Think Aloud Protocol, Writing.

1. INTRODUCTION

Afar, before on the paper, writing involves many elements considered in the writing process. Within the writing process a student of SMP should decide the correct grammar, vocabularies, punctuation and strategies to create a sentence.

The complex elements of writing led the students of SMP IT Daarul 'Ilmi having problem during the writing process. They found that writing is a difficult activity which must be done because of the demand of teacher. Students of SMP IT Daarul 'Ilmi have three writing problems as Byrne (1991: 3-4) in [3] states; three problems facing a student on making a good writing are:

1. Psychological problem: there is no benefit of feedback from others directly. It may happen because the student rarely gets writing training.
2. Linguistic problem: students need to choose sentences and structure in such a way that can be understood by the reader.
3. Cognitive problems: to be able to write is not an instant process, but someone can acquire this ability by 'process of instruction or strategy'; how to learn certain structures, organize ideas etc. In this way, the student uses their cognitive strategy as the process center in writing. The problem would be complicated if the student did not use cognitive strategy well.

The third problem above, cognitive problem, takes big role in the process of writing. It is the process which happens before the writing itself. The student tended to create errors when his cognitive (thought) was in doubt. [5] states that students' errors are caused by students' thought. The students' thought sometimes create intelligence of their mistakes. What they thought was transferred in the wrong linguistic form because they had wrong writing strategy. They would use wrong vocabulary when he could not evaluate the appropriate vocabulary on their writing.

Thinking Aloud Protocol (TAP) is one of the method to study writing strategies. It is used to dig deeper information during writing process. [6] states that teacher can use the TAP as an expression of students' inner dialogue in which will reveal much information not available from the finished product alone. Through TAP, teacher can define what happen in their mind because the students verbalize their thinking. From the introduction above, the researcher tried to find out the strategies used in the writing process as well as getting set of writing strategies.

2. METHOD

The research was a qualitative one. It dealt with students' writing strategies during composing process. The instrument for analyzing students' writing strategies was the researcher because he analyzed it by himself. He concentrated on recording, transcribing and analyzing.

In SMP IT Daarul 'Ilmi, there was only one class of VIII (eight) grade; it is Roudatun Najihin Class. The class consists of twenty one students. All of them were trained to practice Think Aloud Protocol (TAP) during their writing process. The subjects were asked to compose their descriptive writing which had been studied previously.

From twenty one students, the researcher took six students as his subjects. The six students were taken through the lottery.

The lottery process is every student, from twenty one students, was asked to pick one paper out of twenty one papers. The twenty one papers were divided by two; six numbered pieces and fifteen blank pieces. A student who got the numbered paper, automatically, became the subject of the research. The six subjects were required to create a descriptive writing. While the subjects were doing the writing and thinking aloud, researcher recorded their verbalization.

The data analysis was done to determine the subjects' strategies and identify the dominant and the minor one. Students' recorded verbalizations were transcribed. The transcription is coded based on Victory's Taxonomy. Then, the strategies were categorized based on occurrences; if the strategies occur five times or more, they belong to *frequently used,* the strategies which occur three to four times are in the *sometimes used category*, and the strategies which occur less than two times are in the *rarely used category.* Finally, the six subjects were interviewed to find deeper observation about their Foreign Language (FL) writing strategies.

3. RESULT

3.1 Strategies Used During Writing Process

3.1.1 Strategies Ranks

To gain the complete data about strategies used by subjects during descriptive writing, the researcher distribute the coded transcription in Table 1. Each subject's data are put based on the categories. Table 1 can show how the subjects occupied the strategies which lead the researcher to rank the data based on three categories; *frequently used, sometimes used* and *rarely used.*

Table 1. Subjects' Writing Strategies.

No	Name	Strategies														Total
		PLid	PLpr	PLor	PLtx	TM	SM	EV	REW	REV	ED	RES	RP	RD	L1	
1	Ar	14	1	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	0	0	6	4	10	44
2	Ev	19	1	0	0	0	3	11	3	0	2	7	14	2	30	92
3	Fa	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	20	32
4	Na	21	1	0	0	9	9	23	0	0	2	4	35	5	60	169
5	Ha	24	2	0	1	4	3	19	0	0	6	1	29	10	72	171
6	As	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	26	31
Total		86	7	0	1	13	17	60	5	3	11	12	85	21	218	**539**
Average		14.3	1.2	0.0	0.2	2.2	2.8	10.0	0.8	0.5	1.8	2.0	14.2	3.5	36.3	
Percentage		16.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.2%	2.4%	3.2%	11.1%	0.9%	0.6%	2.0%	2.2%	15.8%	3.9%	40.4%	

In this research, there are 13 strategies used in writing. However, no subject who used all of 14 strategies during composing process. The subject who used the least strategies was *As*, in which, he used only six types of strategies out of 14 strategies. The subject who used l strategies most in this study is **Ha**. He used 11 types out of 14 strategies.

The dominant strategy which was used by the subjects was *using L1* in the writing process which 40.4% as the highest percentage out of 14 strategies. The strategy which does not occur in this research is *PLor*; no subject used this strategy. The strategies ranks which occurred in different frequency for each subject are elaborated in detail as follow.

At the time **Ar** intended to write about Dora and Boot, he used nine types of strategies. From the nine strategies (*PLid, Plpr, SM, EV, REW, REV, RP, RD and L1*), **Ar** had various ranks since he used various strategies in various frequencies. In the case of using *frequently used* category, she had *PLid* amounting to14 times, *EV* five times, *RP* six times and *L1* amounting to ten times. On the second rank, *sometimes used* which frequency is 3 to 4 times, **Ar** used *RD*. The third rank, *rarely used* category, which frequency is two or less than two times is occupied by *PLpr, PLor, PLtx, TM, SM, REW, REV, ED, and RES*.

1. For the second subject, **Ev**, in the case of using *frequently used* category, she occupied *PLid* amounting to 19 times, *EV* 11 times, *RES* 7 times, *RP* 14 times and L1 amounting to 30 times. On the other hand, **Ev** had *sometimes used* rank for *SM* amounting to 3 times and *REW* amounting to 3 times. Then, her third rank,

rarely used, she used *PLpr* footing up to once, *PLor* amounting to zero, *PLtx* footing up to zero, *TM* none, *REV* none, *ED* amounting to two times, and *RD* footing up to two times.

2. **Fa** had different rank. In the case of *frequently used* category he had PLid amounting to 7 times and L1 footing up to 20 times. On his second rank, *sometimes used* category, he had nothing because there is no his strategy which achieved the criteria. In fact, he had many strategies for *rarely used* category. He had *PLpr* once, *PLor* amounting to zero, *PLtx* footing up to zero, *TM* none, *SM* once, *EV* once, *REW* once, *REV* once, *ED* zero, *RES* zero, *RP* none, and *RD* amounting to zero.

3. The fourth subject, **Na**, used several strategies amount to 169 times. In her first category, she had *PLid* amount to 21 times, *TM* 9 times, *SM* 9 times, *EV* 23 times, *RP* 35 times, *RD* 5 times, and L1 foot up to 60 times. She had a single strategy in *sometimes used* category, that is *RES* amounting to 4 times. In the case of *rarely used* category, **Na** used *PLpr* once, *PLor* none, *PLtx* none, *REW* none, *REV* none, and *ED* amounting to twice.

4. **Ha** had the highest number of strategies in this research because his strategies amount to 171 strategies. In the case of first category, frequently used, he had *PLid* amounting to 24 times, *EV* 19 times, *ED* 6 times, RP 29 times, *RD* 10 times, and L1 amount to 72 times. On his second category, *sometimes used*, he used *TM* amount to 4 times and *SM* amount to 3 times. On the other hand, he used six strategies which occupied the *rarely used* strategies. He had *PLpr* amounting to two times, *PLor* none, *PLtx* once, *REW* none, *REV* none and *RES* amounting to once.

5. The sixth subject, **As**, used fewest strategies. He used only 31 strategies during the writing process. He had *L1* which was used 26 times in his *frequently used* category. He had no *sometimes used* strategy. On the other hand, he used 13 strategies in the *rarely used* strategies, they are: *PLid* amounting to once 1, *PLpr* once, *PLor* none, *PLtx* none, *TM* none, *SM* none, *EV* once, *REW* none, *REV* none, *ED* once, *RES* none, *RP* once and *RD* amounting to zero.

   Summing up, it is obvious that the total strategies which were used are 539 strategies. This number came from *PLid* amounting to 86 times, *PLpr* foot up to7 times, *PLor* none, *Pltx* once, *TM* 13 times, *SM* 17 times, *EV* 60 times, *REW* 5 times, *REV* 3 times, *ED* 11 times, *RES* 12 times, *RP* 85 times, *RD* 21 times, and *L1* amounting to 218 times.

   The total of each strategy used, the researcher divided it into six subjects. The researcher got the average. From this average, if the researcher put them to the three strategy categories the researcher got data that *PLid* amounting to 14.3, *EV* amounting to 10.0, *RP* foot up to 14.2, and *L1* amounting to 36.3 are on the *frequently used*. The second category which is *sometimes used,* is occupied by *RD* amount to 3.5. On *rarely used*, the researcher put *PLpr* amounting to 1.2, *PLor* foot up to zero, *PLtx* 0.2, *TM* amounting to 2.2, *SM* foot up to 2.8, *REW* amounting to 0.8, *REV* amounting to 0.5, *ED* foot up to 1.8 and *RES* amounting to 2.0.

3.1.2 Strategies for a Sentence

   The coded TAP shows that, in producing a sentence, a subject needed to use several types of writing strategies. The following samples show how a subject needed to switch from one strategy to another in accomplishing the task about the picture concerning "*Dora and Boot*":

1. **Ar** used some strategies to create an intended sentence '*They are in the hill'*. She used: EV strategy such as *Apa lagi ya? (EV)* which refers to asking herself about the next step of creating sentence. After asking herself about the next step, she planned to write an idea which is started by saying *There are (PLid)*. After uttering the beginning of a sentence, suddenly she changed her next idea by using reduction strategy; she said *bukan bukan bukan(RD)*. She tried to ask herself the appropriate idea to the intended sentence by saying *apa ya?(EV) ah.. (PLid) apa lagi /what next/(EV) emmmm (PLid)*. When she got an idea, a writing problem destructed her concentration; she was confused to use an appropriate preposition. Then, she chose preposition *in* at her sentence: in beside *oooo salah in front of (REV). In front of dora... salah....e...in.....ssalah. bukan bukan in front of dora salah (RD)*. Finally, **Ar** got a complete sentence after using and changing some strategies, she wrote *They are in the hill*[21]. To emphasize her idea she repeat her idea by saying *They are in the hill (RP)*.

2. When **Ev** wanted to write a sentence "*There are many plants, flowers and trees.*" she used several strategies to create a sentence in the sixth minute. The strategies are*: there are there (PLid). There many plant*[17] She said *banyak tanaman(L1)*, she actually denoted many plants. She added an idea that is flower *like flower*[18] because she looked flowers on the picture. **Ev** got another idea in writing the intended sentence, it is shown by her utterances*: and ... a.. (PLid) apa ya?(EV)* means what is it? *Many flower and tree*[19]*, pohon(L1)*. Finally, the word tree is the intended word. The complete sentence is "*There are many plants, flowers and trees.*"

3. The third subject who uses several strategies in producing a sentence is **Fa**. He showed it in his TAP at forth minute. "*I think they're wanna go to blue bridge*" can be produced after he tried to use *PLid, EV*, and *L1*. He

said to himself that *I think* then he translated as *berpikir.* Next, he further uttered *telah berpikir* (*PLid*)(*L1*) which means have thought. He combined two strategies (*PLid* and *L1*) in one time during articulating her initial idea. He asked himself the suit word after *I think* by saying: *adehh apa ya?* (EV) he indicates that utterances as *What is it?*. Finally **Fa** get the complete idea, he wrote the intended sentence by articulating the L1 version first, such as *Aku berpikir mereka ingin pergi ke jembatan biru*(*L1*). *I think they're wanna go to blue bridge*[20].

Tracing the samples above, the researcher finds that in producing a sentence the subject needed to use many types of strategies. They need to use at least three strategies for a sentence. The subject will use more strategies if they write a paragraph or a text.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1 Strategies in Writing

The finding shows that *Planning content and idea* strategy is found in the second rank. It is one of the most frequent strategies used. It shows that subjects tried to relate new information to old (written) information because the subjects have many ideas to be informed for reader. Cumming (1989:113) in [7] calls this as 'what-next strategy', that is questioning what else to write about after writing some ideas.

PLpr was one of limited strategies used in the research. It happened because the subjects did not prepare their writing to be a good writing. If they prepared their writing well they would have more *PLpr* in their TAP. [7] discussed it in her finding that good writers plan their writing well rather than the poor writer who had fewer plans in their writing. If the subjects in this research did *PLpr* poorly it indicates that they are poor writers.

Planning organization shows the subjects' way to arrange their ideas in the writing process. This strategy is needed to create a systematic writing which makes the composition more easily read. [7] states that *PLor* mostly happens in the free writing process or improvising composition. It can be said that all of the subjects in the research, did not take the assigned descriptive writing as the serious one. They just composed their work as they wanted to write without any planning.

The previous *L1* and ESL researches in [7] show that the various *Planning linguistic text* meant as non linear writing fashion. In fact, the subjects in the research did not create any *PLtx*. It can be said that the subjects in the research are linear fashion writers who use the same ways in writing.

In [7] conclusion states that generating new ideas also entailed rehearsing more alternatives. The ideas that should be stated in the writing need subjects' vocabulary consideration.

As the result shows there are two subjects who used *TM*. They are **Na** and **Ha**. After the TM occurrences we see there are several types of strategies which followed it. It shows that after being sure about what they wrote, the subjects could change and write the other ideas by using other strategies. This also happened in [7] research. She found that the identification of these on-line problems often triggered the setting of new procedural goals, which derived in further evaluations, reviewing, generating of ideas and in the restructuring of the written text, interfering once again with their writing fluency.

On the other hand, Self-Monitoring (*SM*) shows that the subjects in the research declared their difficulties in composing process. The difficulties they faced made them try the other strategies in order to address the idea they want to transfer.

Through evaluating strategies (*EV*) which were used by the subjects, it can be seen that the subjects had problems in deciding the following idea should be written. The subjects also had problems in choosing an appropriate word to be used.

Reviewing (*REW*), as [7] states, is the sign that the learners try to retrieve new ideas; to assess whether the written text matched the intended meaning; to evaluate the linguistic structure as it had evolved; to keep them focused and ensure them were still on track; to decide how to connect the preceding idea with the forthcoming ones; to revise and to edit. It means the subject pause their writing to use this strategy in order to get better composition.

In fact, the subjects rarely used it. From six subjects there were only three students who used it , they are **Ar, Ev,** and **Fa**, albeit in the small number. It shows that the subjects did not try to create good composition. Thus, they just tell whatever in their mind without reconsidering the appropriateness and target.

The *Revising* (*REV*) strategy is used to clarify or connect ideas. In contrast, the subjects of this research did not use it maximally. They felt satisfied on what they wrote. They thought they do not need to revise anything, except **Ar** and **Fa** who used it twice and once.

Only some of the subjects *used Editing Strategy* (*ED*). It can be said that the subjects were sure that what they had written was correct and conveyed what in their mind. On the other hand, some subjects used the strategy because they had problems in the vocabulary. There was no subject who concerned with their writing punctuation and grammar.

In general, *Evaluating Strategies* took small part of strategies used by the subjects. In fact, evaluating strategies is really important in writing process. [2] informs us that the unskilled writer is not good at introspecting while writing. It means when the subjects' *Evaluating Strategies* are few, the subjects are unskilled writers.

In the writing process, some students used *Resourcing strategy* when they did not know a needed vocabulary. They consulted to their dictionary or their friends. They did so because they had insufficient numbers of vocabularies to be exact.

Repeating is a way to provide impetus to continue composing [4]. It means that the students make repetition to make their cognitive focus on the idea they write. It can remind them on what they intended to write. This situation also happens in this research that the subjects frequently repeat their idea during the writing process to avoid miss-writing or skipping an idea.

Some reductions were created by the four subjects; they are *Ar, Ev, Na,* and *Ha*. Each subject did it because their problem on vocabulary. It can be inferred from their think aloud protocol that, lack of vocabulary causes reduction and affects written idea; the aspirated idea cannot be achieved. [10] states that the students' descriptive writing ability is closely related to their vocabulary mastery. In short, it could be declared that one of the most important aspects which influences the students' descriptive writing ability is their vocabulary mastery. When the students' vocabulary mastery is good, their writing ability must be good especially in applying the use of vocabulary in sentences. Moreover, the interview reveals that they are low in vocabulary competence.

It is the most dominant strategy in the study, with the biggest portion 40.4%, *Use of L1* seems having big role in the subjects' writing process. From the interview, it is known that the subjects always try to use it to inform what they have in mind. It is relevant with what [9], they state that L2 writing research has shown that L2 writers use their first language (*L1*) while writing in L2, although the extent to which they do so clearly varies. Studies to date have also found that adult writers use their L1 while writing in their L2 for a wide variety of purposes, such as planning, generating ideas, or solving linguistic problems such as vocabulary issues. They add that *L1 use* has also been reported for back-tracking, stylistic choices and as a mean to prevent cognitive overload.

The above discussion shows that each strategy is used in the various terms. The subjects used it when they faced difficulties by uttering the intended words first, in their native tongue or bahasa Indonesia, then trying to find out their equivalent words in English.

4.2 Various Strategies for a Sentence

Subjects in this research had writing problem during the writing process. These problems often triggered the setting of new procedural goals, which derived in further evaluations, reviewing, generating of ideas and in the restructuring of the written text, interfering once again with their writing fluency [7].

It can be concluded that the difficulties during the writing process forced the subjects of the research to try the other writing strategies in order to address the idea they want to transfer. Therefore, the use of more than one strategy in producing a sentence is understandable.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of subjects' writing and TAP derives two conclusions in this research. First, in producing a sentence or a line, several types of writing strategies are used by each subject of the research. A sentence needs at least three strategies. Second, regarding the occurrence, the researcher has three categories; they are *frequently used* such as *PLid*, *EV*, *RP*, and *L1; sometimes used* consists of *RD; rarely used PLpr*, *PLor*, *PLtx*, *TM*, *SM*, *REW*, *REV*, *ED*, and *RES*. The big amount of *rarely used strategies* indicate that subjects had difficulties in the writing process.

REFERENCES

[1] Bowles, Mellisa A. 2010. *The Think Aloud Controversy in Second Language Research*. New York: Routledge.

[2] Chen, Bo and Guangwei Hu. 2005. *A Protocol-Based Study of University-Level Chinese EFL Learners' Writing Strategies* : http://www.englishaustralia.com.au/index.cgi?E=hcatfuncs&PT=sl&X=getdoc&Lev1=pub_jour_23_&Lev2=EAJ_23_2_hu, cited June 30, 2011.

[3] Qomarudin, Achmat. 2010. *Correlation between Extraversion Personality and English Writing Skill*. Semarang. Fakultas Humaniora Undip.

[4] Raimes, Ann. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[5] Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. Wyoming: Prentice Hall Regents.

[6] Scardamalia, M. 1984. *Teachability of Reflective Process in Written Composition. Cognitive Science*: A Multidisciplinary Journal of Artificial Intelligence.

[7] Victori, Mia. 1997. *EFL Composing Skills and Strategies: Four Case Studies:*

[8] http://www.um.es/langpsy/Publicaciones/Victori.pdf., cited on June 30, 2011.

[9] Weijen, Daphne Van., Huub van de Bergh., Gert Ritjlaarsdam., and Ted Sanders. 2009. *L1 Use during L2 Writing: An Emprical Study of A Complex Phenomenon:* http://www.ilo.uva.nl/Projecten/Gert/Research/VanWeijen_ et-al_2009_SecondLanguageWriting.pdf, cited June 30, 2011.

[10] Yulina, Nurma. 2010. *The Corellation between the Vocabulary Mastery and Descriptive Writing Ability at the First Year of SMAN 1 Ambarawa, Pringsewu.* Bandar Lampung: FKIP Unila (Unpublished paper).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

universitas
bandar lampung

9 772303 141001