

WRITING IN EFL: AN ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPING COGNITIVE PROCESSES

Tans Feliks

School of Teacher Training and Education, Jl. Jend. Suharto 72 Naikoten Kupang NTT
e-mail: felikstansnara@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study aims at finding out a writer's developing cognitive processes in EFL writing. The data are analyzed based on the classic theory of Odell (1977). It was found that the writer develops better in using: 1) grammatical subjects; 2) connectors and superlative forms; 3) lexicons showing *similarity*, *resemblance*, and *class*; 4) physical words; and, 5) sequence. He is less developed or stagnant in using comparisons and negatives, syntaxes, lexicons showing *difference*, *change*, *paradox*, *contrast* and *examples*.

Keywords: writing, EFL, cognitive processes.

As one of the major international languages, English is now intensively learned by many people in countries like Indonesia where English is a foreign language. They learn it in order to master it, namely, to be able to use it in speaking, listening, reading, and writing as well as translating. In other words, the aim of one's learning English is to talk and communicate locally, nationally, and globally using the language with people around him/her (Nan, 2005: 110-111). Despite their hard work to learn it, however, many learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) fail to be fluent in using it (Astika, 2007; Harsono, 2005; Kweldju, 2003).

In EFL writing, learners' mastery of EFL is so poor that writing teachers call it "a crisis," a phenomenon which has also occurred in English speaking countries like the USA, Australia, and the UK, and in countries like India and the Philippines where English is used as a second language (Gipayana, 2004; Diaz-Chamaco et al., 1995; Jenson, 1992). Despite the "crisis," however, there are some student writers who could successfully develop their (EFL) writing abilities (Tans, 1999). The problem is what makes a piece of (EFL) writing good so that its author is developing well as an author and what makes it poor so that its author fails to show his/her good writing development.

This article is an attempt to answer the problem by looking at the Indonesian context, that is, writing in EFL whose focus is on cognitive processes. Such a focus is understandable as writing is

also called a cognitive process in which writers' awareness and judgment of writing components such as content, language, organization, and mechanics are of great value (Blanchard & Root, 2004). In a more general term, that is, learning a language, be it a native or non-native language, Taylor and Taylor (1990:19) argue that to succeed, a learner has to learn also mental processes like "perceiving, reasoning, remembering, understanding, judging, problem solving, and inferring, all of which are involved in learning and using language. Learning, producing, comprehending, and remembering language are cognitive processes."

In such a context, EFL learners' understanding of writing as one of cognitive processes is necessary to master the art of (EFL) writing which involves several stages, that is, prewriting, writing, revising and editing (Blanchard & Root, 2004: 11-42) as well as post-writing whose major activity is publishing. Along the process, writers have to be constantly aware of their writing topic(s), reader(s), and purpose(s) that, in turn, lead them to judge whether the words and/or sentences including writing mechanics (i.e. spelling and punctuation) they use in their writings are appropriate in terms of meaning, grammar, and organization.

In line with the thought, two pieces of EFL writing written by a student of the English Department of Nusa Cendana University in Kupang, West Timor, NTT, have been analyzed in this article. It is acknowledged that there have been some studies on EFL

writing topics in the Indonesian context such as those by Safnil (2001), Tans (2001), Widiati (2002), Kweldju (2003), Dalman and Indrawati (2003), Mustofa and Rahman (2003), Mandaru (2005), and Astika (2007). There have been no studies, however, on cognitive processes in a student's writings. Therefore, answering the problem above is important to help English lecturers understand the strengths and/or weaknesses of any texts produced by their students. Such an understanding, in turn, would enable them to be more successful in helping their students improve their EFL writing abilities, that is, by strengthening things that they are good at and overcoming those in which they are still poor.

In addition to the improvement of their students' EFL writings, Indonesian EFL teachers' or lecturers' understanding of their students' writings in English could also improve their students' writings in Indonesian or any language. This is reasonable for one's writing ability in one language can influence, positively and/or negatively, his/her writing in another language. In this sense, Edelsky (1982: 211) says that the relationship between one's ability to write in his/her mother tongue (L_1) and in L_2 (that is, his/her second or foreign language) is "either interference of L_1 with L_2 writing or as application of L_1 to L_2 writing." Tans (1999: 23) adds that for some student writers, "especially those who have a sufficient understanding and use of L_2 , the direction of such relationship can be from L_2 to L_1 , that is, the application of L_2 with L_1 , or language transfer of L_2 to L_1 ." This is why to ensure that the interference of L_1 writing to L_2 writing or vice versa would not deteriorate one's writing ability requires writing teachers/lecturers to understand the nature of such relationship. This is also the case of those who would like to improve their students' writing abilities in two or more languages; understanding how L_1 writing abilities could be positively applicable to L_2 writing or vice versa is, therefore, important.

Such an understanding can be achieved by looking at one's cognitive processes (Kameo, 2007; Kristono, 2006; Refnita, 2005). The cognitive processes can be detected, by understanding the linguistic cues used by writers. The linguistic cues they use, he argues, show several aspects of writing which are necessary to have a good piece of writing. The first one is focusing. Its linguistic cue is the grammatical subject(s) of each clause in a piece of discourse.

The second is contrasting. The linguistic cues used in contrastive thinking.

The third is division of ideas whose linguistic cues include syntax, phrases, lexicon, and ideas related to *change*. In syntax, the linguistic cues are

related to sentences whose subject and its predicate nominative are joined by a linking verb. In phrases, the linguistic cues are such phrases as *for example*, *an example*, *for instance*, and *an instance*. In lexicon, the linguistic cues are nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverb forms of the words like *similar*, *resemble*, *class*, or their synonyms. The linguistic cues related to changing ideas are verbs, nouns, adjectives, or adverb forms of the words *change* or its synonym. Including in division or classification are verb phrases which "can be plausibly rewritten so as to include become (e.g. *realize-become aware*)" and "include *began* (or a synonym) or *stop* (or a synonym) plus a verbal (e.g., *'I began to cease from noticing...'*" (Odell, 1977:118).

The fourth mental process in writing involves the description of a physical context. The linguistic cues used to describe a physical context are as follows: nouns which denote to a geographical place (that is, the name of a town, a geographic area, and a map point), a physical object in a concrete setting (e.g. a table or a chair), a perceptive material of a physical environment (for example, wind sound in the trees).

The last mental process is related to time and logical sequence. The linguistic cues referring to time sequence or chronological order are adverbial components indicating that something has happened previously, during, or after a particular time, for example, *then*, *when*, *next*, *later*, *meanwhile*, *subsequently*, *previously*, *earlier*, *at that moment*. On the other hand, the linguistic cues referring to logical sequence are words implicitly showing cause-effect law, for example, *because*, *therefore*, *since*, and *consequently* or such phrases as *if ... then ...*.

It is believed that writers' ability to apply such mental processes in their writings develops along with their writing growth which as, Odell (1977) and Peyton *et al.* (1990) assert, generally moves along "the following continua: from something concrete to something abstract, from less focused ideas to more focused ideas, from less complex clauses to more complex clauses, from less varied structures to more varied structures, from less cohesive ties to more cohesive ties" (Tans, 1999: 20).

The development of the cognitive processes discussed above, therefore, can be detected from any pieces of writing written by particular writers at a particular time since the more mature they are as writers the better their ability is to apply such mental processes or vice versa. In other words, it is assumed that mature writers would be more competent in using such cognitive processes than less mature writers in their writings (Tans, 1999). This

simply indicates that becoming a writer is indeed a process that could never end, that is, a writer will never arrive at a definite stage where he/she would be growing no more.

Along the process, someone, for reasons which are not always known, becomes a better even well-established and/or well-known writer, others move on the spot, and some others even stay at the very basic level, that is, scribbling 'writers' like what infants do: writing without any clear meaning.

It is, therefore, interesting to study how such cognitive processes develop in a single EFL writer within a period of six months. Finding out such a development, that is, in what aspects he has been better or even worse is always great to help (EFL) writing teachers appropriately intervene when their student writers are in need of assistance. This is to ensure that their students' journey to becoming better (EFL) writers is well nurtured. In other words, although it is more of a case study whose findings are not meant to be generalized this study is extremely important to overcome the so-called "writing crisis," that is, an insight from this study is supposed to be useful for (EFL) writing teachers or practitioners in appropriately helping their student writers so that their journeys to becoming great writers in their native language and/or foreign languages like English would not be disappointing. This is crucial since one of contemporary teachers' major challenges is to ensure that each single student's talent can be actualized by giving him/her an ample opportunity to develop better day by day. In this sense, Ibnu (2003:200) says, "Students are regarded as individuals with a prospective potency in themselves and must be given enough opportunity to make use of their own potencies to grow to their maturity".

METHOD

This research conducted from September 2006 to March 2007 is classified into descriptive research whose aim is to describe a phenomenon so that it can be understood well in its context and that its problems, if any, can be overcome. In the context of this research, the phenomena to be described are cognitive processes found in two pieces of EFL writing by an EFL student.

The research was conducted at the English Department, Nusa Cendana University, Kupang, NTT. The writer of those two pieces of EFL writings is Vije, a nickname, who is one of the second semester students at the English Department. In this sense, Vije is the subject of this research and his two pieces of writing are the objects of this research.

Vije, who is 19 years old, was purposively chosen as he was one of the second semester students who was quite active in writing both in English and in Indonesian. To get the data, Vije was asked to write a piece of writing on any topic on 29 September 2006. He was allowed to use any dictionaries and was supposed to finish it in 100 minutes, that is, from 09.45 to 10.25.

It turned out that he wrote an article entitled *Dreaming of Living Abroad*. The article which is called Article 1 (A₁) for the purpose of this study consists of 262 words, 20 lines, 28 sentences, and six paragraphs. Six months later, that is, on March 20, 2007, he was given the text again to revise and/or to make it better. He revised it using the same treatment, that is, dictionaries of any kind were allowed to be used and he was supposed to finish it in 100 minutes as well. The result was his piece of writing with a different title, that is, *Why I always Want to Live Abroad*. The revised article which is named Article 2 (A₂) in this study consists of 415 words, 25 lines, 35 sentences, and seven paragraphs.

The data were analyzed using a classic comparative technique proposed by Odell (1977). The analysis technique which has also been widely discussed by Tans (1999) compares the cognitive processes, namely, *focusing*, *contrasting*, *classifying*, *physical context*, and *sequencing*, in two or more texts written in different periods, usually within a range of months or years, by the same author. In this study, the writer also enriches his data analysis by comparatively analyzing word choice, sentence structures, organizations, and writing mechanics in both A₁ and A₂, that is, elements of a good piece of writing as stipulated by Dunbar et al (1991).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings of this research are classified into *focusing*, *contrasting*, *classification*, *physical context*, and *sequence* as stipulated by Odell (1977). Such aspects of cognitive processes as found in both A₁ and A₂ will be discussed further below. In addition, the discussion of both articles will also include the analysis of the types of the sentences used and their accuracy in terms of structures, organization, and spellings.

Focusing

In A₁, there are 39 grammatical subjects consisting of three types. The first are one word grammatical subjects such as *I*, *we*, and *they* as in the fol-

lowing Text 1 (the subjects have been italicized). Vije uses 36 grammatical subjects of this type.

Text 1:

I always have a great admiration when *I* watch television, listen to radio, or read newspapers or books about people overseas, especially in Europe, North America, and Japan. As *we* know they are highly qualified. *They* are wellknown as effective, efficient, and modern society. And above all, *they* have no fear – not like Indonesians or at least me – about what *they* will do to make their life proper (Ls.1-4).

The second are two word-grammatical-subjects. The following Text 2 shows how Vije uses them in two sentences whose subjects are *the people* (L.5) and *no time* (L.10).

Text 2:

The people have been live in a proper situation (L.5).
No time wasted (L.10).

The third are three word-grammatical-subjects which can be found in two sentences in Vije's writing, that is, *one of them* (L.7) and *some of them* (L.16) as in Text 3 below.

Text 3:

One of them is they are not lazy (L. 7).
Some of them are ... (L.16).

In A₂, Vije develops longer, more various, and complex grammatical subjects. He uses 55 grammatical subjects consisting of several categories. The first is one word grammatical subject used in 47 clauses whose subjects are such words as *I* (L.1), *who* (L.1), and *knowing* (L.3) as in the following Text 4.

Text 4:

I always admire people *who* live in western countries. When *I* read books or newspaper, listen to radio, and watch TV, *I* always find something good about the people *who* live in countries like Germany, England, USA, Australia, etc. *I* have a kind of curiosity to know more about them because *knowing* them make me happy and get motivated (Ls.1-4).

The grammatical subjects built up in A₂ are more complex in the sense that they are the subjects of both independent and dependent clauses including gerundial forms such as *knowing* in L.4 of Text 4 above. The second is a grammatical subject consisting of two words. Vije uses four grammatical subjects of this kind as in Text 5.

Text 5:

The curiosity has been affecting me to dream about living abroad (L.4).
The government is clean and transparent as well (Ls.9-10).
Their teacher are well-prepared with knowledge and skill on how to teach individual effectively (Ls. 12-13).
All jobs are worthy there as they appreciate every job (L.18).

The third category is a four-word-grammatical subject which is used in two clauses as in Text 6 below.

Text 6:

There are *a lot of facilities* to support them during the process of teaching and learning (Ls.13-14).
Honestly, *the most interesting thing* that makes me want to live there so much is a good condition of economy (Ls.15-16).

The fourth category is a five-word-grammatical subject. Vije uses this kind of subject in one clause, namely, "Their situation, education, and economy brings me into dream, a kind of dream of living abroad" (L.25) whose subject, the noun phrase *their situation, education, and economy*, consists of five words. The final category is a six-word-grammatical subject used by Vije in a single clause, that is, "There are *a great number of good books* written by their authors" (L.14) in which the six word noun phrase, *a great number of good books*, is the subject of the sentence. Those longer and more complex grammatical subjects in A₂ indicate that Vije is far more focused in A₂ than in A₁ since his A₁ is without grammatical subjects as such.

Contrasting

In A₁, there are two connectors, namely, *even though* and *but* as in the following Text 7.

Text 7:

They respect people who works there *even though* they don't belong to their nation (Ls.12-13).
But, they have many things to be adopt by us (Ls.15-16).

The comparative and superlative forms used are *least* (L.4) and *more* (L.11) as in Text 8.

Text 8:

And above all, they have no fear – not like Indonesians or at *least* me – about what they will do to make their life proper (Ls.3-4).

One more thing I would to emphasize is that they don't really care about your country, your religion, your background (Ls.₁₁₋₁₂).

There are 12 negative forms ranging from *no* to *not* in A₁, some of which are shown in Text 9 below.

Text 9:

No discrimination. They respect people who works there eventhough they *don't* belong to their nation (Ls.₁₂₋₁₃).

Yet, A₁ does not have any negative affixes. The lexicon used is a synonym of *distinction*, namely, *highly qualified* (Ls.₂₋₃) as in Text 10 below.

Text 10:

As we know they are *highly qualified* (Ls.₂₋₃).

The synonym of the word *difference* is also used, namely, *discrimination* (Ls.₁₂ & 19) as in Text 11 below. A₁, however, has no word/phrase whose meaning is *paradox* or its synonym.

Text 11:

No *discrimination* (Ls.₁₂ & 19).

In A₂, Vije uses more connectors, namely, four *but*s, that is, in Ls._{7, 21, 22, and 24} as shown in the following Text 12.

Text 12:

But, I have my own reasons (L.₇).
I want to have what I don't have *but* they do (L.₂₁).
I want to live a life that I don't live *but* they do (Ls.₂₁₋₂₂).
But, it is the way how I motivate myself (Ls.₂₄₋₂₅).

One comparative form, that is, *more* (L.₃) and three superlative forms of *most* are used in A₂ (Ls._{11, 15 & 16}) as in Text 13.

Text 13:

I have a kind of curiosity to know *more* about them because knowing them make me happy and get motivated (Ls.₃₋₄).
They are well-educated and clever, things that I wonder had by *most* Indonesian (L.₁₁).
Honestly, the *most* interesting thing that makes me want to live there so much is a good condition of economy (Ls.₁₅₋₁₆).
They have enough money to spent and not like *most* Indonesian, they have no worry about what they are going to eat tomorrow (Ls.₁₆₋₁₇).

In addition, there are eight negative forms in A₂, some of which are shown in Text 14.

Text 14:

I *don't* like such a bad situation Indonesia facing now (L.₆).

They have enough money to spent and *not* like *most* Indonesian, they have *no* worry about what they are going to eat tomorrow (Ls.₁₆₋₁₇).

Nobody will take a laugh at you even if you work as a cleaning service staff or an office boy (L.₁₈).

Like A₁, A₂ has no negative affixes. It is also without the words like *contrast*, *paradox*, and *difference* or their synonyms, yet it has one synonym of *distinction*, that is, *competence* (L.₉) as in Text 15.

Text 15:

People who govern their country have *competence* to rule and create a good condition (L.₉).

The data indicate that in A₂, Vije uses more connectors and superlative forms. Yet, his use of comparative forms seems to be less developed (i.e. just one in A₂ compared to two in A₁) and he still fails to show his ability to use negative affixes or the words like *contrast* and *paradox* or their synonyms. Although there is no word of *distinction* or its synonym in A₂, Vije is believed to be able to use this kind of cognitive process in his writing as he uses the word in A₁ (see Text 11 above).

Classification

In A₁, there are 12 syntaxes using *to be* as linking verbs, some of which are shown in Text 16 below.

Text 16:

They *are* wellknown as effective, efficient, and modern society (L.₃).
They *were* born rich (L.₅)!
They had a beautiful life when they *were* children (L.₆).

Yet, A₁ has no phrases like *for example*, *an example*, *for instance*, and *an instance*. It does not have such words as *similar*, *resemble*, and *class* or their synonyms either. Except the verbal form of the word *improve* (L.₈) which shows *change* as in Text 17 below, A₁ is without linguistic cues showing verb phrases that may plausibly mean *become* or *began* or *stop* or its synonym.

Text 17:

They always want to *improve* their life (L.₈).

In A₂, Vije uses less sentences using *to be*, that is, 11 sentences such as those in the following Text 18 compared to 12 in A₁. Despite such a slight difference, this datum shows that he is less developed in using *to be* in A₂ than in A₁.

Text 18:

You may say I *am* stupid also (Ls. 6-7).
They *are* wealthy and live in peace. It is because they have good government (L₈).
They *are* well-educated and clever, things that I wonder had by most Indonesian (L₁₁).

Like A₁, A₂ has no sentences in which such phrases as *for example*, *an example*, *for instance*, and *an instance*, are used. It does not contain the word *change* or its synonyms. Unlike A₁, A₂, however, has two sentences in which a lexicon such as *like* is used to show similarity, resemblance or class. The word *like* as in the following Text 19 indicates the writer's better capability to use classification in A₂.

Text 19:

I make them *like* angels: feel no pain, facing no bad things (L₂₄).
When I read books ... I always find something about the people who live in countries *like* Germany, England, Australia, etc. (Ls₁₋₃).

Physical Context

In A₁, there are 13 cases in which Vije uses some words indicating physical contexts, namely: *radio* (L₁), *newspapers* (L₁), *books* (L₂), *people* (Ls_{2 & 5}), *overseas* (L₂), *Europe*, *North America*, and *Japan* (L₂), *children* (L₆), *thing(s)* (Ls_{7 & 11}), and *country* (L₁₁). In A₂, however, the number of words indicating physical contexts increases significantly, that is, 37 words/phrases, namely: *people* (Ls_{1, 3 & 9}), *western country/countries* (Ls_{1, 3, 9 & 21}), *books* (Ls_{1 & 14}), *newspapers* (L₁), *radio*, *TV*, *something*, *Germany*, *England*, *USA*, *America* (L₃), *abroad* (Ls_{4 & 25}), *Indonesia* (L₆), *Indonesian* (Ls_{6, 11, & 17}), *teachers* (L₁₂), *facilities* (L₁₃), *authors* (L₁₄), *thing* (L₁₅), *money* (L₁₆), *nobody* (L₁₈), *cleaning service staff*, *office boy* (L₁₉), *Europe*, *North America*, *Australia* (L₂₀), and *citizens* (L₂₁). Such a significant increase in using physical words shows that Vije has developed far better in A₂ than in A₁.

Sequence

A₁ has four words/phrases indicating time sequence, namely, *when* (twice), *as*, and *one more thing*, as in the following Text 20.

Text 20:

I always have a great admiration *when* I watch television ... (L₁)
As we know they are highly qualified (Ls₂₋₃).
They had a beautiful life *when* they were children (Ls₅₋₆).
One more thing I would to emphasize is that they ... (L₁₁).

In A₂, there are five sentences in which such words as *when*, *because* (twice), *during*, and *even if*, are used to show time sequences as in the following Text 21. Despite such a slight increase of time sequence use in A₂, that is, four compared to five, the datum shows that Vije has developed better in A₂ than in A₁.

Text 21:

When I read books or newspaper, listen to radio, and watch TV, I ... (L₁).
I have a kind of curiosity to know more about them *because* knowing ... (L₃).
It is *because* they have good government (L₈).
There are a lot of facilities to support them *during* the process of ... (L₁₃).
No body will take a laugh at you *even if* you work as a cleaning service ... (Ls₁₈₋₁₉).

Further Insights

In A₁, Vije uses 12 simple sentences and 16 complex/compound sentences. On the other hand, he uses 16 simple sentences and 19 complex/compound sentences in A₂. This shows that A₂ is definitely more various and more complex in terms of sentence variety and word choice.

A₂ is also more accurate than A₁. It is found that A₁ has 11 sentences whose structures are incorrect due to grammatical errors or the absence of such important components as subjects (sentence topics) and verb (sentence focus), some of which are shown in the following Text 22.

Text 22:

The people have been live in a proper situation (S₅).
No time wasted (S₁₆).
No discrimination (S₁₈).
They respect people who works there eventhough they don't belong to their nation (S₁₉).
But, they have many things to be adopt by us (S₂₆).

Since Sentence 5 (S₅) is supposed to be using the present perfect progressive tense, it has to be, "The people have been *living* in a proper situation."

Or it may use the present perfect tense; in that sense, the sentence has to be, "The people have *lived* in a proper situation." Like S.₅, there are some possibilities to improve S.₁₆ and S.₁₈, namely, using introductory *there*, so that S.₁₆ would be, "There is no time wasted," or "There has been no time wasted;" S.₁₈ would be, "There is no discrimination," or "There has been no discrimination." In S.₁₉, the problem is the use of *works* rather than *work* since the subject of the verb is *people*, a plural noun. Whereas in S.₂₆, the problem is the use of the verb *adopt* instead of *adopted*.

Unlike A₁, A₂ has just seven errors, some of which are stated in the following Text 23 (the errors are italicized):

Text 23:

I have a kind of curiosity to know more about them because knowing them *make* me happy and *get* motivated (S.₃).
I don't like such a bad situation *Indonesia facing now* (S.₈).
They are well-educated and clever, things that I wonder *had by* most *Indonesian* (S.₁₆).

S.₃ is false since Vije uses the words *make* and *get* instead of *makes* and *gets* whose subject is the word *knowing*. In S.₈, the phrase *Indonesia facing now* is not natural; it could be made more natural by changing it into *(that) Indonesia is now facing*. In S.₁₆, the problem is the use of *had by ... Indonesian*; it should be "... *things that, I wonder, should be possessed by most Indonesians*."

What is interesting in A₂ is that the errors done in A₁ as shown in Text 22 above have been correctly revised in A₂ as shown by the following text (the improved forms are italicized).

Text 24:

I always admire *people* who *live* in western countries (S.₁).
When I read books or newspaper, listen to radio, and watch TV, I always find something good about the *people* who *live* in countries like Germany, England, USA, Australia, etc. (Ss.₁₋₂).
People who *govern* their country have competence to rule and create a good condition (S.₁₄).
The curiosity *has been affecting* me to dream about living abroad (S.₄).
They have worthy jobs *to be done* (S.₂₄).

Text 24 shows that Vije is able to use simple present perfect tense (S.₄), to use a verb which is in agreement with its subject (Ss.₁₋₂ & S.₁₄), to use present perfect tense (S.₄), and the passive form of

to infinitives (S.₂₄). This indeed shows that in A₂ Vije has developed better, particularly in English structure in which his sentences are more cohesive and more coherent.

Vije also shows a remarkable improvement in A₂ as it is without incorrect spelling and punctuation. In other words, errors of spellings and punctuations which he commits in A₁ do not appear in A₂. This is also the case of paragraph organization; A₂ consists of some paragraphs which are relatively better-developed compared to A₁ in which one paragraph, that is, Paragraph six simply consists of one incomplete sentence. This means that in A₂, Vije has developed better in building up sentences which are more acceptable in terms of their structures, paragraph organization, spelling, and punctuation.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

In conclusion, it is acknowledged that Vije's cognitive processes develop better in A₂, particularly in the following aspects in which he uses: 1) longer and more abstract grammatical subjects, that is, 55 in A₂ compared to 39 in A₁ (*focus*); 2) more connectors and superlative forms, that is, A₂ has four connectors and three superlative forms compared to two and one respectively in A₁ (*contrast*); 3) more lexicons showing *similarity*, *resemblance*, and *class*, that is, two in A₂ compared to none in A₁ (*classification*); 4) more physical words, that is, 37 in A₂ compared to 13 in A₁ (*physical contexts*); and, 5) more words/phrases showing sequences, that is, five in A₂ compared to four in A₁ (*sequence*). This makes A₂ more cohesive and more coherent than A₁.

On the other hand, there are some instances in which Vije's cognitive processes are less developed which is shown by the fact that Vije's A₁ contains more cognitive processes than A₂. The first aspect which is less developed is one related to *contrast*. In A₁, for example, Vije uses 12 negative forms compared to eight in A₂; A₁ has a lexicon showing *difference*, yet A₂ has no such lexicon. The second is related to *classification*. A₁ contains 12 syntaxes using *to be* compared to 11 in A₂; A₁ uses a word that shows *change* compared to none in A₂.

In addition, there are some cases in which the development of Vije's cognitive processes is stagnant. The first is related to *contrast*. Both A₁ and A₂ use one comparative form and one distinctive form, yet both articles use no negative forms, no paradox, and no contrast. The second is related to *classifica-*

tion. Both articles use no phrases showing examples or instances.

The analysis of Vije's sentence varieties shows that Vije is more developed in A₂ than in A₁. A₂, for example, contains 16 simple sentences and 19 complex/compound sentences compared to 12 and 16 respectively in A₁. This is also the case of grammatical accuracy. In A₂, Vije made less errors/mistakes than A₁, that is, seven compared to 11.

What is more interesting is that in A₂ Vije has been successful in revising the errors/mistakes he has made in A₁. A₂ also shows that Vije's paragraph development is better than A₁. This does not mean, however, A₂ has perfect paragraph organization; its introduction, body, and conclusion need to be improved. In A₂, Vije shows that his use of punctuation and spelling, that is, writing mechanics, is better; he makes no mistakes in A₂ compared to some mistakes in A₁.

Suggestions

To ensure that Vije could significantly develop his cognitive processes, it is suggested that he, with or without the assistance of his writing lecturers, friends, families or anyone interested in his writing development, maintain and/or improve his strengths on such aspects as: 1) grammatical subjects (*focus*); 2) connectors and superlative forms (*contrast*); 3) lexicons showing *similarity*, *resemblance*, and *class* (*classification*); 4) physical words (*physical contexts*); 5) words/phrases which show sequencing

(*sequence*); and, 6) grammatical accuracy, sentence variations, word choice, and mechanics of writing.

Vije, again with or without the help of others, should also improve his cognitive processes in which he is weak or stagnant, that is: 1) the use of negative forms, comparative forms, and lexicons showing *distinction*, *paradox*, *contrast*, and *difference* (*contrast*); and, 2) the use of syntaxes and words indicating *examples* and *change* (*classification*).

Since his paragraph organization is not perfect, he should also learn more how to have good introductory, supporting, and concluding paragraphs.

It is also suggested that further longitudinal studies on more subjects and in more languages (English, Indonesian, etc.) to know other students' writing development, particularly of those whose major is not English, be carried out. In addition, since great authors are usually born by learning to write independently, that is, without formal education, it is also suggested that some studies on independent writing development be conducted to ensure that our understanding of such issues is getting better and, in turn, more great authors could be born to make life better for all.

Assuming that in A₂, Vije is better due to the courses he has joined in Semester 1 like *Writing I*, *Reading 2*, and *Structure I*, and in Semester 2 like *Writing 2*, *Reading 2*, and *Structure 2* as well as due to his discipline, determination, and hard work in writing, further research on factors influencing one's writing development should also be carried out.

REFERENCES

- Astika, G. 2007. *Readings in Language Teaching and Research*. Salatiga: Widayarsi.
- Blanchard, K. & Root, Ch. 2004. *Ready to Write More: From Paragraph to Essay*. London: Longman
- Dalman & Indrawati, S. 2003. Kohesi dan Koherensi Wacana Tulis Mahasiswa Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sriwijaya. *Lingua*, 4 (2):103-119.
- Diaz-Chamaco, C., Foley, C.L. & Petty, J.A. 1995. A Comparison of Imagery Dialogue and Drawing Prewriting Strategies with Second-Grade Students in Guam. *Educational Research*, 37 (2):177-184.
- Dunbar, G., Dunbar, C. & Rorabacher, L.E. 1991. *Assignments in Expositions*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Gipayana, M. 2004. Pengajaran Literasi dan Penilaian Portofolio dalam Konteks Pembelajaran Menulis di SD. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 11 (1): 59-70.
- Harsono, Y.M. 2005. English Language Teaching in Indonesia: Facts, Problems, and Possible Solutions. *English Edu: Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5 (2): 93-107.
- Ibnu, S. 2003. Revival of Competency Based Teacher Education. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 10 (3):191-201.
- Jenson, R.M. 1992. Can Growth in Writing Be Accelerated? An Assessment of Regular and Accelerated Composition Course. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 26 (2):194-211.
- Kameo, R.M. 2007. Critical Thinking in Classroom: Some Cultural Constraints. *English Edu: Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 7 (1): 1-13.
- Kristono, L. 2006. Critical Thinking: From Theory to Practice. *English Edu: Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6 (1):1-15.
- Kweldju, S. 2003. Improving a College Writing Instruction: Developing L2 Learners' Awareness and Strategies to Attain Near-Native Stylistic Skills. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 10 (3):214-236.

- Mandaru, M. 2005. Analisis Struktur Topik dalam Pengajaran Menulis Bahasa Inggris. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 9 (17): 225-228.
- Mustofa & Rahman, F.A. 2003. Pembelajaran Menulis dengan Evaluasi Portofolio: Penelitian Tindakan Kelas di SD Muhammadiyah 12 Palembang. *Lingua*, 4 (2):180-191.
- Nan, X. 2005. Teaching English as an International Language. *English Edu: Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5 (2):108-120.
- Odell, L. 1977. Measuring Changes in Intellectual Processes as One Dimension of Growth in Writing. In C.R. Cooper & L. Odell (Eds.), *Evaluating Writing: Describing, Measuring, Judging* (pp.107-132). New York: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Peyton, J.K., Staton, J., Richardson, G. & Wolfram, W. 1990. The Influence of Writing Task on ESL Students' Writing Production. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 24 (2):310-334.
- Refnita, L. 2005. Developing Critical Thinking Skills through Questions in Linguistic Class at the Formative Assessment. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 9 (17): 174-182.
- Safnil. 2001. Pola Retorika 'Editorial' Surat Kabar: Sebuah Model Aplikasi Metode 'Triad. *Linguistika*, 6 (15): 16-32.
- Tans, F. 1999. *EFL Writing of Indonesian Grade 11 Students: an Inquiry into Becoming a Writer*. Unpublished Thesis. Melbourne: School of Education, La Trobe University, Australia.
- Tans, F. 2001. The Nature of Writing Development. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 6 (11): 78-95.
- Taylor, I. & Taylor, M. M. 1990. *Psycholinguistics: Learning and Using Language*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Widiati, U. 2002. Problems with Peer Response of Writing-as-a-Process Approach in an EFL Writing Classroom. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 9 (3): 188-199.