LLT Journal, e-ISSN 2579-9533, p-ISSN 1410-7201, Vol. 28, No. 1, April 2025, pp. 302-326

LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/LLT
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

REVERSED TRANSFER OF ARGUMENT-COUNTERARGUMENT STRUCTURE IN INDONESIAN EFL LEARNERS' L1 AND L2 ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING

Rusfandi Rusfandi
Universitas PGRI Kanjuruhan Malang, Indonesia
0706057601@unikama.ac.id
*correspondence: 0706057601@unikama.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/llt.v28i1.9124
received 10 July 2024; accepted 7 April 2025

Abstract
The influence of L2 writing on L1 writing has been viewed as a complex process. Bilinguals are often faced with challenges in trying to reuse prior writing knowledge received through L2 and in trying to reshape that writing knowledge when composing in L1. This study aims to gain evidence of a reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 in an Indonesian EFL teaching context. This quantitative research analyzed EFL learners' L2 and L1 essays after an L2 writing instruction which focuses on argumentative writing had been provided for one semester in an Indonesian university. The study found evidence of a reversed transfer of argument-counterargument structure from L2 English to L1 Indonesian among third-year English majors. However, this transfer process is dynamic because it depends on mediating factors, including the L2 learners' different levels of understanding of the argument-counterargument structure, L2 proficiency, and perceived audience expectation in a specific language. There was also a significant correlation in the overall scores between the L2 and L1 essays produced by the English majors. The findings suggest that conceptual knowledge of writing is transferable across languages, and developing L2 writing ability could directly/indirectly trigger L2 learners' L1 writing development.

Keywords: argumentative writing, argument-counterargument structure, prior writing knowledge, reversed transfer

Introduction
English has become an essential part of the education system in many non-English native countries (Cha & Ham, 2011). In Indonesia, for example, English is the first foreign language to become a compulsory subject in secondary schools and universities and is one of the national exam subjects. However, problems regarding English language learning, especially those related to learners' literacy skills (i.e., reading and writing), are often viewed separately from the possibility of the learners to have the similar problems in Indonesian. For example, the problems concerning students' writing abilities in English, such as in developing ideas and elaborating audience awareness, are often viewed separately from the

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

likelihood of the learners to have the same problems when they write in Indonesian (Rusfandi, 2021).

Nevertheless, studies (e.g., Babaii & Ramazani, 2017; Forbes & Fisher, 2020; Kecskés & Papp, 2000; Rinnert et al., 2015; Rusfandi, 2013) found that the writing knowledge or ability acquired and developed by second language learners during second language writing instruction could be used to improve their writing not only in second language (L2) but also in first language (L1). This finding indicates that writing knowledge is transferable across languages, and developing knowledge or ability to write in one language will directly or indirectly also improve the other.

The influence of L2 writing knowledge on L1 writing is known as the reversed transfer of writing knowledge. This influence encompasses the incorporation and modification of L2-specific rhetorical features, such as refutation, in the participants' L1 writing. This phenomenon occurs as a result of their experiences with L2 and L2 writing instruction at the university level. In the context of the present study, L2 refers to English and L1 refers to Indonesian.

Despite the potential pedagogical significance of the results of studies on the reversed transfer of writing knowledge to improve L2 learners' writing ability in L2 and L1, only a few number of research has been carried out, especially in less familiar EFL contexts such as in Indonesia. Within the Indonesian EFL context, research concerning writing has focused mainly on evaluating the quality of Indonesian EFL learners' argumentative writing structures (e.g., El Khoiri & Widiati, 2017; Fajrina et al., 2022) and exploring instructional strategies to help these learners improve their ability in writing English argumentative essays (e.g., Murtadho, 2021).

In addition, early studies on the reversed transfer of writing knowledge between languages generally still adopt a relatively static concept of transfer. They usually focus only on the reusing of conceptual aspects of L2 writing that are deemed to be language-specific when L2 learners write in L1, such as the use of a refutation feature (i.e., readers' possible opposing view along with the rebuttal) as in studies conducted by Rusfandi (2013) and Kobayashi and Rinnert (2007). However, writing in L1 or L2 is a complex process. L2 writers are often faced with challenges not only in trying to reuse prior writing knowledge received through previous writing instruction either in L1 or L2, but also in trying to reshape that writing knowledge by adapting it to their perceived audience expectations in L1 or L2 (Rinnert et al., 2015), compensating for novice understanding of certain rhetorical aspects (i.e., refutation) of writing in L1 or L2 (Rusfandi, 2013), and managing the complexity of the information or ideas conveyed in their writing (Qin & Karabacak, 2010; Wolfe et al., 2009). In other words, the static concept of transfer overlooks the possible complex interrelationships of bilinguals' L2 and L1 writing knowledge when they write in the two languages.

As a response, the present study aims to gain further evidence of a reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 in the context of EFL teaching in Indonesia. The purpose is to understand whether the reversed transfer process, as proposed by DePalma and Ringer (2011) and Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016), is dynamic and influenced by individual factors such as L2 proficiency and general writing proficiency, as well as social factors like the perceived writing audience.

Being able to confirm the presence of this reversed transfer will enhance understanding of how bilingual individuals process and transfer rhetorical and conceptual writing knowledge between languages. Additionally, it will offer insights into bilingual cognition and the interplay between L1 and L2. Practically, the findings can inform teaching practices by highlighting how L2 instruction can enhance L1 writing skills, especially in argumentative writing. Furthermore, by understanding the factors that mediate reverse transfer, educators can more effectively support bilingual writers in utilizing their complete linguistic repertoire.

The research investigated Indonesian EFL learners' L2 and L1 essays after an L2 writing instruction which focuses on argumentative writing has been provided for one semester in an Indonesian university. The study adopts multiple concepts of transfer as its theoretical foundation, such as the cross-linguistic interdependence hypothesis (Cummins, 2000, 2021), adaptive transfer (DePalma & Ringer, 2011), and dynamic views of transfer (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016) to build a deeper understanding about a reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1, particularly in an Indonesian EFL context. In this study, the term reversed transfer refers to the participants' utilization (reusing) or modification (reshaping) of their L2 writing knowledge (i.e., English-specific rhetorical features called refutation) in their L1 writing as they have learned and developed it during L2 writing instruction. Meanwhile, refutation refers to the potential counterarguments that readers may have against the writer's stated claim, as well as the writer's rebuttal, which is a response to those counterarguments.

Argument structures of writing: English vs. Indonesian

Indonesian and English argumentative essays generally have a relatively similar basic rhetorical structure characterized by the availability of macro features such as an introductory (accompanied by a clear and concise thesis statement), developmental (body), and concluding paragraphs (Jubhari, 2009; Numertayasa et al., 2013; Purdue Online Writing Lab, 2023). However, concerning the explicitness of idea transactions, Indonesian argumentative essays tend to be less explicit when compared to English argumentative essays. Studies (e.g., Numertayasa et al., 2013; Rusfandi, 2015) found that Indonesian argumentative essays tend to focus more on the writer (one-sided) and emphasize how the writer conveys the main idea and supports it with justification and logical evidence as a means to convince the readers.

Unlike Indonesian, English writing adopts a writer-responsible rhetoric, requiring writers to present unified information and appropriate transitional signals. This approach enables readers to grasp the logic, argumentation, and persuasion within the text, making the writing more comprehensible (Hinds, 1987). According to an online writing resource from the Purdue Online Writing Lab (2023), an English argumentative essay should consist of four main components. The first component is an introductory paragraph that includes a clear, concise, and well-defined thesis statement. In this section, the writer should briefly review the topic, explain its significance, and state the thesis of the argumentative essay.

The second part of the text comprises the body, which includes paragraphs that support the main claim (thesis statement). Each paragraph should present

evidence that logically connects to the thesis statement, using illustrations, facts, opinions, and statistics as support. Following this, there is a refutation section, where the writer addresses an opposing viewpoint (counterargument) and offers a rebuttal. The writer must show that alternative opinions are unacceptable; if an opposing opinion is deemed acceptable, it should be argued that it is insufficient to counter the main issue discussed (Wyrick, 2022). The final component is the concluding paragraph, where the writer summarizes the arguments presented earlier and offers some discussion.

However, audience involvement (in the writer's imagination), or as mentioned by Ede and Lunsford (1984, p. 156) as "audience invoked," has not been considered an integral part of Indonesian argumentative essays. This lack of audience involvement is indicated by the minimal (even non-existent) use of a refutation feature covering aspects like readers' possible opposition view, counter-arguments, and justification (Guilford, 2023; Wyrick, 2022).

Another explanation that specific audience involvement has not yet become an integral part of the rhetorical structure of Indonesian argumentative essays is that there may currently be more flexibility in the argument structure styles in the Indonesian writing. Unlike English which applies detailed references or guidance to its writing argument structure which are emphasized in the teaching and learning of English writing at schools (Guilford, 2023; Lu, 2005), there is no such explicit references or guidance within Indonesian writing. Several references (e.g., Helaluddin, 2017; Numertayasa et al., 2013) mention that the macro-structure of Indonesian argumentative essays generally contains features such as introduction, thesis statement, development (body), and conclusion.

To the researcher's knowledge, Keraf (1982) is the only source that discusses the importance of involving other-side views in Indonesian argumentative essays. He states that a writer should consider opposing opinions and identify facts or ideas that can be refuted. Keraf (1982), however, does not explain in specific ways how this rebuttal can be elaborated into an Indonesian argumentative essay. The limited sources concerning the refutation and its integration demonstrate that this rhetorical feature might have generally not been studied explicitly in the teaching and learning process of Indonesian writing. If Indonesian EFL learners can elaborate on this feature in English and Indonesian essays, they must have received this knowledge during English L2 writing instruction. They might receive it directly or indirectly through lectures, textbooks, and examples provided during the teaching and learning process.

In an English argumentative essay, a refutation feature represents a dialogic process between the writer and his imagined readers. It also signifies the writer's awareness of the opposing views on the topic discussed. The writer is expected to refute or rebut the different opinions by providing an alternative perspective substantiated by strong argumentation (Guilford, 2023). If the opposing viewpoint is acceptable, the writer then should demonstrate that it is insufficiently persuasive to address the discussed issue (Wyrick, 2022).

Transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1

Previous studies suggest that L2 learners' writing knowledge that they developed through L2 instruction can be used to enhance writing abilities not only in L2 but also in L1 (Babaii & Ramazani, 2017; Kecskés & Papp, 2000;

Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2007). This possibility of reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 is supported by numerous theories including intercultural rhetoric (Connor, 2011), cross-linguistic interdependence hypothesis (Cummins, 2000, 2021), multicompetence (Cook, 2008, 2016), dynamic system theory (de Bot et al., 2007; Herdina & Jessner, 2002), and adaptive transfer (DePalma & Ringer, 2011). These theories generally argue that L2 learners do not develop separate systems of conceptual knowledge of writing for each language they have but rather a merged system, which embodies all the writing knowledge they have acquired through L1 and L2. This suggests that in a context where L2 learners receive more writing instruction and practice in L2 than L1 (i.e., studying L2 as a field of study in university), their writing knowledge/ability will improve and overlap between L1 and L2. In other words, developing knowledge/ability to write in one language will directly or indirectly also improve the other.

Studies on the transfer of writing knowledge also suggest that the relationship between writing knowledge in L1 and L2 developed by L2 learners is not static but dynamic (DePalma & Ringer, 2011; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016). Transfer is perceived as a complex meaning-making process involving not only the reusing but also the restructuring (reshaping) of prior writing knowledge obtained and developed through L1/L2 writing instruction. This process of restructuring or adaptation of prior writing knowledge is influenced by several factors, such as different perceived audience expectations between L1 and L2 writing (Rinnert et al., 2015), L2 writers' underdeveloped knowledge of rhetorical structures, L2 proficiency (Rusfandi, 2013), and complexity of information conveyed (Qin & Karabacak, 2010; Wolfe et al., 2009).

In his crosslinguistic interdependence hypothesis, Cummins (2000, 2021) mentions three conditions for a bidirectional cross-linguistic transfer to occur: effective instruction in L1/L2 that enables L2 learners to improve their conceptual knowledge of writing and proficiency in L1/L2; adequate exposure to L1/L2, either in a formal education context or in society; and adequate motivation to learn the L1/L2. Cummins (2000, 2021) believes that effective literacy instruction has a significant role in the transfer process because it enables L2 learners to develop cognitive, academic, and language proficiency (CALP). Cummins (2000, 2021) attributes these types of conceptual knowledge as interdependent and transferable across languages. Similarly, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016) also postulate that L1/L2 writing instruction, whether provided explicitly or implicitly, are the primary sources shaping the L1/L2 conceptual writing knowledge of L2 learners as a whole, covering aspects like writing conventions, rhetorical features, audience awareness, etc. This L1/L2 writing knowledge, together with individual (i.e., language proficiency, perception, attitude) and contextual (i.e., task, topic, setting) factors, affects and determines the L2 learners' decisions in the production process of L1/L2 writing.

In an EFL context such as Indonesia, achieving adequate exposure to English might still be a problem, but for students who take English as their major at university, exposure to English, especially to formal linguistic aspects (e.g., grammar) in their university learning environment, is pervasive through their English courses. At the same time, obviously, they have rich contact with their L1. This language environment corresponds to the kind of context in which "additive bilingualism" (Cummins, 2000, p. 37) is a possibility. The L2 English is unlikely

to be a threat to the development of the learners' L1 Indonesian, and vice versa. The students may, in fact, develop their L1 and L2 at the same time.

However, there are still a few studies investigated the potential for the reversed transfer of writing skills from L2 to L1, especially in an EFL teaching context in Indonesia. Within the Indonesian EFL context, research concerning writing has focused mainly on evaluating the quality of Indonesian EFL learners' argumentative writing structures (e.g., El Khoiri & Widiati, 2017; Fajrina et al., 2022) and exploring instructional strategies to help these learners improve their skills in writing English argumentative essays (e.g., Murtadho, 2021). How the writing knowledge and skills that Indonesian EFL learners have acquired and developed through L2 writing instruction might be incorporated to build writing knowledge and abilities in L2 and L1 has not been widely explored.

To the researcher's knowledge, only one study on the possibility of reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 was conducted in the context of EFL teaching in Indonesia (i.e., Rusfandi, 2013). However, this research only focused on writing products by analyzing and comparing the rhetorical structures of argumentative essays written by participants from two different study programs (i.e., the English Language Education study program and the Indonesian Language Education study program) and with distinct lengths of study (first year and third year) at a private university in Indonesia. The results show that the reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 was confirmed, especially in the suppliance of a rhetorical feature categorized as refutation in L1 and L2 essays written by participants from the third-year English majors. This research also found the role of L2 proficiency in mediating the reversed transfer.

However, Rusfandi's (2013) research has not incorporated the role of formal L2 writing instruction for a certain period, especially concerning aspects of writing knowledge that are potentially different between L1 and L2, such as audience awareness. This conceptual aspect is usually manifested in the use of a refutation covering features like possible opposition views, counter-arguments, and justifications. The inclusion of formal L2 writing instruction as a study focus is necessary to understand the extent to which the writing knowledge learned is applied when writing in L2 and the potential for its application in L1 writing. In addition, how the aspects of knowledge considered different between L2 and L1 are used and influence the quality of L1 and L2 essays needs further investigation to uncover whether this knowledge is just reused or undergoes a reshaping process (DePalma & Ringer, 2011; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016).

As a response, the present research aims to obtain further evidence about the reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1 by comparing and contrasting the use of argument-counterargument structures, manifested from the use of rhetorical features such as claim, sub-claim, refutation, and justification, in the L2 (English) and L1 (Indonesian) essays written by third-year English majors at a private university in Malang, Indonesia. Compare and contrast was also carried out between the L1 essays written by English majors and those written by third-year Indonesian majors to ensure that certain rhetorical features used by the English majors were English-specific and not commonly used in Indonesian essays produced by the Indonesian majors. This research also explores the possibility of reusing and reshaping process L2 writing knowledge in the L2 and L1 essays written by English major participants to understand whether the transfer

process, as argued by DePalma and Ringer (2011) and Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016), is dynamic.

The results would deepen our understanding of the efforts and challenges made and faced by L2 learners when writing in L2 and the potential for developing L2 learners' writing in an integrated way in L2 and L1. This understanding can be a conceptual basis and valuable source for L2 teachers in teaching writing and in developing teaching materials, techniques, and methods.

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. Does the Indonesian EFL learners' English (L2) writing rhetorical structure transfer when they write in Indonesian (L1)?
2. If the reversed transfer is confirmed, how is the argument-counterargument structure manifested in the learners' L1 and L2 writing?
3. Does the argument structure that the students develop in their essays influence their overall writing scores?

Method

Setting and participants

The research was conducted at a private university in Malang, Indonesia. It involved third-year participants from two study programs: English Language Education and Indonesian Language and Literature Education. The English majors consisted of 131 students from four classes, while the Indonesian majors comprised 30 students from one class. The difference in the number of classes and students participated between the English and Indonesian study programs was due to varying formal permissions granted by the heads of the respective departments. The head of the English Language Education study program allowed the researcher to conduct the research in all four classes, whereas the head of Indonesian Language and Literature Education program permitted only one class for the study. Each of these participants provided informed consent prior to participating in the study, and the students did not receive any course credit for their participation. Table 1 presents the number of students participating in this research.

However, more than 50% of the English majors were disqualified, as only those with at least an intermediate level of English proficiency were recruited as participants. This decision was based on the findings of Rusfandi (2013), which indicated a tendency for reversed transfer of rhetorical structures of writing from L2 to L1 when participants had reached at least an intermediate level of English proficiency. Therefore, although 161 students participated, only 84 (54 English majors and 30 Indonesian majors) were included as participants in this study.

The English major participants mostly consist of female students (90.7%), with only 9.3% being male students. The distribution is similar for the Indonesian major participants, with 76.7% female and 23.3% male. Regarding ethnicity, the participants from the English and Indonesian study programs are predominantly Javanese, with less than 30% coming from the central and eastern regions of Indonesia. Besides speaking Indonesian as the national language, these students mostly communicate in their mother tongues, such as Javanese, Madurese, Manggarai, Ambonese, etc. However, these local languages primarily exist as spoken languages, with Indonesian serving as their first language for literacy (reading and writing).

Table 1. Number of students participating in the study

Study Program	Semester/Class	Σ students before selection	Σ students after selection
English Education	6A	27	9
	6B	31	8
	6C	30	14
	6D	43	23
Indonesian Language & Literature	6B	30	30

The English proficiency of the participants was measured, except for the third-year Indonesian majors. The reason for recruiting the Indonesian majors as participants was that their Indonesian argumentative essays produced by them served as comparative samples to those written by the English majors concerning the application of argument-counterargument structure. Therefore, there seems to be little plausible reason to assess their English proficiency levels in the study. However, this does not rule out the possibility that they may also possess sufficient English proficiency, which allows them to write in English as they learn the language in senior high school. This could potentially bias the results of the present study.

An adapted version of the Michigan English Language Assessment Battery (MELAB) test model (Spaan, 2007, pp. 46-59) was used to measure the third-year English majors' L2 proficiency levels. The test consists of grammar, vocabulary, and reading sections. The listening section was excluded because the researcher had difficulty obtaining permission to access the language laboratory for the test. The researcher also omitted the writing section because he had prepared a writing task to evaluate the participants' writing proficiency. Table 2 presents the percentage of English proficiency levels of the third-year English majors achieving the prerequisite proficiency level of intermediate.

Table 2. Percentage of students achieving at least an intermediate level of English proficiency (N=54)

Levels of English proficiency*	%	F
Intermediate	90.7	49
Adv. Intermediate	3.7	2
Advanced	5.6	3

*Note:
Elementary: 1 – 24; Adv. Elementary: 25 – 37; Intermediate: 38 – 52; Adv. Intermediate: 53 – 59; Advanced: 60 – 78; Comparable to educated native speaker of English: 79 – 100

L2 writing instruction

The English-major participants received L2 writing instruction through a course named Advanced Academic Writing (AAW), with a weight of two credits. Based on its lesson plan, the course focuses on English argumentative writing. Generally, two main topics were provided for the course: argumentative writing as a dialogic process (Hoey, 2001; Thompson, 2001) and citation in English academic writing. The former includes discussion of writing as a reciprocal dialogue between a writer and his imagined readers, audience awareness, organizations (introduction, problem, refutation, solution, and conclusion), and rhetorical features (claims, sub-claims, opposition views, counter-arguments, and

justification). The latter focuses on various citation formats and the usage of citation management software like Mendeley to help students manage citations for their writing.

The course consists of fourteen meetings, including mid- and final-semester exams. The MELAB was conducted in the second meeting after the introduction in the first meeting. The lecturer allocated two sessions to discuss the dialogic concept of argumentative writing. Each session includes a theoretical explanation of the topic and writing practice. The first session was provided before the mid-term exam, while the second one was after the mid-term exam. Key references used for this course include Wyrick (2022), Ramage et al. (2021), Axelrod and Cooper (2018), and several IELTS preparation books. The participants' writing task for the final exam served as data for the research because the students presumably had developed knowledge about the dialogic concept of writing and had writing experience based on it through the L2 writing instruction.

Writing tasks

To understand the elaboration patterns of rhetorical features (claim, sub-claim, refutation, and justification) in students' L1 and L2 essays, as well as to evaluate aspects of essay quality (content, organization, vocabulary, language use, mechanics, and overall scores), the researcher provided two writing tasks for English major participants—one in English and one in Indonesian. Additionally, for Indonesian major students, one writing task was administered solely in Indonesian. This approach aimed to assess the occurrence of reversed transfer of writing knowledge from L2 to L1.

Overall, 138 essays formed the data for this research. The English majors wrote 108 essays, 54 in English and 54 in Indonesian. Meanwhile, the Indonesian majors produced 30 essays in Indonesian. The Indonesian majors were not requested to write essays in English because this research focused on the potential for a reversed transfer of writing skills from L2 to L1 among Indonesian EFL learners. Their involvement as participants in the study was because their Indonesian argumentative essays provided comparative samples to those written by the English majors regarding the use of argument-counterargument structure. Therefore, there was no plausible reason for them to write in English. In addition, they might also feel reluctant to do so because they studied Indonesian and not English at university, although they might have proficiency in English.

The orders and topics of the writing sessions were counter-balanced to minimize the effects of idea rewriting and topic difficulty. For example, one group of participants wrote in L1 first, while the other group composed in L2 first, and vice versa. One group of students wrote using topic A for L1 essays, while the other group composed using topic B for L2 essays, and vice versa. The two topics were "The Internet and its effects on children and young people in Indonesia" and "Video and online games and their effects on children and young people in Indonesia." These topics were both debatable and general, providing participants with sufficient background knowledge. To assess students' original ideas and English writing proficiency, the writing tasks were conducted in class and on paper. For this purpose, the researcher allocated ninety minutes for each writing task, and students were not allowed to use a monolingual or bilingual dictionary during the writing sessions. There was a one-week time gap between writing tasks

1 and 2. Table 3 presents the number of participants, topic allocation, and language order for the writing sessions.

Table 3. Participants, topics, orders of writing sessions

Major	Class	Topic	Order for writing session
English	A	Topic 1	English
		Topic 2	Indonesian
	B	Topic 1	Indonesian
		Topic 2	English
	C	Topic 1	English
		Topic 2	Indonesian
	D	Topic 2	Indonesian
		Topic 1	English
Indonesian*	B	Topic 2	15 students used Topic 1 and 15 used Topic
		Topic 1	2 (they wrote at the same time)

Essay scoring and rhetorical feature identification

The L1 and L2 essays were assessed according to whether or not they contained the four rhetorical features of claim, sub-claim, refutation, and justification. A claim refers to the main idea or thesis statement of the essay. Justification provides data to support the main and sub-claims, such as explanations, facts, or statistics (Connor & Lauer, 1988). Refutation refers to the possible counterargument of the readers against the writer's stated claim, along with its rebuttal (a response to the counterclaim). A sub-claim is a statement that relates to specific cases or circumstances in the writer's thesis statement and needs further elaboration (Crammond, 1998). Figure 1 provides an example of rhetorical feature identification in a participant's essay. The researcher developed codes to determine whether the features were present or absent in the essay. The codes were used as data for statistical analysis.

Participant 48
Topic: The effects of video and online games on children and young learners

Rhetorical Features	Paragraphs and Sentences
Claim (CL)	Nowadays, technology is not something new for people. They believe that technology helps them a lot with their work, for example, the use of the Internet. The Internet is known as the primary need for people all around the world. With it, they can find everything that is beneficial to ease their work. For students, the Internet helps them a lot in finding some interesting things like videos and games. Playing games will provide them relaxation, and it can help the students to keep away from getting bored. Although videos and online games offer various benefits for learners, the uncontrolled use of both products of technology will bring negative effects for them [CL].
Refutation (RF) and Justification (JF)	First of all, the excessive use of video and online games will hinder the students' ability to learn. Most people believe that it is okay to let their children to watch video or playing online games through the Internet because both products of technology can be used as a reward for learners who feel stressed from school activities. However, it is estimated that there are over 70% students who played online games could not focus anymore with their study because they got addicted to playing online games. Besides, the addicted effect from playing online games is that it makes the students' eyes being locked to the monitor, and it will make them forget everything especially their responsibilities as students [RF dan JF]. Accordingly, it is impossible for someone to choose to study when they are provided by something more exciting such as video and online game. Furthermore, videos and online games will lock the learners' memory on everything that is shown there, and it will make them do not focus to other things such as studying, their duties, and even their parents.
Sub-claim (SC) Refutation (RF) and Justification (JF)	Second, videos and online games will keep the students away from the real world [SC]. Many professional online gamers said that playing games is also studying, but it is packaged to be more interesting. They added that online gamers are also able to achieve better academic scores if they can manage their time well. They also claimed that playing games also provides them achievement by joining world-online game competitions. Some YouTubers also claim that video also helps them to earn money and show the talent they have to people around the world. We cannot deny those facts above, but the negative effects of video and online games are more often occurred than its advantages. The fact, people who consider themselves as online gamers are not guaranteed to reach their success through it because we know that everything just exists in a period. Moreover, the excessive use of video and online games will decrease interaction between children and their parents because the children enjoy watching video or playing online games more in their room. The case above also shows that parents will be unable to control the development of their children if the children prefer to lock themselves inside their rooms. It is also possible that the children will watch or play something which is not appropriate for their age in their rooms [RF dan JF].
	To sum up, advanced technology has benefits for people around the world. Everything will be easy to do and solve using technology, for example video and online games. Both are technology that often helps us to refresh our mind especially when we got stressed with our routines in school. Although both video and online games are beneficial for us, we need to be aware that everything that is used excessively will give us bad impacts.

Figure 1. Rhetorical feature identification in a participant's essay

Appointed raters evaluated the overall quality of the essays, covering aspects such as content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics. A rubric, developed by Djiwandono (1996, p. 130), was adopted to score the L1 essays. Meanwhile, the researcher used a scale developed by Hartfiel et al. (1985, p. 214) to assess the L2 essays. The main reason for the adoption is that they had detailed descriptors for each aspect of writing proficiency. The difference lies in the criteria descriptors developed for some aspects (i.e., language use and mechanics) which are more suited to each respective language.

Eight raters undertook the coding and scoring for the essays. Four raters evaluated the L2 essays, and four raters assessed the L1 essays. Two raters in each language identified the presence or absence of rhetorical features, and two raters

scored the overall quality aspect. The raters were Indonesian native speakers; four were lecturers at an Indonesian language study program, and the rest were EFL lecturers at an English education study program at a university in Malang, Indonesia. The researcher was one of the raters who evaluated the presence or absence of rhetorical features in the L2 essays.

There was no formal training on essay scoring or feature identification, but the researcher gave each rater a booklet with guidelines to help them with the essay evaluation process. The researcher only convened an initial meeting with all the raters to establish a shared understanding of the evaluated aspects of the essays. Apart from that, each rater was allowed to consult and discuss with the researcher if there were obstacles to understanding certain aspects of the scoring and carrying out the assessment. The booklet provides the rationale of writing as a dialogic process and its idea structural units or rhetorical features such as introduction, claim, sub-claim, refutation, and conclusion, along with examples of identifying them in an argumentative essay.

Tables 4 and 5 present the results of the inter-rater reliability and coding agreement between raters for the L1 and L2 essays. Overall, the correlation of the two scores provided by the two raters exceeds .85, and all are significant at $p < .001$. This inter-rater reliability score could be considered acceptable as it is more than .70 (Multon, 2010; Stemler, 2007).

Despite the acceptable inter-rater reliability scores for the essay scores provided by the raters, as indicated in Table 4, the identification of rhetorical features by the Indonesian and English essay raters did not achieve 100% agreement (see Table 5). Overall, there was a 97.6% agreement on L1 rhetorical features and a 99.05% agreement on L2 rhetorical features. Consequently, the researcher asked the raters to discuss and come to an agreement on the essays where their evaluations differed for both Indonesian and English essays.

Table 4. The inter-rater reliability scores for the L1 and L2 essays

Evaluated aspects	Rater 1		Rater 2		*r*	R^2	sig
	M	SD	M	SD			
L1 essays (N=84)							
Content	23.8	3.8	23.9	3.8	.97	.94	$p < .001$
Organization	15.6	2.6	15.8	2.5	.94	.88	$p < .001$
Vocabulary	15.9	2.1	15.8	2.1	.95	.90	$p < .001$
Language use	19.1	3.3	18.8	3.2	.96	.92	$p < .001$
Mechanics	4.2	0.8	4.2	0.8	.98	.96	$p < .001$
Overall score	78.6	11.9	78.5	11.8	.98	.96	$p < .001$
L2 essays (N=54)							
Content	25.2	2.9	24.9	2.8	.93	.86	$p < .001$
Organization	16.8	2.0	16.5	2.1	.89	.79	$p < .001$
Vocabulary	16.2	2.0	15.8	2.2	.88	.79	$p < .001$
Language use	19.4	2.2	18.9	2.6	.88	.79	$p < .001$
Mechanics	4.3	0.7	4.3	0.7	.94	.88	$p < .001$
Overall score	81.9	9.1	80.4	9.8	.93	.87	$p < .001$

Table 5. Coding agreement scores between raters for the L1 and L2 essays

Evaluated aspects	Agree (%)	F	Disagree (%)	F
L1 essays (N=84)				
Claim	95.2	80	4.8	4
Sub-claim	100	84	0	0
Refutation	96.4	81	3.6	3
Justification	98.8	83	1.2	1
	M = 97.6			
L2 essays (N=54)				
Claim	98.1	53	1.9	1
Sub-claim	100	54	0	0
Refutation	98.1	53	1.9	1
Justification	100	54	0	0
	M = 99.1			

Data analysis

The coded and scoring data from writing tasks were analyzed quantitatively. Categorical data, including frequency and percentage, were assessed using a non-parametric chi-square test and descriptive statistics. For example, the researcher conducted a chi-square analysis to test whether the difference in the use of rhetorical features in the L1 essays written by English and Indonesian majors was significant. In contrast, continuous data (at least the dependent variable) were analyzed using regression analysis and Pearson correlation. For example, the researcher performed a linear regression analysis to determine whether the inclusion of a refutation in L2 and L1 essays written by English majors influenced their overall essay scores. Similarly, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to measure the relationship between the quality of L2 and L1 essays produced by English majors.

Findings and Discussion

Findings

Rhetorical structure of students' L1 and L2 essays

Table 6 presents the percentage of the use of features in the L1 and L2 essays produced by the English majors. Almost all the English essays written by the participants contained claim, sub-claim, and justification features. Unlike the claim and justification, considered mandatory in English argumentative writing, all L2 essays produced by the participants also had an optional sub-claim feature. Meanwhile, about 67% of the essays had a refutation. This feature is often considered a characteristic of English writing (Purdue Online Writing Lab, 2023; Wyrick, 2022), and its use is often not explicitly promoted in argumentative writing in other languages. A similar pattern of feature availability was also found for the L1 essays. All the participants supplied claims, sub-claims, and justifications in their Indonesian essays. However, more students (85%) provided a refutation when writing in Indonesian than when composing in English (67%).

Table 6. Percentage of English and Indonesian essays produced by English and Indonesian majors containing specific rhetorical features

Rhetorical feature	Available		Not available	
	%	F	%	F
English essays (English majors N=54)				
Claim	98.1	53	1.9	1
Sub-claim	98.1	53	1.9	1
Refutation	66.7	36	33.3	18
Justification	98.1	53	1.9	1
Indonesian essays (English majors N=54)				
Claim	100	54	0	0
Sub-claim	100	54	0	0
Refutation	85.2	46	14.8	8
Justification	100	54	0	0
Indonesian essays (Indonesian majors N=30)				
Claim	83.3	25	16.7	5
Sub-claim	50.0	15	50.0	15
Refutation	30	9	70	21
Justification	80	24	20	6

Concerning the L1 essays written by the Indonesian majors, the majority of the essays contained claim and justification features (refer to Table 6). However, 70% of the essays did not include a refutation, and half did not have a sub-claim. This might indicate that refutation is not a rhetorical feature commonly elaborated on in Indonesian argumentative essays. The essays were produced by third-year Indonesian majors deemed to have adequate mastery of Indonesian writing and linguistics. Had this knowledge of refutation been taught explicitly throughout the teaching and learning process, the elaboration of this feature in students' Indonesian essays might have become a focal point.

A non-parametric *chi-square* analysis was carried out to discover whether the difference in the use of rhetorical features in the L1 essays written by the English and Indonesian majors was significant. This type of statistical analysis was employed because the data were categorical (i.e., frequency) and not continuous (i.e., scale). The analysis yielded that the difference was statistically significant: Claim (χ^2 (1) = 9.57, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 10.8); Sub-claim (χ^2 (1) = 32.87, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 54.0); Refutation (χ^2 (1) = 25.98, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 13.4); and Justification (χ^2 (1) = 11.63, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), odds ratio = 13.5). The odds ratio value, which represents the effect size of the comparison, indicates that the likelihood for the essays written by the English majors to have a claim was 10.8 times higher than that in the Indonesian majors' essays. Meanwhile, the Indonesian essays written by the English majors also had 54.0 times more likelihood of having a sub-claim, 13.4 times more chance of having a refutation, and 13.5 times more possibility of having a justification than the Indonesian essays written by the Indonesian majors.

This result indicates that the L2 writing instruction received by the English majors influenced their use of rhetorical features in their Indonesian argumentative essays, especially with refutation, an aspect considered part of the

English culture-specific argumentation (Guilford, 2023; Wyrick, 2022). As discussed earlier, these students produced Indonesian essays containing refutation, a feature not commonly used by those studying Indonesian as a university major. In other words, this conceptual knowledge of writing received during their L2 writing instruction was transferred when they composed in Indonesian.

This study also measured the degree of agreement regarding the presence of these features in the L1 and L2 essays composed by the same individual participant. The purpose was to understand the patterns of the occurrence of rhetorical features in the L1 and L2 essays. Table 7 below presents the analysis results. The '+' sign means supplied, while the '—' sign indicates not supplied.

Table 7. Degree of agreement on the use of rhetorical features in the participants' L2 and L1 essays

Rhetorical features	English (+) Indonesian (+)		English (+) Indonesian (-)		English (-) Indonesian (+)		English (-) Indonesian (-)	
	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F
Claim	98.1	53	0	0	1.9	1	0	0
Sub-claim	98.1	53	0	0	1.9	1	0	0
Refutation	64.8	35	5.6	3	24.1	13	5.6	3
Justification	98.1	53	0	0	1.9	1	0	0

As presented in Table 7, there was high consistency in the use of claim, sub-claim, and justification features, accounting for almost 100% of L2 and L1 essays. Even though there was around 65% agreement in the use of the refutation feature in L2 and L1 essays, the level of inconsistency in its use was high, reaching almost 30%, both for those who used refutation in English essays but did not use it in Indonesian essays and vice versa. There was a greater agreement level in the use of refutation for the case where participants did not supply the feature when writing in English but did use it in Indonesian essays (24%). This trend might be due to their difficulties in expressing ideas in English. Therefore, when they wrote in Indonesian and were not relatively constrained linguistically, they supplied this feature in the essays. As reported in the methodology section, most of the English majors had an intermediate level of English proficiency.

Difficulty in expressing ideas in English might lead the participants to use a less complex rhetorical pattern, for example, by not including a refutation in their English essays and focusing more on how the thesis statement was supported by adequate justification. However, as they were no longer constrained by English linguistically, they did provide a refutation when composing in Indonesian. In addition, there was a statistically significant difference in the use of refutation between the Indonesian essays produced by the English and Indonesian majors (see Table 6). The number of L1 essays by the English majors containing a refutation was higher than that produced by the Indonesian majors. This result indicates a transfer of the rhetorical structure of writing from L2 English to L1 Indonesian, especially for the inclusion of refutation.

However, further analysis of the L2 and L1 essays produced by the English majors revealed that 27.7% of L2 essays (10 out of 36) and 34.7% of L1 essays (17 out of 49) that contained a refutation were provided only in the introduction

section, conclusion section, or both. This result shows the participants' lack of understanding of the argument-counterargument structure. Because refutation consists of aspects like readers' possible opposing views, justification for the different views, and the writer's counterargument with its justification, a refutation is usually placed in the body paragraphs (Cioffi, 2018; Wyrick, 2022). This two-sided model of argumentation usually involves extended explanations, such as descriptions, examples, statistics, etc., to support or challenge either side of the argument. Therefore, it is difficult (although possible) to elaborate on a refutation in the introduction or conclusion section; otherwise, this section will be long.

The analysis also found a case where the participants supplied a refutation when writing in English but did not include it when composing in Indonesian, even though the percentage was only 5.6% (3 out of 54 participants). This result suggests that the writer might have different perceptions regarding audience expectations that specifically apply to English or Indonesian essays. As they wrote in their native language, they did not face difficulties linguistically in being able to integrate a refutation into Indonesian essays. However, they opted not to use it when writing in Indonesian. They might consider that the presence of this feature would not convince the readers regarding the given claims in their Indonesian argumentative writing. The results of the analysis of the presence of refutation in Indonesian essays produced by the Indonesian majors also supported this inference. These writers seem to focus more on how a claim or sub-claim could be supported by adequate justification. Only nine of the thirty participants (30%) included a refutation in their essays, with three supplying it in the introduction and the rest in the body paragraphs. In other words, the different perceived audience expectations between L1 and L2 argumentative essays were also factors behind the participants' decisions on whether to include or exclude a refutation in their L1 and L2 essays.

The use of refutation and its effect on the overall writing score

A statistical analysis was carried out to determine whether the inclusion of a refutation (a predictor variable) in L2 and L1 essays written by the English majors had an influence on their essay overall scores (outcome variable) using simple linear regression. A multiple regression analysis could not be done because the level of inclusion of the other three features (claim, sub-claim, and justification) was very high, reaching 98% for English essays and 100% for Indonesian essays (see Table 8). Otherwise, these variables would be excluded automatically by the statistical analysis application. Apart from that, the outcome variable (essay overall score) data were not normally distributed because the z-score value (3.37) exceeded the range of -1.96 to 1.96. However, considering the large number of participants (N=54), the non-normality of the data distribution could be overlooked (see Field, 2009).

Table 8. Means and standard deviations of essay overall scores and the presence of rhetorical features

Variables	Participants (N=54)		
	M	%	SD
L2 Essay total score	80.4	-	9.82
Claim	.98	98.1	.14

Variables	Participants (N=54)		
	M	%	SD
Sub-claim	.98	98.1	.14
Refutation	.66	66.7	.48
Justification	.98	98.1	.14
L1 Essay total score	82.91	-	8.11
Claim	1	100	.00
Sub-claim	1	100	.00
Refutation	.85	85	.36
Justification	1	100	.00

The presence of refutation significantly predicted the English essay total score with a beta value of .45 (see Table 9). The R^2 value shows that the refutation availability affected 20.1% of the L2 essay total score variance. The researcher did a similar analysis for the Indonesian essays. However, the result shows that the refutation feature availability failed to significantly predict the variance in the L1 essay total score with a beta value of .19. Its R^2 value indicates that the inclusion of refutation predicted only 3.6% of the variance of the L1 essay total score. The small predicting power of refutation availability on the quality of Indonesian essays written by the English majors was because the L1 essays mostly contained this feature (85%).

Table 9. Beta values and standard errors of the regression analysis for L2 and L1 essays

Variables	*B*	*SEB*	*β*
Refutation availability in English essays	9.25	2.56	.45*
Refutation availability in English essays	4.29	3.07	.19

Note:
English essays: $R^2 = .20$, $\Delta R^2 = .18$ ($p = .001$). *$p < .05$
Indonesian essays: $R^2 = .036$, $\Delta R^2 = .09$ ($p = .169$). $p > .05$

The relationships of L1 and L2 writing scores by English majors

A *Pearson correlation* analysis was run to measure the relationship between the quality of L2 and L1 essays produced by the English majors. As presented in Table 10, the average score for the Indonesian essays was slightly higher than the mean score for the English essays. The correlation analysis towards the total score variables for both Indonesian and English essays shows that there was a significant relationship between the two ($r = .60$, $p < .05$ (2-tailed), $R^2 = .36$). This result indicates a tendency that participants who received high scores for English essays were also those who obtained high scores for Indonesian essays, and vice versa. In other words, a significant relationship was found not only for the use of rhetorical features in the L2 and L1 essays but also for the total scores of the essays.

Table 10. Means and standard deviation of L1 and L2 essays

Variable	Mean	SD	z score
Total scores of English essays	80.4	9.8	-3.37
Total scores of Indonesian essays	82.9	8.1	-2.83

Discussion

The study generally found that the Indonesian EFL learners' prior writing knowledge developed during L2 writing instruction transferred when they wrote in L1. This reversed transfer of prior writing knowledge was manifested in the presence of the four rhetorical features characterizing English argument structure in their L1 writing. Firstly, the English majors produced more essays containing a claim, sub-claim, refutation, and justification than the Indonesian majors. The most noticeable difference was observed in the presence of refutation. Secondly, the English majors produced essays with relatively consistent use of the four rhetorical features (claim, sub-claim, refutation, and justification) in both their L1 and L2. Thirdly, there was a statistically significant correlation in the overall quality aspect (overall scores) between the L2 and L1 essays produced by the English majors. Nevertheless, although the presence of refutation improved overall English essay scores by about 20%, it did not significantly affect L1 essay scores. The inability of the refutation inclusion as a variable to predict the quality of Indonesian essays was because most of the L1 essays already contained a refutation (85%). The same situation happened to the other three features: claim, sub-claim, and justification. Their presence in the L2 and L1 essays reached more than 95% and even 100% in the L1 and L2 essays.

It should be noted, however, that although the present study could confirm the L2 to L1 transfer of writing rhetorical structures, the process was dynamic and involved both the reusing and reshaping of the participants' prior writing knowledge. Several mediating factors influenced its occurrence, including the participants' understanding of the argument-counterargument structure, L2 proficiency, and perceived audience expectation in a specific language. Therefore, this finding supported the cogency of the dynamic transfer concept of writing knowledge (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2014; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016). For example, Rinnert and Kobayashi (2016) argue that the interaction between a bilingual writer's prior writing knowledge and social and individual factors influences and determines their text construction. Each of these three factors is discussed in the following Sections.

The first mediating factor is the L2 learners' understanding quality of the dialogic model of argumentation. While most of the English majors supplied a refutation in their L2 essays (67%) and L1 essays (85%), about 28% of the L2 essays and 35% of the L1 essays containing a refutation had this feature only in the introduction section, conclusion section, or both. However, most of the opposing views within the refutation lacked sufficient support, containing only one or two sentences. In addition, the opposing views were offered by the writers as a means to introduce their main claim (thesis statement) in the introductory paragraph. This indicates a lack of understanding of the argument-counterargument structure because a similar form of argument-counterargument integration also appeared in the L2 learners' L1 essays (35%). This type of refutation integration is essentially weak and unpersuasive based on English argumentative writing (cf. Berrill, 1992; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 2007; McCarthy et al., 2022) because the justification for the opposing views is not discussed adequately. Since they were also writing in their native language (Indonesian) and relatively not constrained linguistically, the Indonesian EFL learners could have produced a more elaborate form of refutation in their Indonesian essays.

It is possible to include a refutation in the introduction section to strengthen a writer's stance by showing their willingness to engage or negotiate with the imagined readers (Mei, 2006), provided that it contains proper data or support. However, it needs to be further elaborated or discussed in the body paragraphs (Barton, 1993; Mei, 2006). Otherwise, the opposing views (counterarguments) remain unresolved or unaddressed.

Another mediating factor is the L2 learners' L2 proficiency. Most of the participants (90.7%) had an intermediate level of L2 proficiency. In addition, about 24% of the English majors supplied a refutation in their L1 essays but did not supply it in their L2 essays (Table 7). This finding might indicate that their novice English proficiency probably constrained these students in trying to develop an elaborate argument-counterargument structure in their L2 essays, which is often characterized by writing researchers (e.g., Berrill, 1992; Crammond, 1998; Qin & Karabacak, 2010) as cognitively demanding. To successfully develop this double-sided model of argumentation, the writer needs to elaborate on the support for his claim and present an alternative position along with its rebuttal. Therefore, the difficulty in developing this relatively complex structure in English probably led the Indonesian EFL learners to simplify the structure by focusing only on supporting their main claim and neglecting a reader's possible opposing view and its rebuttal to avoid overloading their working memory. If an opposing viewpoint was presented, it was often only briefly examined in the introduction or conclusion as a way to introduce the thesis statement. Put another way, while realizing the value of providing an opposing viewpoint and its rebuttal to strengthen the argument's persuasiveness, the students chose not to incorporate this feature into their English essays because of the processing cost and their novice English proficiency. L2 proficiency level is one of the factors influencing a bilingual writer's decision to produce L1/L2 text (Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016).

The next mediating factor is the L2 learners' perceived audience expectation. The study also found a case where some of the English majors supplied a refutation in their English essays but did not include it in their Indonesian essays, even though the percentage of its occurrence was small (5.6%). These students possibly had the perception that refutation was not an essential rhetorical aspect that would make their L1 essays persuasive according to the Indonesian academic tradition. Therefore, they focused more on how to state their stance and provide sufficient justification for it in their L1 essays (cf. Fajrina et al., 2022). Idea organization in writing is not simply a matter of reusing the knowledge of rhetorical structure that the students might have learned previously in a writing course. Instead, there is a selection process for using or modifying it (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2014). The Indonesian EFL learners' current understanding of the "ideal" rhetorical structures in both Indonesian and English might be one of the factors behind the mismatch in refutation inclusion in the L1 and L2 essays. However, this interpretation should be treated with caution because the participants in the current study were not interviewed to find out why they were unable to include a refutation in their Indonesian essays.

The last mediating factor is prior writing instruction. Although several L2 essays written by English majors did not include a refutation or included the feature only in the introduction or conclusion sections, the majority contained this

rhetorical feature. This result suggests that the English majors' prior writing instruction was effective in enabling them to elaborate on the argument-counterargument structure in their L2 essays. This is probably because the course provided a focus on this so-called dialogic model of argumentation. Furthermore, the Indonesian EFL learners applied this knowledge of the argument-counterargument structure in their writing in both Indonesian and English. In other words, this macro-structure knowledge of writing was transferred across languages. This result supports Cummins (2000, 2021) hypothesis that bidirectional transfer of conceptual knowledge would take place if three conditions were satisfied: effective L2 instruction that would improve bilingual learners' conceptual knowledge of L2; adequate exposure to L2/L1 (at least in formal and instructional contexts); and sufficient motivation to learn L1/L2.

Nevertheless, several cases also emerged where the Indonesian EFL learners briefly supplied a refutation in the introduction section of their L1 and L2 essays as a way to introduce their thesis statement, indicating their novice understanding of the dialogic model of argumentation. For this reason, further explicit instruction and practice need to be provided by L2 writing teachers, particularly on the various possible strategies to develop argument-counterargument structure and address a possible opposing view. Nussbaum and Schraw (2007) propose three strategies for addressing an opposing viewpoint in an argumentative essay. The first strategy (refutation strategy) involves directly refuting the opposing view by providing a rebuttal. The second strategy (the synthesizing strategy) involves compromising by accepting some points of the opposing view while rejecting others. The last strategy (the weighing strategy) includes evaluating the soundness of the opposing view by discussing its advantages and disadvantages before making a final decision as the writer's position at the end of the essay.

Overall, the results of the present study have contributed to further understanding that conceptual knowledge of writing is transferable across languages. However, its occurrence is considered complex and dynamic, affected by some mediating factors. In addition, the elaboration of argument-counterargument structure has been found effective in promoting learners' essay quality as it relates positively to the learners' L2 and L1 writing overall scores. In this study, the L1 essays containing this model of idea organization produced by English majors were rated high even by the Indonesian raters who did not study English. Therefore, rather than blaming L1 writing culture as the main reason for Indonesian EFL learners' inability to produce essays with argument-counterargument structure, EFL writing teachers in Indonesia should start viewing conceptual knowledge of writing as integrated and transferable across languages. Their inability to elaborate the argument-counterargument structure in their essays may stem from their underdeveloped understanding of how to structure ideas appropriately for their essays.

By focusing on the mediating factors contributing to the reversed transfer of writing knowledge, writing teachers can better assist EFL students in developing their L2 and L1 argumentative essays in an integrated manner. Therefore, there is a need for more explicit and effective L2 writing instruction that enhances students' understanding of the dialogic model of argumentation, improves L2 proficiency, and addresses varying audience expectations in L2 and L1 academic writing. Additionally, students should be made aware of the potential similarities

and differences in audience expectations when writing in L2 and L1. This involves providing a rationale for the relevance or lack of relevance of specific rhetorical features in each language. Then, students should evaluate whether their rhetorical moves align with audience expectations or whether modifications are necessary for their L2 and L1 writing.

Conclusion

The study found evidence of a reversed transfer of argument-counterargument structure from L2 English to L1 Indonesian as a result of prior L2 writing instruction among the English majors. This finding suggests that conceptual knowledge of writing could be interdependent and transferable across languages. However, this transfer process is not automatic because it depends on several mediating factors, including the L2 learners' different levels of understanding of the argument-counterargument structure, L2 proficiency, and perceived audience expectation in a specific language. Accordingly, these findings confirm the dynamic transfer concept of writing knowledge (DePalma & Ringer, 2011, 2014; Rinnert & Kobayashi, 2016), which states that the interaction between a bilingual writer's prior writing knowledge and social and individual factors influences his/her text construction in a specific language. The findings also support Cummins' (2000, 2021) interdependent hypothesis and threshold hypothesis. The learners' prior L2 writing instruction, L2 proficiency, and relatively extensive L2 learning in the English study program collectively form their general conceptual knowledge of writing. The fact that this conceptual writing knowledge is merged rather than separated across languages makes it possible for it to be transferred from L2 to L1.

The results of this study were subjected to some limitations. The study was descriptive in nature since it only described and compared the students' writing final products but did not assess their writing processes, such as pre-writing, composing, and revising activities in both their L1 and L2. The comparison results were then used as a basis to assess the possibility of a reversed transfer of writing knowledge from English to Indonesian. Future research should address this lack of attention to the writing process. In addition, the present study did not include retrospective interviews with the participants to understand their preferences for using a particular rhetorical structure in their L1 and L2 essays and to confirm directly with them the possible influence of L2 conceptual knowledge of writing on their L1 writing. For this reason, future studies should address this issue so that a more comprehensible finding can be obtained.

References

Axelrod, R. B., & Cooper, C. R. (2018). *The St. Martin's guide to writing* (12th ed.). New York: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Babaii, E., & Ramazani, K. (2017). Reverse transfer: Exploring the effects of foreign language rhetorical patterns on L1 writing performance of Iranian EFL learners. *RELC Journal*, *48*(3), 341-356. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688216687456

Barton, E. L. (1993). Evidentials, argumentation, and epistemological stance. *College English*, *55*(7), 745-769. https://doi.org/10.2307/378428

Berrill, D. P. (1992). Issues of audience: Egocentrism revisited. In R. Andrews (Ed.), *Rebirth of rhetoric: Essays in language, culture, and education* (pp. 81-101). London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203149935

Cha, Y.-K., & Ham, S.-H. (2011). Educating supranational citizens: The incorporation of English language education into curriculum policies. *American Journal of Education*, *117*(2), 183-209. https://doi.org/10.1086/657887

Cioffi, F. L. (2018). *The imaginative argument: A practical manifesto for writers* (2 ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

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

Connor, U., & Lauer, J. (1988). Cross-cultural variation in persuasive student writing. In A. C. Purves (Ed.), *Writing across languages: Issues in contrastive rhetoric* (pp. 138-159). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication.

Cook, V. (2008). Multi-comptence: Black hole or wormhole for second language acquisition research? In Z. Han, E. S. Park, A. Revesz, C. Combs, & J. H. Kim (Eds.), *Understanding second language process* (pp. 16-26). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690159-004

Cook, V. (2016). Premises of multi-competence. In V. Cook & L. Wei (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence* (pp. 1-25). Cambridge: 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. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

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

de Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A dynamic systems theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(1), 7-21. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728906002732

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). Savannah, GA: The WAC Clearinghouse. https://doi.org/10.37514/PER-B.2014.0551

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

Ede, L., & Lunsford, A. (1984). Audience addressed/audience invoked: The role of audience in composition theory and pedagogy. *College Composition and Communication*, *35*(2), 155-171. https://doi.org/10.2307/358093

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

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS* (3 ed.). London: SAGE Publications.

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

Guilford, C. (2023). *Anticipating opposition.* Paradigm Online Writing Assistant. https://www.powa.org/convince/anticipating-opposition.html

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

Helaluddin, H. (2017). Analisis struktur esai mahasiswa pada mata kuliah Bahasa Indonesia di IAIN Sultan Maulana Hasanuddin Banten. *Jurnal Bindo Sastra*, *1*(1), 15-23. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32502/jbs.v1i1.663

Herdina, P., & Jessner, U. (2002). *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781853595547

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). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hoey, M. (2001). *Textual interaction: An introduction to written discourse analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Jubhari, R. (2009). Academic writing as discourse practice in Australian and Indonesian universities: A critical review. *Educationist*, *3*(2), 67-81. http://file.upi.edu/Direktori/JURNAL/EDUCATIONIST/Vol._III_No._2-Juli_2009/03_Ria_Jubhari.pdf

Kecskés, I., & Papp, T. (2000). *Foreign language and mother tongue*.New York: Psychological Press.

Keraf, G. (1982). *Argumentasi dan narasi: Komposisi lanjutan III*. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia.

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). zwashington DC: British Association for Applied Linguistics.

Lu, L. (2005). Rhetorical education through writing instruction across cultures: A comparative analysis of select online instructional materials on argumentative writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *14*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2004.11.001

McCarthy, P. M., Kaddoura, N. W., Al-Harthy, A., Thomas, A. M., Duran, N. D., & Ahmed, K. (2022). Corpus analysis on students' counter and support arguments in argumentative writing. *PEGEM Journal of Education and Instruction*, *12*(1), 256-271. https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.01.27

Mei, W. S. (2006). Creating a contrastive rhetorical stance: Investigating the strategy of problematization in students' argumentation. *RELC Journal*, *37*(3), 329-353. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688206071316

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*.

Nussbaum, E. M., & Schraw, G. (2007). Promoting argument-counterargument integration in students' writing. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *76*(1), 59-92. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20157471

Purdue Online Writing Lab. (2023). *Argumentative essays*. Purdue University. Retrieved 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* (11th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: 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). Boston: 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, R. (2013). *Transfer of L2 English rhetorical structures of writing to L1 Indonesian by Indonesian EFL learners* [Dissertation, The University of Queensland, Australia].

Rusfandi, R. (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

Rusfandi, R. (2021). Pembelajaran bahasa Inggris berbasis bilingualisme dalam masyarakat yang multilingual dan multikultural. In A. F. Gultom, A. R. Hakim, & L. B. Wadu (Eds.), *Ideologi dan sains dalam integrasi pendidikan* (pp. 204-223). Malang: Kanjuruhan Press.

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

Stemler, S. E. (2007). Interrater reliability. In N. J. Salkind & K. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of measurement and statistics* (pp. 484-486). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Thompson, G. (2001). Interaction in academic writing: Learning to argue with the reader. *Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 58-78. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/22.1.58

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* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.