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Abstract

Several studies have investigated how students integrate the first language (L1) for the function of acquiring L2 writing proficiency (Murphy & Roca de Larios, 2010; Sasaki, 2000; Stapa & Majid, 2012; Wang & Wen, 2002). In the case of L2 writers, their language ability is limited whereas L1 can be used to sustain their writing (Wolfersberger, 2003). English as a Foreign Language learners rely on their first language since they use it as an instrument for their writing when they attempt to compose a written piece. They might use transfer as a tool to learn or as a means to convey their meaning, and they may also use it to formulate hypotheses about target language and to test those hypotheses (Khaled & Hossein, 2013). However, there is still no consensus that relates the degree of L1 use and various writing strategies in L2 writing to student proficiency levels and writing genres or writing tasks (Kim & Yoon, 2014). Furthermore, L1 use on L2 writing tasks has been found to be harmful for students since different structures from the L1 can cause interference in the L2. L1 interference with regard to the terms ‘cross-linguistic’ and ‘language transfer’ refers to the influence of native language structures on students’ performance and development in the target language (Hashim, 1999). There are many cases, in which interference from students’ mother tongue can influence second language acquisition. Therefore, the present study sought to explore the writing strategies utilized by these participants when generating a writing piece. The amount of L1 use was analyzed to determine if it had an impact on their writing proficiency across writing tasks and writing proficiency levels. The data was collected through a placement test (Appendix D), writing tasks (Appendices F and G), and think aloud protocols (Appendix E) (the process of recording the learners’ thoughts while they complete each task). The writing tasks consisted on producing one narrative and argumentative text per participant. Results showed the different writing strategies used by the participants when they performed the L2 writing activities. These strategies were identified and discussed in light of the different proficiency levels of these participants. Furthermore, the researchers determined the amount of L1 and L2 employed by the participants during the L2 writing process and the frequency of strategy use by the participants on each writing task narrative and
argumentative. Finally, researchers came up with some recommendations for future research regarding the use of the L1 in L2 writing.

Keywords: writing, language learning strategies, writing strategies, second language, proficiency, writing skill, and think aloud protocol.
Resumen

Múltiples estudios han investigado cómo estudiantes integran su lengua materna mientras adquieren la habilidad de escribir en un segundo idioma (Murphy & Roca de Larios, 2010; Sasaki, 2000; Stapa & Majid, 2012; Wang & Wen, 2002). En el caso de estos aprendices, el lenguaje tiende a ser limitado así que pueden recurrir a su lengua materna para apoyar su proceso de escritura (Wolfersberger, 2003). Los estudiantes de Inglés como Idioma Extranjero dependen de su primer idioma, ya que lo usan como un instrumento para su escritura en el proceso de composición de una pieza escrita. Pueden usar esta estrategia como herramienta o como medio para comunicar el significado de su mensaje; puede que la usen para formular hipótesis acerca del lenguaje que están aprendiendo, y para probar éstas mismas (Khaled & Hossein, 2013). Sin embargo, todavía no existe consenso que se relacione al grado de uso de la lengua materna y estrategias para escribir en el lenguaje que está siendo adquirido, con los niveles de competencia en el idioma y los géneros y tareas de escritura (Kim & Yoon, 2014). No obstante, se ha descubierto que el uso de la lengua materna en tareas de escritura en el segundo idioma es perjudicial para los estudiantes, ya que las diferentes estructuras del primer idioma pueden causar interferencia con la lengua extranjera. La interferencia en términos de translingüística y transferencia del idioma se refieren a la influencia de estructuras del idioma nativo en el desempeño de los estudiantes y su desarrollo en el lenguaje extranjero. Hay muchos casos en que la interferencia está presente debido al uso de la lengua materna en el segundo idioma. Este estudio exploró las estrategias de escritura utilizadas por estos participantes mientras creaban una pieza escrita. La cantidad del uso de la lengua materna fue analizada para determinar si tendría algún impacto en su nivel de escritura. Los datos fueron recolectados a través de una prueba de nivel, tareas escritas, y protocolos de ‘pensar en voz alta’ (el proceso de grabar los pensamientos de los estudiantes mientras completan una tarea). Las tareas escritas consistieron en producir un texto narrativo y uno argumentativo por participante. Los resultados mostraron las diferentes estrategias de escritura usadas por los participantes mientras completaban tareas en el idioma extranjero. Estas estrategias fueron identificadas
y discutidas junto al nivel de cada participante. Además, los investigadores determinaron la cantidad de lengua materna y lengua extranjera usada por los participantes en el proceso de escritura en su segundo idioma y la frecuencia del uso de estrategias en cada tarea escrita, ya fuese de tipo narrativa o argumentativa. Finalmente, los investigadores crearon algunas recomendaciones para futuras investigaciones sobre el uso del idioma nativo en el idioma extranjero.

Palabras clave: escritura, estrategias de aprendizaje de idioma, estrategias de escritura, segundo idioma, competencia, habilidad de escritura, y protocolo de pensar en voz alta.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The study of Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) has played an important role in the finding of the variables that are responsible for knowing the differences among EFL learners. The skill of writing is not an exception due to its importance while learning a second language (Victori, 1999). Considering the emphasis on the processes that writers engage in when composing, during the last decades researchers have witnessed a rise in the number of first and second language (L1 and L2) studies analyzing the diverse strategies used by learners. Although some of their findings have met with mixed results, many of them agree (Perl, 1978; Pianko, 1979; Flower and Hayes, 1980, 1981; Raimes, 1985; Cumming, 1989; Whalen, 1993) that it is the strategies and general writing processes that primarily separates successful from less successful writers.

1.2 Background of the Study

During the 1990’s, the Chilean economy grew significantly which created different challenges for society. Internet and the globalized world brought to Chile a different point of view of the importance of the English language in the country, so the necessity for English was seen as important for the future of Chile because it is a powerful and competitive tool for working in a globalized market (Castro, 2011). Therefore, the Chilean educational system has fostered the idea of the importance of learning English as a means to access academic knowledge, information, and technology, in order for learners to be competent in this globalized world. By the end of the 1990’s, the Ministry of Education decided that English should be taught at schools compulsorily from 5th grade, reflecting the aim of the government to expand the English culture in Chile. In addition, educational reforms were made in the country in order to enhance the English curriculum. The first educational reform in 1990 stated that 40 percent of the English curriculum should be devoted to reading comprehension, 40 percent should be devoted to listening comprehension and 20
percent to writing and speaking (Ministerio de Educación, 2009). This reform strengthened the development of listening and reading comprehension skills, but gave speaking and writing a secondary role. However, this was changed in recent amendments to the national English curriculum. After the reform in 2009 and later adjustments initiated in 2012 at primary level, the ministry of education introduced a new level of expectation regarding the productive skills of speaking and writing. This adjustment delineated content and objectives and put an equal expectation on the development of the four language skills (Barahona, 2015). The productive skills such as speaking and writing are very hard to master for EFL learners, so it is important to teach them properly. Despite the educational reforms, extensive writing instruction still needs improvements to enrich learners’ proficiency. Therefore, the following research study focused on the skill of writing mainly to explore which writing strategies are used by a group of Chilean adult English learners in order to contribute to the field of English Language Teaching in Chile.

1.3 Conceptual Framework for the Study

Language learning strategies (LLSs) are processes that are consciously deployed by language learners to increase their proficiency in any of the four skills of the L2; speaking, reading, listening, and writing (Hocine, 2017). LLSs have certain classifications that have been explored as well. For example, O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) classification is divided into three types of LLSs; metacognitive strategies, cognitive strategies, and social/affective strategies. These classifications are based on psychological functions (Vlckova, 2013). Furthermore, the language skill of writing is a very complex process which involves cognitive, cultural, and motivational factors (Asmara, R 2015). In fact, writing has always been considered as an important skill as stimulates thinking and idea organization. Therefore, it is very important for EFL learners to properly develop this communicative skill. In order to master it, learners need to be taught different writing strategies as they are crucial to enhance organization and coherence within texts. Writing strategies refer to how second language (L2) learners go about composing; that is, “any actions employed in the act of producing text” (Manchon, De Larios & Murphy, 2007, p. 231).
1.4 Statement of the Problem

The study of writing strategies use has been widely studied around the world (Chien, 2012; Chen & Hu, 2007; De Silva, 2014; Gascoigne, 2000; Hermilinda, 2016; Van Weijen, Van den Bergh, Rijlaarsdam, & Sanders, 2009; Victori, 1999; Wang, 2003). However, not enough research has been conducted regarding this issue with L2 learners in Chile. In the Chilean context, the national curriculum does not provide references for extensive writing i.e. essays, thesis, long narratives, and others. Therefore, public education does not provide students with different strategies and tools to approach extensive writing tasks. In the present study, learners did not brainstormed ideas before writing neither they organized their arguments in the argumentative task and events in the case of the narrative task. These processes are important in order to have coherence and cohesion within texts and show proper writing preparation.

1.5 Purpose of the Study

The present study sought to explore the writing strategies utilized by adult EFL learners and the use of L1 in the L2 writing process. To achieve this, learners from a Tourism college program were asked to participate in one session where they had to write narrative and argumentative tasks. The idea was to make them write two different kinds of tasks in order to discover if they deployed different strategies per task. The researchers analyzed their writing compositions in order to identify the writing strategies employed by them and possible variation regarding the use of the writing strategies and proficiency levels. To accomplish this, during the writing tasks participants were asked to verbalize their thoughts following the instructions of the think-aloud protocol while they were recorded. The writing sessions were transcribed with the purpose of identifying the writing strategies in the participant's verbalized thoughts.
1.6 Research Questions

The research questions of the study were the following ones:

RQ1: What type of writing strategies do adult EFL learners use across writing tasks and proficiency levels?

RQ2: What is the impact of the type of writing task on the type of strategy used and language used?

RQ3: What is the impact of proficiency level on strategy used and language used?

The first research question sought to identify and describe the type of writing strategies reported by Chilean Adult EFL learners as they engage in a L2 writing task. The second research question tried to assess the effect of type of writing task (narrative and argumentative) on the type of strategy used and language used. Finally, the third research question tried to assess the effect of learner's proficiency level on the type of writing strategies and language used.

1.7 Significance of the Study

If learners learn how to use writing strategies properly, they will reinforce cognitive functions that lead them to effective and successful writing. EFL learners go through different processes when they are composing a writing task. It is essential for teachers to be aware of different writing strategies to teach them so that this writing instruction can be meaningful for each student. Furthermore, students should also be aware of their weaknesses in the writing process in order to identify the type of strategy that best suits their writing. Therefore, writing strategies are important and must be taught to every learner. The present study can contribute to the existent literature as reaching writing instruction as an important goal for EFL learners. The results and discussion can lead to a better understanding of what writing strategies Chilean learners use while composing a writing task. The findings can also recommend future writing instruction at educational establishments to promote the
act of writing among learners. Therefore, researchers can compare the variables strategy type and language use to determine their impact on L2 writing.

1.8 Organization of the Study

Chapter II will address the literature review from different decades in order to display previous research about the main topic of the study. Chapter III will address the methodology of the present study. How this research study was conducted and the steps that researchers followed to complete it. Chapter IV will present the results and the discussion of data. A comparison between previous studies and this one will be presented to see the differences and similarities among studies. Finally, chapter V will address the conclusion of the study, its recommendations for future research, and implications for pedagogy.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Overview

This chapter will consider all the necessary aspects to comprehend the literature related to the study. Firstly, language learning strategies will be explained as an introduction to the main topic of the study. Secondly, the concept of the writing skill will be clarified in order to recognize it properly. Thirdly, the writing process will also be described to see how it works for learners. Fourthly, different writing approaches will be presented, and also the difference between product and process regarding writing. Fifthly, the diverse writing strategies seen during the study. Sixthly, the classification of writing strategies that will be outlined according to different authors. Seventhly, the L1 influence of interference on the L2 writing process will be showed. Finally, the writing tasks and strategy use of the study will be addressed.

The process of L2 writing has been a major focus of L2 writing research since the early 1980s (Cumming, 1987, 1989, 1990; Friedlander, 1990; Lay, 1982; Qi, 1998; Raimes, 1985; Roca de Larios, Murphy, & Manchón, 1999; Whalen & Ménard, 1995; Wolfersberger, 2003; Zamel, 1982; Zimmermann, 2000). These studies have discussed over factors that influence the writing process such as strategy use, writing approach, first language interference, among others. In order to understand the process of writing, the following chapter gives an insight into these concepts.

2.2 Language Learning Strategies

The term strategy comes from the Greek strategy: “command of a general’. In Greece, strategy involved a general’s plan to win a war (Oxford, 2000). In its modern usage, a strategy is a plan that is consciously aimed at meeting a certain goal. Aspects such as conscious control, intention, and goal-directedness remain essential as the criteria for a strategy (Bargh, 1990). A learning strategy cannot be categorized as either good or bad. There is uncertainty of what makes a strategy positive for a given individual. However, a strategy can be useful if the following conditions are present: (1) the strategy relates well to the L2 task at hand; (2) the
student employs the strategy effectively and links it with other relevant strategies for doing the task; and (3) the strategy coordinates with the student’s general learning style preferences to one degree or another (Finkbeiner, Knierim, Smasal & H. Ludwig, 2012). The strategies that fit these conditions “make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations” (Oxford, 1990, p. 8). Language Learning Strategies (LLSs) are processes and actions that are consciously deployed by language learners to increase their proficiency in any of the four skills in the L2; speaking, reading, listening, and writing (Hocine, 2017). Chamot (1987) defined L2 learning strategies as the behaviors and thoughts that learners engage in during the learning process, which intend to influence the learners’ encoding process. In other words, learning strategies are techniques that occur within the learners’ mind during the learning process, which help them to process information. The research on learning strategies has highlighted the importance of strategy instruction and its role in making learners more successful in their academic careers (Rahimi & Katal, 2012). Moreover, LLSs have essential values for second language learners since they are means for practicing and self-evaluating the language (Gholamali & Faryadres, 2011). English as a Foreign or Second Language Learning (EFL/ESL) strategies are specific actions, behaviors, steps or techniques learners use—often consciously—to improve their progress in understanding, internalizing, and using the L2 (Oxford, 1994). Finally, as Chamot (1989) stated, learning strategies are conscious thoughts and actions that learners take in order to achieve a learning goal.

The term LLSs usually comprises all the strategies that L2/FL learners use when learning the target language. Moreover, Griffith (2004) provided a very broad definition of language strategies as techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge. Some examples regarding L2 learning strategies are planning for a language task, evaluating one’s own learning, employing analysis to find the meaning of a word or expression, and asking questions (Cohen 1998; O’Malley and Chamot 1990; Oxford 1990). LLSs have been classified in terms of their functions, and in terms of learning processes. For example, in the case of O’Malley and Chamot classification, LLSs are divided into three types; metacognitive strategies, cognitive
strategies, and social/affective strategies. These strategies were presented in a study by Chi-Him Tam (2013) to understand them appropriately. The characteristic of each strategy is shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Definitions and Examples of LLSs (Chi-Him Tam, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>Executive processes in planning for learning</td>
<td>Directed attention, self-management, and self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Direct manipulation of the material to be learnt</td>
<td>Repetition, note-taking, and deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/affective</td>
<td>Direct interaction of learners with other people in order to assist their learning</td>
<td>Cooperation and asking for clarification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This classification is based on psychological functions (Vlckova; Berger; & Völkle, 2013); that is, they were classified according to different mental processes needed for these strategies to happen. Regarding metacognitive strategies, they refer to learners’ knowledge of their own cognitive processes (Dignath & Büttner, 2008). These types of strategies are known as behaviors used for centering, arranging, planning, and evaluating one’s learning. They are used to provide ‘executive control’ over the learning process (Oxford & Crookall, 1989). There is also evidence that metacognitive strategies play a more significant role than other learning strategies in learning because once a learner understands how to regulate his/her own learning through the use of strategies, language acquisition should proceed at a faster rate (Anderson, 2003). In the case of Cognitive strategies, these are skills that involve the manipulation or transformation of the language in a direct way through reasoning, analysis, and note taking (Crookall, 1989). Finally, social/
affective strategies are seen as techniques that involve self-reinforcement and positive self-talk, which help learners to acquire a better control over their emotions, attitudes, and motivation in relation to their language learning process. It must be noted that one of the main factors that appears to play an important role in the development of different language skills is the use of learning strategies. Second Language Acquisition (SLA) researchers have investigated the roles of L2 learning strategies in the development of language learning, and how they are related to L2 motivation (Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Wharton, 2000), learning styles (Chen, 2009; Liu, 2008) language proficiency (Bruen, 2001; Hong-Nam & Leavell, 2006; Lai, 2009; Park, 1997) and performance (Kummin & Rahman, 2010; Phakiti, 2003, 2008; Yau, 2009; Zhang & Zhang, 2013). Overall, research on the use of learning strategies (Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Grenfell & Harris, 1999; Harris, 2003; Park, 1997; Wharton, 2000) suggests that language learners, whether consciously or unconsciously, utilize a variety of learning strategies. Successful language learners, however, employ more effective and diverse language learning strategies than less successful learners due to their knowledge about LLSs. Accordingly, in order to help second language learners in general and less successful learners in particular, researchers have recommended to integrate strategy training into the language curricula (Chamot & Kupper, 1989; Tyacke, 1991).

2.3 The Writing Skill

Writing is seen as a process whereby writers discover and reformulate ideas as they attempt to create meaning. It can be viewed as a problem-solving activity rather than a simple act of communication (Maarof & Murat, 2013). In fact, writing has always been regarded as an important skill when teaching and learning EFL, as it stimulates thinking, compels students to concentrate, to organize their ideas, and cultivates their ability to summarize, analyze, and criticize (Asmara, 2015).

The language skill of writing is a very complex process which involves cognitive, cultural and motivational factors. When talking about the cognitive aspect of this skill, it is necessary to highlight an important aspect known as ‘attention’. This aspect is needed by writers to develop properly any written product, in fact, “by
attention we mean the ability to maintain focus on a task in the face of distraction” (Hayes & Berninger, 2014, p.4). Attention is often referred to as an executive function, which is the ability to execute appropriate actions and to inhibit inappropriate actions for the attainment of a specific goal. Therefore, if the writer is not able to focus and gets distracted, ideas can be lost, and grammar mistakes can take place. Consequently, this executive function plays a fundamental role in task reading, for instance, distractions while reading the prompt and instructions of a task can lead to a low-level written product. In addition, these cognitive factors enclose the entire mental processes that a person goes through when using the writing skill. The cultural factor refers to how English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students at university level present diverse approaches to reading, writing, and critical thinking, often based in the patterns of their home languages and cultures. Frequently, these students may use different ways to convey ideas logically and persuasively than those with which English-speaking faculty and students are familiar (Krampetz, 2005). Finally, motivational factors are of great importance when using the skill. It has been shown that positive teacher’s performance, inspiring classmates, motivational parents, and positive classroom atmosphere are primary factors influencing learners’ motivation when producing a written piece (Yustinus, 2015).

The writing skill has traditionally been viewed as a “low-priority skill” at beginner and intermediate second language (L2) level (Gascoigne, 2008) because teachers tend to view writing as a support skill, rather than a skill worth studying, and associated to traditional activities such as note-taking and transcription constituting the majority of writing practice. Nevertheless, according to Maley (2009), the writing skill helps language development at all levels: grammar, vocabulary, phonology and discourse; it requires learners to manipulate the language in interesting and demanding ways as they attempt to express themselves. The skill also requires willingness to ‘play’ with the language as it concentrates more on the right side of the brain, with a focus on feelings, physical sensations, intuition and musicality.

The writing skill also enables learners to communicate with others beyond the limits of time and distance. It is an essential skill for students in the current internet-
driven age. It is a valid mode for the transmission of culture, knowledge and ideas from one generation to another, and hence it directly deals with preserving and developing the sociocultural, educational and anthropological aspects of human life. Through written texts, humans can pass on knowledge to further generations. In other words, writing is not only considered as criteria of getting knowledge, but it is also an important means for disseminating and producing knowledge in any educational and cultural system (Raoofi, 2017).

2.4. Characteristics of Writing

2.4.1 Writing Process

One of the most common writing models that learners are taught at school is based on seeing writing as a process that suggests that a finished composition is “the result of the complex interaction of activities that include several stages of development” (Williams, 2003, p. 106). However, not every writing task requires the same writing stages, which signifies how successful writing can be in general. The stages of a composition process are portrayed as gradual procedures that initiate the construction of a written text (Williams, 2003). In other words, it implies that students cannot start drafting before they do pre-writing, and that they cannot start revising until they draft, and so on. It is recommended that the writing process has influential states: planning, drafting, and revising. However, these states are repeatedly changed. This implies that, students revise as they draft, they plan as they edit, and so forth. The phase model consists of eight processes of writing: prewriting, planning, drafting, pausing, reading, revising, editing and publishing (Abas & Hashima, 2017).

Each process comprises various activities that are associated with effective writing and recursive nature of the writing process (Williams, 2003). The first stage is prewriting, and it consists on generating ideas, strategies, and information for a given writing task. The second stage is planning, which reflects on the material produced during prewriting to develop a plan to achieve the aim of the paper. The third stage is drafting, and it involves producing words on a computer or on paper
that match (more or less) the initial plan for the work. The fourth stage, pausing, teaches learners to have specific moments as they produce the writing task. In these moments when they are not writing, they can reflect on what they have produced and how well it matches their plan. It usually includes reading. The fifth stage is reading, and it comes together with pausing since it also includes moments during pausing when the learners read what they have written and compare it to their plan. The sixth stage revising is literally “re-seeing” the text with the goal of making large-scale changes so that text and plan match. The seventh stage editing focuses on sentence-level concerns, such as punctuation, sentence length, spelling, agreement of subjects and predicates, and style. To some extent, editing is one of the challenging parts of writing. One reason is that many teachers mistakenly think that errors in form are not important in students’ writing (Williams, 2003). Consequently, many students do not know how to edit. Another reason for this issue is that editing needs a sensible effort. Finally, the eighth stage is publishing, which has the purpose of sharing the finished text with its intended audience. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasize that there is no best way to go about doing the writing process since what works successfully for some learners may not work well for others, and what functions well for one written assignment may not be compatible for another. Some writers combine various activities, while others use only one. Thus, learner writers should explore the writing strategies to identify what works best for them.

2.4.2 Writing Approaches: Product and Process

When discussing writing approaches, the two more utilized by learners are claimed to be product and process-oriented writing processes. Moreover, these two means of writing are quite different one from the other. The product writing process is “a traditional approach in which students are encouraged to mimic a model text, usually is presented and analyzed at an early stage” (Gabrielatos, 2002, p.5). For instance, in a typical product approach-oriented classroom, learners are supplied with a standard sample of text and they are expected to follow the standard to construct a new piece of writing. The product approach model comprises of four stages (Steele, 2004). In stage one, learners study model texts and then the features
of the genre are highlighted. For example, if studying a formal letter, learners’ attention may be drawn to the importance of paragraphing and the language used to make formal requests. If a learner reads a story, the focus may be on the techniques used to make the story interesting, and learners focus on where and how the writer employs these techniques. Stage two consists of controlled practice of the highlighted features, usually in isolation. Therefore, if learners are studying a formal letter, they may be asked to practice the language used to make formal requests, for example, practicing the ‘I would be grateful if you would...’ structure. Stage three is the most important stage, as this is where ideas are organized. Those who favor this approach believe that the organization of ideas is more important than the ideas themselves and as important as the control of language. Lastly, stage four is the final product of the learning process. Learners not only demonstrate that they can be fluent and competent users of the language, but also that they can individually use the skills, structures and vocabulary they have been taught to produce the product.

As related to the previously mentioned model, a case study made by Chieh (2012) stated that planning, composing and reviewing are the main processes that EFL learners use when they are writing in the L2, and they have to be monitoring their writing process in order to be proficient writers. In addition, with the purpose of achieving this, the learners must go through a process called executive control which involves analysis, decision making, and coordination of cognitive resources (Chieh, 2012). In this process, writers are able to analyze, make decisions, and coordinate cognitive resources (Graham, 2006). Moreover, the aim of executive control is to dominate and organize writing strategies; it also helps learners to know why one strategy is better than another one according to a specific task.

With respect to the process approach model, it tends to focus more on diverse classroom activities, which promote the development of language use: brainstorming, group discussion, and rewriting. Furthermore, the process approach model comprises eight stages (Steele, 2004). In stage one (Brainstorming): learners generate ideas by brainstorming and discussion. As an example, learners could be discussing the qualities needed to do a certain job. Therefore, they discuss the topic and its characteristics before the act of writing. In stage two (Planning/Structuring):
learners exchange ideas into note form and judge the quality and usefulness of the ideas. They realize which ideas can be more beneficial for their writing. In stage three (Mind mapping): learners organize ideas into a mind map, spidergram, or linear form. This stage helps to make the hierarchical relationship of ideas which helps learners with the structure of their texts. In stage four (Writing the first draft): learners write the first draft. This is done in the class frequently in pairs or groups. In stage five (Peer feedback): drafts are exchanged, so that students become the readers of each other’s work. By responding as readers, learners develop awareness of the fact that a writer is producing something to be read by someone else and thus they can improve their own drafts. In stage six (Editing): drafts are returned, and improvements are made based upon peer feedback. In stage seven (Final draft): a final draft is written. Finally, in stage eight (Evaluation and teachers’ feedback) learners’ writings are evaluated and teachers provide feedback on it. As a consequence, it can be argued that process driven approaches are similar to task-based learning in terms that learners are given considerable freedom within the task. They are not influenced by the teaching of lexical or grammatical items. However, process approaches do not reject all interest in the product since the aim is to achieve the best product possible. What differentiate a process focused approach from the product centered one is that the outcome of writing, the product, is not predetermined.

If skilled and unskilled L2 writers take different approaches to a writing task, they can be expected to exhibit different writing behaviors. Sasaki (2000) reported that expert writers spent longer times planning overall organization in detail. In a protocol-based analysis of the relationship between Chinese EFL writers’ strategies and their writing scores on an English proficiency test, Xiu and Xiao (2004) found that skilled writers and unskilled writers differed in the use of two writing strategies: organizing ideas and formulating (or transcribing). The researchers interpreted their findings as being in line with Bereiter and Scardamalia’s (1987) model. Yang (2002) also observed differences between skilled and unskilled L2 writers in planning globally, generating ideas, and revising while using the think aloud protocol. However, not all studies found differences between skilled and unskilled L2 writers.
Raimes (1985) reported that ‘no clear profile of the unskilled ESL writer emerged from this study of behaviors during composing’ (p. 249). Arndt (1987) observed that writing behaviors among members of a group varied considerably.

2.5 Writing Strategies

Writing strategies are regarded as mental or behavioral techniques that writers employ to enhance their writing (Bai, 2016). Moreover, a good writer should learn and control different skills and strategies such as planning, revising, and organizing (Chien, 2012). However, students usually struggle to write cohesive and coherent texts due to the lack of planning and writing skills (Hu & Chen, 2007). In fact, learners with writing problems are not aware of their problems, or do not apply a strategic approach to writing as they approach writing as if it involves a single process - content generation (Okasha & Hamdi 2014) which refers to students focusing only on the writing task as a product without paying attention to the process of the task and the strategies involved in such process. Hayes (1996) stated that a proficient writer needs to regulate and monitor his/her own progress, in a process that was denominated executive control. When writers are conscious of the strategies that they use, it allows them to differentiate between strategies that are appropriate or inappropriate for particular writing situations (Hayes, 1996). Hence, learners can benefit from using strategies when writing in their second language, as they directly influence their writing performance. Some of the strategies that can enhance learners’ writing performance consist in organizing what to write (Planning), translating ideas from the L1 to the L2 (Translating), rereading the sentences that were already produced (Rereading), and assessing their own proficiency or the generated text (Evaluating) (Sasaki, 2000).

The main purpose of strategic writing instruction is that learning to write includes the learning of mental procedures to produce writing and to control the production of writing (Calhoun & Hale, 2003). Thus, the use of strategies in the writing process is crucial to successful writing. The key to producing good writing pieces lies on the types and amount of strategies used, and on the regulation of such strategies for generating ideas and revising what has been written (Maarof & Murat,
Consequently, it has been found that for students to enhance their writing skills, awareness of the different writing techniques, and the ability to identify their own writing deficiencies, ought to be fostered. For example, in a study aimed to investigate the effect of writing strategy instruction on writing performance among 54 Vietnamese university students, it was found that writing strategy training significantly improved ESL writing performance (Nguyen & Gu, 2013). Although the goal of all writing instruction is to help students become expert writers so that they can achieve independence and autonomy in their writing (Okasha & Hamdi, 2014), students are seldom guided on the use of strategies in the process of writing. Doing this could help them to become good writers by identifying and recognizing the appropriate writing strategies according to their own characteristics. In this respect, teachers provide little guidance to their students on writing strategies because they may have a poor understanding of their students’ knowledge of writing. The problem here, is that many teachers do not know how to manage techniques to teach learners how to write, or they do not consider the learners’ writing ability by not taking into account the writing level of each learner (Hu & Chen, 2007). Furthermore, a lack of writing proficiency could be a factor that negatively influences the use of writing strategies and prevents them from improving their writing skill. As the studies by Beare and Bourdages (2006) and Plakans (2008) showed, writers with higher L2 proficiency used a wider range of strategies than writers with lower L2 proficiency during the process of L2 composing. In addition, as writing has rules of coherence, spelling or tenses, there is also a process that the writer has to follow to accomplish a successful piece of writing (Palma, 2016) since there is a strong relationship between strategy use and L2 proficiency. It has been discovered that proficient L2 learners have a broader repertoire of strategies and draw on them to accomplish L2 tasks (Anderson, 2005). At the same time, research supports the concept that less competent L2 learners resort to fewer strategies and do so in a less effective way (Anderson, 1991; Dreyer & Oxford, 1996; Ehrman & Oxford, 1990, 1995; Green & Oxford, 1995).
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Therefore, rules of coherence, spelling or tenses are factors that determine L2 learners’ writing performance and use of strategies. In general, students who lack knowledge of writing strategies have difficulties in generating ideas, do little or no planning, and revise little, will struggle with writing (Harris, Graham, Mason, & Friedlander, 2008). Thus, there is a crucial need for English teachers to identify and understand the strategies used by their learners in their writing tasks (Maarof & Murat, 2013) in order to improve their writing skill.

2.6 Classification of Writing Strategies

The classification of writing strategies used by L2 learners takes an important role because the adequate use of those techniques can lead to greater writing proficiency. It is crucial to classify writing strategies as there are several, and each serves a specific goal to improve writing proficiency. Moreover, it becomes very beneficial for teachers and students to have an idea of possible techniques to teach and use in the writing process. Therefore, the exploration of an explicit classification of ESL writing strategies is necessary so that learners can acquire and access them in an easy way in order to facilitate their writing (Mu, 2005). Moreover, L2 researchers are also interested in the learning strategies employed by more proficient learners for general language learning as part of the L2 writing process research, as well as in strategy training for writing (Oxford, 1990; Rost, 1993; Wenden & Rubin, 1987). Most of the writing strategies that EFL learners use are first learned and practiced in their first language, then the learners transfer and apply those strategies in the L2 (Alhaisoni, 2012). Furthermore, according to Raoofi, Binandeh and Rahmani (2017), learners who already practiced writing strategies in the L1 will be more successful in composing in the L2 since their first language writing experience will help them in the process of writing in the target language. According to Leki (1995), it is crucial to have some ideas of what students already know how to do, consciously or not, in considering the possible role of writing strategy training in ESL writing course. Due to this importance, several authors have put forward different classifications for strategies (Leki, 1995; Sasaki, 2000; Mu, 2005; Kim & Joon, 2014). Moreover, Leki (1995) states that the strategies are
adaptable in use and the participants can shift from one writing strategy to another if the first one does not succeed. Table 2 displays the category of writing strategies by Leki (1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategies</th>
<th>Sub-strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarifying strategies</strong></td>
<td>Talking to the teacher to understand the assignment better.</td>
<td>Undertaking to determine and imitate what it is that English teachers would do with the task assigned and how the assigned activity would fit into a professional life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talking to other students about the assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asking for specific feedback on the project before doing it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trying to interpret the teacher's purpose in an assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focusing strategies</strong></td>
<td>Rereading the assignment several times.</td>
<td>Concentrating the attention on the writing task in both narrow and broad ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Writing out the essay exam question at the top of the essay.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading books and articles in the content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Using the L1 in L2 Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Using past writing experiences</th>
<th>Looking back to the past experience to accomplish the writing task area.</th>
<th>Referring at one time or another to past writing experiences in the effort to accomplish the current task.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking advantage of L1/culture</td>
<td>Using the strategy that is known from previous knowledge used by others.</td>
<td>Using the knowledge and experience that help to compensate for other linguistic and educational disadvantages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using current experience or feedback to adjust strategies</td>
<td>Using the feedback from own word or other classmates receiving from the teacher</td>
<td>Using feedback or current experience from the previous assignment in the current or later assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for models</td>
<td>Looking out for models for the assignment</td>
<td>Finding models in books, articles as source to imitate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sasaki (2000) investigated EFL learners’ writing processes using a Japanese L1 research scheme. Sasaki’s (2000) category of writing skills consists of eleven writing strategies namely: planning, retrieving, generating ideas, verbalizing, translating, rereading, evaluating and others. Each of the categories consists of one
to four sub strategies. Table 3 displays the writing strategies, the sub-strategies and their definitions.

Table 3 Sasaki’s (2000) categories for Writing Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategies</th>
<th>Sub-strategies</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Global planning</td>
<td>Detailed planning of overall organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thematic planning</td>
<td>Less detailed planning of overall organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local planning</td>
<td>Planning what to write next</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Organizing the generated ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion planning</td>
<td>Planning the conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retrieving</td>
<td>Plan retrieving</td>
<td>Retrieving the already constructed plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information retrieving</td>
<td>Retrieving appropriate information from long-term memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating Ideas</td>
<td>Naturally generated</td>
<td>Generating an idea without any stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description generated</td>
<td>Generating an idea related to the previous description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the L1 in L2 Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbalizing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Verbalizing a Proposition</strong></td>
<td>Verbalizing the content the writer intends to write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Rhetorical refining</strong></td>
<td>Refining the rhetorical aspects of an expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mechanical refining</strong></td>
<td>Refining the mechanical or (L1/L2) grammatical aspects of an expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sense of readers</strong></td>
<td>Adjusting expressions to the readers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Translating</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translating</strong></td>
<td>Translating the generated idea into L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rereading</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rereading</strong></td>
<td>Rereading the already produced sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluating</strong></td>
<td><strong>L2 proficiency Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluating one's own L2 proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Local text evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluating part of generated text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General text evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Evaluating the generated text in general</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The present classification of Mu is developed from the analysis and combination of previous classifications of ESL writing strategies, with different methods, participants and results. Mu (2005) observes that this classification has limitations. Firstly, along with Hsiao and Oxford (2002), Mu (2005) states that framing classification of ESL writing strategies is impractical because researchers have diverse criteria for the classification. Secondly, this classification may seem rather unusual with merging different categories together. Another limitation of the classification, as stated by Mu (2005), is its impracticality to incorporate all strategies in one classification because of their resilience and complication for each individual writer (Hermelinda, 2016). However, this classification of writing strategies has significant value for the teaching and learning of EFL writing for its clarity and convenience. Table 4 shows the category of writing strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Strategies</th>
<th>Sub-strategies</th>
<th>Speculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical strategies</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Beginning/development/ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of L1</td>
<td>Translate generated idea into ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Formatting/Modeling</td>
<td>Genre consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparing</td>
<td>Different rhetorical conventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive strategies</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Finding focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Checking and identifying problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating</td>
<td>Reconsidering written text, goals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive strategies</th>
<th>Generating ideas</th>
<th>Repeating, lead-in, inferencing, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revising</td>
<td>Making changes in plan, written text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaborating</td>
<td>Extending the contents of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Disposing of confusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrieval</td>
<td>Getting information from memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehearsing</td>
<td>Trying out ideas or language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td>Synthesizing what has been read</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative strategies</th>
<th>Avoidance</th>
<th>Avoiding some problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction</td>
<td>Giving up some difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of readers</td>
<td>Anticipating readers’ response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social/affective strategies</th>
<th>Resourcing</th>
<th>Referring to libraries, dictionaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Getting feedback</td>
<td>Getting support from professors, peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assigning goals</td>
<td>Dissolving the load of the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest/deferral</td>
<td>Reducing anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kim and Yoon (2014) developed their own classification of writing strategies by adopting categories from previous studies (Wang, 2003; Van Weijen et al., 2009; Raimes, 1985; and Wang & Wen, 2003). They removed categories that either overlapped or that were not necessary to analyze the participants’ use of L1 during the L2 writing. These categories can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5 Kim & Yoon’s (2014) classification of Writing Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse (D)</td>
<td>Verbalization made for planning and evaluating the organization of the text</td>
<td>First, I’ll write merits and demerits about it and second I’ll express my opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea generation</td>
<td>Verbalization made for planning, writing, and revising the content of the writing. Writers are formulating, considering, reconsidering or searching for content in their writing.</td>
<td>You can meet new people and experience valuable things. Also, you can fully relax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use (LU)</td>
<td>Verbalization related to grammar orthographic conventions or punctuation</td>
<td>“Help” is transitive verb, so what is the form behind that verb? To or ing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical searching (LS)</td>
<td>Verbalization for finding an appropriate lexical item</td>
<td>License? It is not proper here. Then, diploma? Certificate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct translation (DT)</td>
<td>Direct translation from L1 into L2</td>
<td>I want to speak English very well... I want to speak English very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back translation (BT)</td>
<td>Back translation from L2 into L1 by going back over the already written text in order to generate content, monitor written production or get an idea of the match between intention and expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buying a car has many benefits...</strong></td>
<td><strong>Buying a car has many benefits.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When I was a high school student...</strong></td>
<td><strong>When I was a high school student</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacommments (MC)</th>
<th>Self-evaluation and metaconcerns about the appropriateness or qualities of one single element or text production. Reflections on the writing process as a whole</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No, it’s not correct. It sounds strange.</strong></td>
<td><strong>I’m not sure whether it is right or not.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-instruction (SI)</th>
<th>Instructions participants give themselves regarding the next step in the writing process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Let’s start to write!</strong></td>
<td><strong>I need to close here.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revising (RV)</th>
<th>Revising the text produced so far at the word, sentence, or text level in order to clarify meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erases “them” and writes “people”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Repeating (RP)</th>
<th>Repeating a word, phrase, or part of sentence to provide impetus to continue composing, monitor ideas, or gain time to think</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading a book...reading a book...is boring...boring...boring...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task-examination (TE)</th>
<th>Analyzing the writing prompt by reading it or commenting on the task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compare your friend’s two choices and explain which one you think your friend should choose. Travel or buying a car? My advice is to go on vacation!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Different studies have been carried out with the intention to identify the writing strategies that L2 learners use when producing a written task. In the study of Raoofi and Heng Chan (2014), after analyzing think-aloud data it was found that Malaysian university students mainly used a variety of metacognitive strategies such as planning and revising in their L2 writing, while strategies from other categories such as social and cognitive strategies emerged from their interviews. Similarly, Wong (2005) used think-aloud interviews to identify the writing strategies used by L2 writers. The analysis of the data indicated that the writers used a similar repertoire of writing strategies including metacognitive strategies (questioning, rereading and goal setting); cognitive strategies (drafting and revising) and affective strategies (self-assessments). However, questioning and rereading were the most prominent features used by the writers throughout the writing process. Moreover, Kim and Yoon (2014) explored the use of writing strategies among Korean university students, and the results showed that the most employed strategies were Idea generation, Direct- and Back translation, Metacommments, and Lexical searching. Maarof and Murat (2013) conducted a study to investigate the writing strategies used by skilled and less-skilled Indonesian students. Their findings showed that reading and rereading were the most predominant strategies used by skilled writers, whereas less skilled writers preferred the strategies of editing and pausing. The findings of these studies suggest that some learners use the same strategies when composing in the L2, but not all of them went through the same stages in the writing process and not all of them employed the same strategies. As Hermilinda and Hashima (2016) state “what works best for one writer might not work well for another” (p. 8).

2.7 L1 Influence of Interference on the L2 Writing Process

The L1 and L2 writing relationship might be viewed as either interference of L1 with L2 writing or as application of L1 to L2 writing. Several studies have explored how learners integrate the first language for the function of acquiring L2 writing proficiency (Gascoigne, 2000; Van Weijen & Van den Bergh, 2009; Youngram, K & Hyunsook Y, 2014; Choi & Lee, 2006; Wang, 2003; Watcharapunyawong & Usaha, 2013). The use of the L1 can be considered as a strategy that students employ in
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order to overcome difficulties faced in L2 writing composition. If the learner’s knowledge of the target language is not enough, he/she relies on his/her L1 to express an idea, which can be positive or negative (Karim & Nassaji, 2013). Many of the composing strategies are the same in the L1 and the L2, thus, L2 learners may be able to transfer those from their L1. For instance, in Guo and Huang’s (2018) study, the main purpose was to know which writing strategies were used by EFL learners when they were composing writing tasks in the L1 and L2, and whether these strategies were transferable or not. The findings of this study showed that EFL learners who reported more strategies in the L1 writing task also reported the same amount of strategies in the L2 writing task. Moreover, Hermilinda (2016) stated that learners who have already learned how to plan, develop ideas, revise, and edit their writing in their L1, may use the same strategies when they engage in L2 writing. Even though there are few studies targeting the relationship between L1 and L2 writing strategies in the writing processes, the ones that have addressed this relationship reveal that L1 writing strategies are closely associated with L2 writing strategies. This strong relationship between L1 and L2 writing strategies may support the role of L1 in L2 linguistic transfer (Raoofi, 2014). However, errors might occur if the learner incorrectly transfers a linguistic form from one language to another, or if the learner is misled by the partial similarities between the two languages. In addition, studies in which interference is presented from the students’ mother tongue into their second language have several factors that influence writing proficiency such as similar or different structures, background knowledge, proficiency, and consonant clusters (Derakhshan & Karimi, 2015).

Regarding the code-switching between the first and second language, it has been stated that the effect of language switching on text quality is sometimes positive (Woodall, 2002). In this way, the mother tongue can help students to cope with organization and creativity. L2 learners’ use of the L1 may have positive effects on improving the quality and quantity of ideas in their compositions, searching for appropriate vocabulary, and organizing their L2 written texts as a whole (Wang, 2003). In line with earlier research, these studies have shown that L1 use varies between writers, although all writers use their L1 while writing in the L2 to some
extent (Knutson, 2006; Wang & Wen, 2002). Another aspect to consider is the general language proficiency of EFL learners. Recent studies have suggested that L2 proficiency influences the amount of L1 use and the variability of L2 writing performance (Wang, 2003). Regarding the process of writing, both English as a second language and foreign language studies point to a transfer of writing strategies from L1 to L2 writing, particularly for planning and revision strategies (Cohen, & Brooks-Carson, 2001). In the case of beginner EFL learners, it is claimed that their L1 can be more intrusive when they are asked to perform a writing task in the target language. When L2 writers’ language ability is limited, L1 can be used to sustain their writing (Wolfersberger, 2003). Moreover, Hussein and Mohammad (2012) stated in their study that Arab learners tended to compose words and sentences in their L1 and then translate them into the L2. Hence, thinking in the L1 may provide a useful problem-solving tool for the challenging task of L2 writing as translating something from the L1 to the L2 may not be grammatically accurate (Knutson, 2006). Therefore, the improvement of writing ability is of principal importance for all the students to successfully perform writing tasks and it is even more essential for L2 students such as ESL students since they have to write in English other than in their native languages (Raoofi, 2014). In every case, L1 interference will take place due to the different aforementioned reasons. Consequently, it is of great importance that students’ use of the L1 is controlled by teachers to see their progress during the writing process, so it becomes beneficial rather than detrimental.

2.8 Writing Tasks and Strategy Use

Despite the copious amount of research on L2 writing, much exploration remains to be done. For example, although L2 writing processes and strategies have been investigated extensively in relation to some variables (e.g., L2 proficiency, motivation, attitudes, and writing goals), other variables have received relatively little attention. One such variable is the writing task per se. Few studies have specifically addressed how writing tasks may influence the processes and strategies adopted by L2 learners, and whether the type of writing task impacts on the strategy use of
skilled and unskilled L2 learners similarly (Hu & Chen, 2018). Inquiry in regard to the effect of writing tasks on strategy use, has the potential to give important implications for process-oriented L2 writing instruction in the classroom.

As mentioned before, only few studies have focused on the influence of writing tasks on L2 writing strategies or the interaction between writing tasks and writing competence in relation to strategy use. Grabe (2001) stated that different writing tasks make different processing demands for L2 learners. He argued that a consideration of the nature of writing tasks can open up ways to address writing development more directly. Furthermore, in an earlier study, Bereiter and Scardamalia (1987) provided evidence of the impact of different tasks and varying task complexity on L1 writing performance as a similar concern for learners when performing L2 writing tasks. Besides, Cumming’s (1989) study revealed that more cognitively demanding tasks such as argumentative writing assignments produced significantly different behaviors from those found in less cognitively demanding tasks such as letter writing. Wang and Wen (2002) found that more L1 was used in the narratives produced by their subjects than in their argumentative essays. As stated by Kreeft, Staton, Richardson and Wolfram (1990):

In studying the developing writing abilities of limited English proficient students, we need to understand what kinds of writing situations and tasks are most helpful for moving them toward increasingly more fluent and coherent expression of their ideas, experiences, and feelings. (p. 142)

In spite of these findings, more research is needed before a better understanding of task effects in L2 writing can be developed.

Besides the previously shown literature review, a methodology chapter needs to be addressed as well down below, as it is an essential part of the study where the parts of this one are thoroughly explained in detail, and contribute to the absolute completion of this paper.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

This chapter will address the research design that was utilized to collect data. Then, the participants of the study will be described according to the context where the study took place. Next, the instruments (placement test, writing tasks, and think aloud protocol) will be identified and explained to understand their purposes towards the study. Next, the procedures will be presented to see the steps that the researchers took in order to accomplish the study. Finally, the method of analysis of the study will be outlined to understand it appropriately.

Writing is regarded as a very complex process in which different social, motivational, and cultural factors influence learners’ writing proficiency (Raoofi, 2014). Writing not only helps to reconstruct the thinking of the learner into the written form, but it also supplies important clues for improving the coherence of the text. Moreover, it can give a deeper insight into what goes on as we struggle to translate meaning into words (Sapkota, 2012). Writing is one of the most important skills in education since it requires a large repertoire of strategies, vocabulary, and structures. As a consequence, those methods to improve writing skills have become areas of study that continue to be developed, implemented and researched (Sulisworo, Rahayu & Akhsan, 2016). In order to help students to improve their writing skills, it is essential to identify problems and interferences derived from these factors. Furthermore, the identification of techniques that can be beneficial for the students’ writing processes is very important. Consequently, the proper selection of writing strategies are tools that help students to overcome problems related to the writing process. These refer to how second language (L2) learners go about composing, that can be referred to as “any actions employed in the act of producing text” (Manchon, De Larios & Murphy, 2007, p. 231). The employment of appropriate writing strategies is a common problem that students face when it comes to writing in the second language. Therefore, teachers should be aware of these strategies and teach them accordingly to students.
The following study was a quantitative research study, and its main goal was to identify and describe the L1 and L2 writing strategies reported by nine Chilean adult EFL learners at three different proficiency levels (elementary, intermediate, and advanced). According to each research question, the specific objectives were to identify and describe the type of writing strategies reported by Chilean Adult EFL learners as they engage in an L2 writing task, to assess the effect of type of writing task (narrative and argumentative) on the type of strategy used and language use, and to assess the effect of learners’ proficiency level on the type of writing strategies used and the language used. The study also aimed to raise awareness on the different writing strategies that learners use (e.g. idea generation, language use, lexical searching, and direct translation) and the amount of language use that participants used while composing the writing pieces. Results showed the different writing strategies used by the participants when they performed L2 activities. These strategies were identified and discussed in light of the different proficiency levels of these participants. Finally, the researchers determined the amount of L1 and L2 employed by the participants during the L2 writing process.

### 3.2 Research Design

The following research investigation is mainly a quantitative case study, which contributes to a deeper acknowledgment of a particular case in detail (Creswell, 1998). This type of research study provides a range of methods in order to establish different perspectives on relevant issues (Richards, 2003). An important aspect to consider is the elements that were used during the study when comparing learners’ proficiency levels and their writing strategies (frequency and means). Three research questions were put forward:

1. What type of writing strategies do adult EFL learners used across writing tasks and proficiency levels?

2. What is the impact of the type of writing task on the type of strategy used and the language used?
3. What is the impact of proficiency level on strategy used and the language used?

Furthermore, these instruments were used to gather the information about the frequency and type of strategy used by the participants. In terms of the data gathered during the study, narrative and argumentative written tasks were selected for the participants to complete and use different writing strategies. A variety of topics were chosen to collect as many writing strategies as possible, so participants who did not find a specific writing task topic amusing to write could do better with another one.

3.3 Participants

Adult EFL learners at a university level were invited to participate in the study. A mixture of snowball sampling and convenience sampling was followed during the selection of the subjects. Snowball sampling is applied when samples with the target characteristics are not easily accessible due to specific characteristics needed to fulfill the learners’ profiles related to their writing proficiency level (Naderifar, Goli & Ghaljaie, 2017). Moreover, convenience sampling is a type of non-random sampling, in which participants are selected according to a certain shared characteristic or are willing to participate in the study (Etikan, Musa & Alkassim, 2015). Researchers also selected the participants based on their willingness to be part of the research. These participants had to, as a baseline, take a placement test to identify their writing proficiency level in the English language. Based on the results of this test, nine participants were selected and divided into three group categories; elementary, intermediate, and advanced. Thus, each of these levels consisted on three adult EFL learners whose proficiency belonged to one of the previously mentioned categories. Table 6 presents the overall information of participants.
TABLE 6. Biographical information of the participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>English Course level</th>
<th>English writing training</th>
<th>Level of writing proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant A</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant D</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant E</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant H</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Instruments

3.4.1 Placement Test

One of the aims of the present study is to explore whether there exists a relation between the amount of writing strategies used and the participants’ proficiency level. Therefore, at the beginning of the study, the participants were asked to take the “Oxford quick placement test” (OQPT) to determine their general English proficiency level. The test consisted only of multiple-choice items about filling the gaps with propositions, verbs, phrasal verbs, and adjectives, among others. According to the Oxford website, not only does the instrument test grammar and vocabulary, it also tests how learners use that knowledge in order to understand the meaning in communication. The first step of the study was to know the participants English level in order to create the three different groups of the study. This placement
test had 60 multiple questions. This test provides a measure of language proficiency with CEFR comparison. The results of the test were used to divide the learners into the three aforementioned categories. The levels were divided in the following way: elementary (A2), intermediate (B1), and advanced English writing proficiency (B2-C1).

### 3.4.2 Writing Tasks

The participants were required to perform two writing tasks in total. After dividing the participants into the previously mentioned categories, they were asked to produce two texts during a one-hour session; these consisted on one narrative and one argumentative text. Narrative tasks are considered to be less challenging for students whereas argumentative tasks are considered to be more difficult. Consequently, it is believed that there must be a remarkable difference in the students' writing performance according to the type of task (Wang & Wen, 2002). In addition, the strong presence of these two types of tasks in previous studies led the researchers to choose them among the rest. These types of tasks had different goals as the argumentative essay is to persuade the reader through logic and reasoning, but a narrative is a story, generally relying on personal experience. Therefore, participants could have employed different writing strategies depending on the type of writing task. In the first narrative task, participants were asked to write a 300-word story based on a sequence of pictures that showed a boy and his dog chasing a frog which they had previously caught. The pictures were taken from the book “Frog, where are you?” (Mayer, 1969). This book has been used in previous research due to its effectiveness (Cameron & Wang, 1999). This task was also used in our pilot study. In the case of the remaining argumentative and narrative tasks, prompts were carefully selected from the TOEFL essay writing topics website, so students could properly follow them. For the argumentative writing task, the participants were guided by two prompts that were written in English and Spanish. In the first one, they had to answer “Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? With the help of technology, students nowadays can learn more information and learn it more quickly. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.” Participants
completed the writing in one session of 1 hour. In the writing session, they had to write the narrative task and argumentative task in 30 minutes respectively. During the session, they had the opportunity to verbalize as many writing strategies as they could in an hour.

### 3.4.3 Think Aloud Protocol

In this research study, the focus was placed on the generating sub-process that can be observed in the participant’s behavior while writing and reporting in the verbal data of the think aloud protocols (Chenoweth & Hayes, 2001). Think-aloud reporting was used to gain insight into the thought processes utilized by the students, and to study the different strategies that adult Chilean university students made use of while writing compositions in L2 English. The main benefit of the think-aloud protocol is that learners can dispatch their thoughts at the same time that they are performing the task, so they do not have time to alter what they are thinking (Yoshida, 2008). Therefore, it is important for conducting a proper think-aloud protocol to have prior consideration regarding the way instructions are to be conveyed to participants. Studies that have employed the think-aloud protocol showed that this method offered enough information to be analyzed, even if the study was applied to a small group of participants (Nielsen, 1994). Thus, in order to gather data on the writing strategies that these participants used, a think aloud protocol was employed. In each writing task, adult EFL learners had to verbalize their thoughts; whether in Spanish (L1) or English (L2) as they preferred and usually do when composing. They were requested to compose the mentioned tasks as they were recorded through the entire process. It is important to mention that a number of issues with the think-aloud instruments may affect the results of a study. According to a study that explored the potential of think-aloud protocols for educational research, there are aspects in this tool that may cause problems to gather reliable data (Cowan, 2017). One important issue explored in that study is that EFL learners who face the think-aloud protocol for the first time may have trouble finding and expressing their thoughts and emotions. Therefore, they choose to use nonverbal expressions that are impossible to transcribe. In another study, writers differed in terms of how much they verbalize due to factors
such as verbosity, ability to voice their thoughts, and L1/L2 challenges (Plakans, 2009). Nevertheless, it will depend on the way researchers provide instructions and model the think aloud protocol to the participants for the protocol to succeed. In the present study, researchers conducted a pilot of the Think-Aloud protocol in order to prevent these issues. In this pilot, a video of learners verbalizing their thoughts in a written task was used to demonstrate to the participants how the protocol worked. Moreover, after the video participants had the chance to ask questions to the researchers regarding the protocol.

Even though the use of think-aloud as a tool in writing research has been much debated in the past, this protocol analysis can contribute with useful data for L2 writing research (Roca De Larios, Manchon, & Murphy, 2006). Researchers can apply the think-aloud method to gather and analyze the verbalized thoughts of the participants, and it can also provide a measurement of the participants' behaviors whereas they are completing the tasks. (Lundgrén & Salanterä, 2009). Therefore, it can be argued that this method is quite useful for observing the occurrence of writing strategies such as Planning, Generating Ideas, and Evaluating during the writing process (Van Weijen, 2009). The think-aloud protocols from each writer's audio-tapes were transcribed in order to create a hard copy of the think-aloud sessions. The think-aloud tapes were transcribed in the language(s) (Spanish or English) that the participants used to externalize their thoughts during the writing process.

3.5 Procedures

First, researchers met students from the Tourism Program at a Chilean university. In the first meeting, students were presented an information sheet (Appendix A) and signed a consent form (Appendix B) which said that they would be willing to participate in the research study. Additionally, they also were informed about the investigation process, its methodology, and the importance of researching this topic by email (Appendix C). After obtaining their consent, the data collection process started. Second, researchers arranged another session with the students for them to take a placement test to know their English proficiency level. A total of 28 tourism students took the placement test, and 9 of them were selected and
divided into 3 groups. The students who got an English level of A2 were categorized as Elementary. The students who got an English level of B1 were categorized as Intermediate and, finally, the students who got an English level of B2 – C1 were categorized as Advanced. After choosing the participants, they were informed that they were selected to participate in the second part of the study. This part consisted of doing 2 writing tasks, 1 NAR and 1 ARG in one session. In this instance, the participant needed to verbalize their thoughts. Therefore, researchers at the beginning of the meeting explained each participant that the writing tasks were supposed to be analyzed for a better understanding of the purpose of the Think-Aloud protocol. Consequently, researchers explained to participants the importance of verbalizing their thoughts while writing. The think aloud protocol was described with a short demonstration by the researcher before starting the writing tasks. Here, the participant practiced and then began with the writing tasks. Once the texts created by the participants were gathered, the recordings of the writing strategies verbalized during the writing process were transcribed in order to identify and analyze those writing strategies. These data were tabulated regarding their frequency and type. To achieve this purpose, the participants were recorded during the writing tasks since they were asked to verbalize their thoughts according to the think-aloud protocol. The writing tasks were transcribed and analyzed by the researchers in order to identify the writing strategies that each participant used.

3.5.1 Pilot Study

According to Bloor and Wood, (2006) pilot studies are small-scale, preliminary studies which aim to investigate whether crucial components of a main study will be feasible. Piloting also provides a structured opportunity for informed reflection on, and modification of, the research design, the research instruments, costings, timing, and researcher security in order to test some procedures beforehand. A pilot study with two students from the Tourism program who were not included in the analysis was carried out before the beginning of the main study. These students were contacted based on their low proficiency results on the Oxford and Cambridge “quick placement test” in order to identify and solve issues with the tasks and instructions.
In this session, the participants were introduced to the think-aloud protocol by watching a video explaining how it is carried out. After verifying that they understood the method, they received instructions for the writing tasks and were asked to verbalize their thoughts while writing. For the writing session, the participants were asked to write 300 words with a time limit of 30 minutes. One of the participants was given a narrative writing task in which he had to write a story based on a set of images he received, while the other participant completed an argumentative task with a certain prompt to motivate his production. The main intention behind the pilot study was to corroborate whether the tasks and the think-aloud protocol were easy to understand.

3.6 Method of Analysis

Researchers analyzed the type and frequency of the participants’ writing strategies. The first step was to listen to the recordings to transcribe them, then researchers identified the writing strategies. In this process, each researcher listened to the participants' recordings and labelled a set of writing strategies used by each participant. Then, the writing strategies were compared and discussed to determine whether which writing strategies were more prominent among participants. The aspects of the study were mainly related to the quantitative approach as when collecting the data and having to calculate mean, frequency counts, and percentages towards the results.

Attached below, a table 'breaks down' the research design of the present study by including the research questions, the data collection means, the methods of analysis and finally, the specific objectives.
TABLE 7 Research design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Method of Analysis</th>
<th>Specific Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ1-</strong> What type of writing strategies do adult EFL learners used across writing tasks and proficiency levels?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. To identify and describe the type of writing strategies reported by Chilean Adult EFL learners as they engage in a L2 writing task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ2-</strong> What is the impact of the type of writing task on the type of strategy used and the language used?</td>
<td>Narrative and Argumentative written tasks</td>
<td>Think aloud protocol: Identification of writing strategies.</td>
<td>2. To assess the effect of type of writing task (narrative and argumentative) on the type of strategy used and language used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Think-aloud protocol</td>
<td>Frequency, percentages, and mean percentages.</td>
<td>3. To assess the effect of learner’s proficiency level on the type of writing strategies used and the language used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ3-</strong> What is the impact of proficiency level on strategy used and the language used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Before developing the present study, the researchers asked the headmaster of the program the emails from the tourism program teachers. Later, the researchers contacted these teachers in order to present the study to the future participants in
one of their classes. Furthermore, a consent form was given to the tourism students who were in the lesson to get their permission to proceed with the development of the already mentioned study, and in order to show that they were willing to participate in the study and the fact that they agreed with the information given and procedures to be followed (appendix B). Once this procedure was accomplished, the participants were asked to arrange a session for completing the writing tasks. Additionally, it was explained to the participants that they could withdraw from the study at any time without any consequences and that neither the information obtained from them nor their names would be revealed. The participants were informed about what kind of information and data that were gathered. Finally, the researchers informed participants about ways of contacting them if there were any kind of doubts or questions related to either their participation in the study or doubts related to the study itself.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Overview

Several studies reporting the use of L1 have been carried out with different approaches. In view of this topic, some studies have focused on the use of L1 during L2 writing with varying findings. Youngram and Hyunsook (2014) analyzed think-aloud and interview data to examine students’ use of L1 during the L2 writing and found that L1 use in L2 writing can play an encouraging role for both the ideational and compensatory purposes. This suggests that the strategic use of L1 can contribute to improvement in L2 composition. Following this method, Raoofi and Heng Chan (2014) stated that data collection tools such as observation and think-aloud protocol seems to be essential for examining real-time writing strategy use since interviews may not reflect the strategies learners use when writing in English. In comparison with the results of the present study, it is true that the think-aloud protocol helps to understand learners’ strategy use. This is to say, learners can demonstrate what strategy is being used at a specific moment when composing a writing piece. However, the previously mentioned authors focused on documenting the link between L2 writing proficiency and writing strategies, instead of the use of L1 whereas this study also focused on the amount of L1 use by the participants. Unfortunately, studies directly relating L1 use during L2 writing to text quality are few and far between, but there are indications that both translation from the L1 to the L2 and L1 use during L2 writing can be beneficial for some writers (Cohen & Brooks-Carson, 2001; Kobayashi & Rinnert, 1992; Uzawa, 1996; Uzawa & Cumming, 1989). In this study, most participants used the L1 for completing the writing tasks, so it is possible that in some cases, the presence of L1 can be meaningful. However, the variable of quality of writing was not analyzed in the study so that researchers gave emphasis on frequency of writing strategies and language use.
4.2 Amount of L1 Use in L2 Writing Processes

Most Chilean university learners used a significant amount of L1 in their L2 writing process in both narrative and argumentative writing tasks. Table 8 shows the total of writing strategies in L1 use that were used in both narrative and argumentative writing tasks taken by the nine participants of the study. Table 8 demonstrates the total of L1 employed by the participants in each writing product. This is portrayed by a percentage of the total number of L1 and L2 utterances in each writing task.

TABLE 8 Overall percentage of L1 use in two writing tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Nar.1</th>
<th>Arg.1</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>97.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Nar.: Narrative writing; Arg.: Argumentative writing
As can be seen in the Table 8, the students used more their L1 during their writing process (59.8%). It implies that during their L2 writing process students frequently relied on their L1 to cope with L2 writing tasks.

The amount of L1 used over the argumentative and narrative tasks across language proficiency was more predominant in the elementary level (71.0%), while intermediate level students showed the least L1 use of the three levels (42.7%). However, advanced participants displayed an L1 use that is very similar to the elementary level (68.4%).

There were wide variations between students in their use of L1 across proficiency levels. For instance, participant 2 in the elementary level, participant four in the intermediate level, and participant seven in the advanced level exhibited a low percentage of L1 use compared to the other participants in their respective groups.

The overall result of the study shows that students used more the L1 for the genre of narrative writing task (68.2%) compared to the argumentative writing genre (48.7%). Moreover, students across proficiency levels always used more the L1 in the narrative tasks rather than in the argumentative tasks. In the elementary level, the overall results show that students employed more L1 in the narrative task (76.9%) compared to the argumentative task (66.7%). In the case of intermediate level students, there is a noticeable difference in L1 use regarding the narrative tasks (54.5%) compared to the argumentative task (17.1%). In the advanced level students, the L1 use in the narrative tasks is higher (73.3%) in contrast to the argumentative task (62.3%).

The results of the study show that Participants employed the L1 more for the narrative task (68.2%) compared to their L1 use in the argumentative task (51.4%). In the narrative writing task, the participants had to create a story based on a picture while in the argumentative task, participants had to write if they agreed or disagreed with the statement that technology helps students to get more information and learn it faster. Moreover, Figure 1 below exhibits a striking result since one of the elementary (P2 (NAR 0.60%) (ARG 0%)) and one of the intermediate (P4 (NAR
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4.1%) (ARG 5.5%)) participants showed low levels of L1 use whereas some advanced participants showed a high level of L1 use (P8 (NAR 100%) (ARG 94.7). These deviations were P2 (elementary) and P4 (intermediate) who displayed low levels of L1 use in both tasks. Furthermore, these examples may show that EFL learners' proficiency level or the type of writing tasks (narrative or argumentative) are not related to the amount of L1 used by participants.

Figure 1 displays the average use of L1 in the two writing genres by individual students.

As it can be observed on Figure 1, participants 1 and 3 from the Elementary level share the percentage of L1 use in the Argumentative task, this one being of a 100%, and their percentage on the same matter in their Narrative task, does not differ much from each other (92.3% and 96.9% respectively). On the other hand, participant 2 did not use the L1 with the expected frequency on the Argumentative task. Actually, she did not use the L1 at all, and on the Narrative task, she just used a small percentage of 0.60% of her L1.

As it was shown in the Elementary group, only one of the participants in the Intermediate group showed a low frequency of L1 use (P4 (NAR 4.1%) (ARG
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(5.5%), while the partners in the same group (P5 (NAR 91), 6%) (ARG 30%) and P6 (NAR 67.8%) (ARG 42.8) showed a higher frequency of L1 use. In the advanced group, the results were very similar previous to the other groups since participant 7 ((NAR 30%) (ARG 38.8)) showed a low frequency of use of L1 while participants 8 ((NAR 100%) (ARG 94.7)) and 9 ((NAR 90%) (ARG 53%)) show a higher frequency in both tasks.

4.3 Use of L1 Writing Strategies in L2 Writing Processes

The number of utterances was counted and analyzed based on transcriptions from the students' writing task sessions. The present study also focused on the purpose for the use of each utterance.

Table 9 shows the frequency of writing strategies in L1 use that were used in the two writing tasks by the nine university learners. The participants employed a diverse amount of strategies such as Repeating (20.7%), Verbalizing a proposition (9.3%), Lexical searching (8.4%), Rereading (6.5%), Local planning (5.6%), Metacomments (5.3%), and direct translation (4.6%). Among these strategies, Repeating remained as the most frequent writing strategy in the writing task sessions. However, this writing strategy was mainly used by a particular learner, so it cannot be argued that most participants used it.

**TABLE 9 Frequency of writing strategies in L1 use**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategy</th>
<th>Elementary (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse (D)</td>
<td>2 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>10 (10%)</td>
<td>12 (3.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea generation (IG)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (4.2%)</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
<td>11 (3.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local planning (LP)</td>
<td>6 (3.4%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>12 (12%)</td>
<td>18 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing (O)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (6.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion planning (CP)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan retrieving (PR)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information retrieving (IR)</td>
<td>11 (6.3%)</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>13 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally generated idea (NGI)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description generated idea (DGI)</td>
<td>13 (7.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td>15 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalizing a proposition (VAP)</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
<td>6 (12.5%)</td>
<td>21 (21%)</td>
<td>30 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use (LU)</td>
<td>4 (2.3%)</td>
<td>2 (4.2%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>9 (2.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the L1 in L2 writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
<th>L2 Proficiency</th>
<th>Local Text Evaluation</th>
<th>General Text Evaluation</th>
<th>Sense of Readers</th>
<th>Repeating</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexical searching (LS)</td>
<td>27 (8.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>22 (6.2%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating (T)</td>
<td>9 (2.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct translation (DT)</td>
<td>15 (4.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-translation (BT)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>5 (1.4%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacomments (MC)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>3 (0.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-instruction (SI)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising (RV)</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating (RP)</td>
<td>67 (20.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-examination (TE)</td>
<td>10 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of readers (SE)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereading (R)</td>
<td>21 (6.5%)</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 proficiency evaluation (L2PE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local text evaluation (LTE)</td>
<td>6 (1.9%)</td>
<td>3 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General text evaluation (GTE)</td>
<td>1 (0.3%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning (Q)</td>
<td>15 (4.6%)</td>
<td>5 (1.5%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>2 (0.6%)</td>
<td>17 (5.3%)</td>
<td>66 (37.7%)</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>323 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>48 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>100 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>175 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>175 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>323 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regarding the second and third highest percentages of the table, the writing strategies Verbalizing a proposition and Lexical searching were used by most learners between both tasks, narrative and argumentative. While the learners were composing the writing tasks, they intended to write their ideas mainly into the L2 and sometimes using Direct translation to generate more content or check their written production. The participants also used Metacomments as a writing strategy, showing that they evaluated and monitored their text production for suitability or writing quality, or comment on the writing process as a whole. Furthermore, the learners assessed their performance by finding appropriate lexical items as well as by checking grammar, punctuation, or orthographic conventions for language use. On the contrary, Naturally generated idea, Sense of readers, and General text evaluation were the least used strategies.

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of L1 writing strategies use relative to the three proficiency levels.
According to Figure 2, the elementary group used a wide variety of strategies 175 (100%) with 18 different L1 writing strategies and their L1 frequency use is very diverse as depicted in Discourse which was used twice (1.1%) in contrast to Repeating 66 (37.7%). At the intermediate level, learners showed the lowest use of strategies 48 (100%) with 17 different L1 writing strategies. Moreover, their L1 frequency use was quite steady with very low percentages. In fact, the highest L1 frequency use in this group was presented in the Questioning strategy 8 (16.7%).

The advanced level exhibited a wide variety of strategies 100 (100%) with the use of 19 different L1 writing strategies. The frequency of L1 use is also diverse as in the case of the elementary level. The highest L1 frequency use was presented in the Verbalizing a Proposition strategy 21(21%), but many other strategies employed in this group have very low percentages. All three groups exhibited a very close amount of strategy use, however their L1 frequency was very varied.
4.4 Use of L2 Writing Strategies in L2 Writing Processes

Table 10 presents the frequency of writing strategies in L2 use that participants employed when completing the writing tasks. The results presented show that the three groups of participants used writing strategies in the L2, being the Intermediate group the one that produced the most utterances in English (95). The second highest number of utterances in English was produced by the Advanced group (37), while the Elementary group was the one that produced the least amount of utterances in English (25).

TABLE 10 Frequency of writing strategies in L2 use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategy</th>
<th>Elementary (%)</th>
<th>Intermediate (%)</th>
<th>Advanced (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse (D)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea generation (IG)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local planning (LP)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing (O)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion planning (CP)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan retrieving (PR)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information retrieving (IR)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally generated idea (NGI)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description generated idea (DGI)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>3 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalizing a proposition (VAP)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use (LU)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical searching (LS)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating (T)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct translation (DT)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-translation (BT)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>2 (5.4%)</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacomments (MC)</td>
<td>6 (24%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>6 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-instruction (SI)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising (RV)</td>
<td>4 (16%)</td>
<td>7 (8.2%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>11 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating (RP)</td>
<td>8 (32%)</td>
<td>27 (28.4%)</td>
<td>23 (62.2%)</td>
<td>58 (37.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-examination (TE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>3 (3.1%)</td>
<td>1 (2.7%)</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of readers (SE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereading (R)</td>
<td>2 (8%)</td>
<td>42 (43.3%)</td>
<td>6 (16.2%)</td>
<td>50 (32.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 proficiency evaluation (L2PE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local text evaluation (LTE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General text evaluation (GTE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning (Q)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (4.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>4 (2.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another feature that table 10 reveals is that Repeating, and Rereading surpassed the other strategies with a considerable difference. Repeating was the strategy that participants used the most in the L2 with 58 utterances (37.4%) in both writing tasks. In the case of Rereading, the participants produced 50 utterances (32.3%) in the L2 when completing the tasks. These strategies can be associated with the process that Hayes (1996) identified as Reviewing. Furthermore, Mu (2005) classified them as Cognitive strategies and stated that they are auxiliary strategies that allow the use of metacognitive strategies, so the function of cognitive strategies is narrower. During the writing process, the participants checked their written content by repeating or rereading key words and sentences to correct information. Additionally, it can be inferred that participants used Repeating to activate and stimulate their ideas. The results indicate that the third most used strategy was Revising with 11 utterances (7.1%), which likewise is categorized as part of the Reviewing process (Hayes, 1996; Chien, 2012).

Figure 3 displays the distribution of L2 writing strategies use relative to the three proficiency levels.
The most distinctive feature in the figure is the use of Rereading by the participants in the Intermediate group. In the case of this strategy, out of the 50 utterances that were produced in the L2, 42 (43.3%) belong to the Intermediate group, thus creating a large gap with the Elementary that produced 2 (8%) and Advanced that produced 6 (16.2%). In contrast, the gap between Repeating utterances is not so drastic. The Intermediate group remained as the one with the highest use of the strategy with 27 utterances (28.4%), but the gap with the Advanced group that produced 23 utterances (62.2%) narrowed considerably. In the Elementary group the use of strategies in L2 remained relatively low, being Repeating the strategy that had more utterances with 8 (32%).
### 4.5 Frequency of L1 Writing Strategies in L2 Writing by Type of Writing Task

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategy</th>
<th>Narrative writing (%)</th>
<th>Argumentative writing (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourse (D)</td>
<td>5 (8.7%)</td>
<td>7 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea generation (IG)</td>
<td>4 (6.9%)</td>
<td>7 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local planning (LP)</td>
<td>15 (26.1%)</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing (O)</td>
<td>4 (6.9%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion planning (CP)</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
<td>7 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan retrieving (PR)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information retrieving (IR)</td>
<td>9 (15.6%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturally generated idea (NGI)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description generated idea (DGI)</td>
<td>9 (15.6%)</td>
<td>6 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbalizing a proposition (VAP)</td>
<td>16 (27.8%)</td>
<td>14 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use (LU)</td>
<td>5 (8.7%)</td>
<td>4 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical searching (LS)</td>
<td>15 (26.1%)</td>
<td>12 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating (T)</td>
<td>4 (6.9%)</td>
<td>5 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct translation (DT)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>14 (21.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-translation (BT)</td>
<td>2 (3.4%)</td>
<td>2 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacommments (MC)</td>
<td>6 (10.4%)</td>
<td>11 (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-instruction (SI)</td>
<td>3 (5.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revising (RV)</td>
<td>4 (6.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeating (RP)</td>
<td>46 (80%)</td>
<td>21 (31.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task-examination (TE)</td>
<td>4 (6.9%)</td>
<td>7 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of readers (SE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rereading (R)</td>
<td>8 (13.9%)</td>
<td>13 (19.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 proficiency evaluation (L2PE)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local text evaluation (LTE)</td>
<td>3 (5.2%)</td>
<td>3 (4.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General text evaluation (GTE)</td>
<td>1 (1.7%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning (Q)</td>
<td>7 (12.1%)</td>
<td>8 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>174 (100%)</strong></td>
<td><strong>151 (100%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the help of this table, the frequency in which L1 writing strategies were used during the production of different texts in the L2 can be easily identified. By having two different text genres, the researchers expected strategy use to vary in terms of frequency (that is to say, ‘how often’ participants would use them), and in terms of language (how much L1 and L2 would be used by participants when
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verbalizing strategies). Surprisingly enough, by dividing the strategies and focusing only on the ones used in their L1, the researchers could conclude the following; the frequency of use of L1 strategies was higher on the Narrative tasks; ergo, the use of L1 strategies in the Argumentative tasks was lower. Strategies such as ‘Repeating’, ‘Verbalizing a proposition’, ‘Lexical searching’ and ‘Rereading’ were the ones whose use was more frequent on both tasks, while strategies such as ‘Plan retrieving’, ‘Naturally generated idea’, ‘Sense of readers’ and ‘General text evaluation’ were used just one time, or not used at all.

Figure 4 shows a distribution of writing strategies in L1 use by writing genres.

As presented in Figure 4, the difference between the frequencies of the strategies used was relatively similar in both tasks, however, there are some exceptional cases that presented a noticeable difference that was relevant when analyzing the total of each task. In one of these cases, the strategy of Direct
Translation presented a higher frequency of use in the argumentative task. This strategy was used in 14 occasions (21.1%) in the argumentative task, but it was only used in 1 occasion (1.7%) in the narrative task. In contrast, the other exceptional cases presented a higher frequency of use in the narrative task. That is the case of Local Planning which was utilized in 15 occasions (26.1%) in the narrative task and 3 (4.5%) in the argumentative task. The other strategy that presented a higher frequency in the narrative task was Repeating. In the narrative task, this strategy was used in 46 occasions (80%), while in the argumentative task it was used in 21 occasions (31.7%). These differences had a great relevance in the total number of strategies used in each task, being the narrative task the one that presented a higher use of L1 strategies, which is in line with Wang and Wen’s (2002) findings.

4.6 Research Question 1: What type of writing strategies do adult EFL learners use across writing tasks and proficiency levels?

Taking into consideration the findings presented, the following can be summarized in order to answer the research questions:

Most of the participants rely on their mother tongue when they are composing in the target language, so the L1 use in these writing tasks was higher (59.8%) than the use of L2 (41.2%). Moreover, it is surprising to see that intermediate students used less L1 (40.3%) in comparison to the amount of L1 used by the advanced (67.8%) and elementary (71.3%) groups. However, it can be noticed that there are certain exceptions, as mentioned above, participants 2, 4 and 7 were the ones who used less their mother tongue when they composed in the target language. When comparing the use of L1 based on the type of writing task, the results showed that in the three groups the participants used the mother tongue with more frequency in the narrative task (68.2%) than in the argumentative task (48.7%). Another result of the study showed that participants 2 and 4 of the elementary and intermediate groups respectively used less amount of L1 compared with the rest of the participants. These results are interesting because the English level of these participants is not as high as compared to the English level of the advanced students who used a greater amount of L1.
The results regarding the frequency of the writing strategies showed that Repeating (20.7%), Verbalizing a proposition (9.3%) and Lexical searching (8.4%) are the most common strategies used by the participants. However, this high percentage of Repeating was reported because only one of the participants used this strategy frequently. Moreover, the frequency in use of writing strategies is different regarding argumentative and narrative writing tasks, meaning that participants found useful different strategies for each type of writing genre.

4.7 Research Question 2: What is the impact of the type of writing task on the type of strategy used and the language used?

According to the results presented in table 11, it can be argued that the type of writing genre might be considered as a variable in the use of writing strategies, but only in specific cases. This can be inferred since the most used strategies in the argumentative tasks are not the same for the narrative ones. For instance, the least used strategy in the argumentative task is Repeating (31.7%), however, in the narrative task that same strategy was used more frequently (80%).

The total percentage of writing strategies used in each task is different. The total percentage of strategies in the narrative task is 174 (100%) while in the argumentative task the total percentage is 151 (100%).

Considering the writing strategies that EFL learners used in each task, we can notice the difference between some strategies. For instance, the frequency of the local planning strategy in the narrative task is of 26.1% while in the argumentative task the use corresponds to a 4.5%. Moreover, the frequency of the Direct Translation strategy in the narrative task was of 1.7% whereas in the argumentative task corresponds to a 21.1%. It can be argued that the low frequency of the Local Planning strategy in the argumentative task was due to the type of task itself since the prompt in the argumentative task (i.e. Use of technology in learning) may have prevented participants from using this strategy, as the prompt arguably requires less planning. On the contrary, the high frequency of the Local Planning strategy in the narrative task can be explained based also in the type of prompt since they had to
invent a story and come up with different events from the beginning of it. Furthermore, the low frequency of the Direct Translation strategy in the narrative task can be due to the lack of vocabulary needed from the participants to develop not only the narrative task, but also the argumentative one.

There are some strategies which were present in the writing strategy classification table, but they were not used at all. These strategies were Plan Retrieving and L2 Proficiency Evaluation. In this regard, the researchers hypothesize that is due to a lack of writing preparation in the participants’ English course. Some of the strategies that were found in previous studies, were not taught to them. Therefore, the participants do not know how to use these strategies.

According to Kim and Yoon’s Study (2014), lower proficiency students depended more on Local Planning than advanced students. However, the findings of this study show that advanced level students rely more often in Local Planning (12 counts at 12%) than low proficiency students (6 counts at 3.4%).

4.8 Research Question 3: What is the impact of proficiency level on the type of strategy used and the language used?

The impact of proficiency level on the type of strategy used and the language used, tends to be crucial in studies of similar nature (Magogwe, 2007). However, in the present study, it can be noticed that L2 proficiency did not have much repercussion in the type of writing strategies used by the participants and their writing process. Regarding the type of strategy used, the advanced group used the strategy “natural generated idea” while the intermediate and elementary groups did not. Another important case is the use of the writing strategy “general text examination, which was only used by the elementary group. As it can be seen on the tables and figures previously attached, the Elementary group used the L1 more (175) than the Intermediate (48) and Advanced (100) groups. In line with Kim and Yoon’s (2014) findings, participants with a lower level of proficiency used their L1 more than the participants with a higher level, but all participants used L1 to different degrees. However, the advanced group was expected to use less L1 than the intermediate
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group. This result contradicts what Wang and Wen (2002) found in their study where the amount of L1 use declined in the L2 composing process relative to writers L2 proficiency. Nevertheless, there were a few cases in which the participants performed in a way that was not expected. A concrete example of this situation can be observed on Participant two’s, from the Elementary level, information. Despite the participant’s basic level of English, she used the L2 most of the time. She just made use of a few L1 Writing strategies in the narrative task, and in the argumentative task, she did not use any. Examples of this can be seen in the transcriptions of her work; During her narrative task, some of the different L1 strategies the participant used can be observed, such as lexical searching, “Por la ventana… For? To?”, and back translation, “While they buscaban, searched…”. Meanwhile, in her argumentative task she naturally ‘chose’ to just use the L2, making the data show an absence of L1 strategies, since she did not use her mother tongue. The situation could be due to the lack of strategies used in total by the participant; however, the researchers believe that the fact that this elementary used only L2 during the second writing task is still impressive. Moreover, even though this participant could have used more L2 strategies in order to produce a better performance, and to inflate the percentages in our research, it was not ‘natural’ for her to do so.

The results of this study are consistent with what Cumming (1989) and Van Weijen et al. (2009) stated about the influence of L2 proficiency in the writing process. It was found that L2 proficiency does not affect the type of writing strategies used by the participants. As seen in the tables and figures previously presented, the Repeating strategy was utilized quite frequently by the three groups regardless of their proficiency level. In the case of the elementary group, this strategy was the most used strategy in the L1 and L2, but in the case of the intermediate and advanced groups it had a higher frequency in the L2.
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

5.1 Conclusion

The present study set out to investigate the different writing strategies that Chilean EFL learners from a private University used during a determined and controlled L2 writing process. The major finding emerging from this research demonstrated that Chilean university most learners are able to use different writing strategies, and that control in L2 writing depends, by and large, on the use of appropriate writing strategies. The participants used a variety of writing strategies classified into categories such as metacognitive, social and cognitive. ESL learners mainly reported using different types of metacognitive strategies such as 'local planning' and 'rereading' in their L2 writing. Even though the other categories, social and cognitive, emerged, these were not as prominent as the metacognitive strategies in the production of both texts.

In general, the study revealed that English proficiency is an important factor in the use of writing strategies, especially when it comes to metacognitive strategies. Students who had the highest proficiency, reported a variety of writing strategies; on the contrary, those who had the lowest proficiency, used a reduced and limited amount of the mentioned strategies.

5.2. Limitations of the Study

There were some limitations in the design of this study. It was planned that each participant would carry out 2 sessions in which they would write 2 tasks per session (narrative and argumentative). However, the country in which the study was conducted is suffering from serious social and political problems. Due to the fact that many protests, social movements, and security forces' violence have caused people to be involved in great difficulties, Chilean universities decided to cancel classes across the country. Consequently, some participants did not have the chance to do the second writing session, and the researchers decided to only use the data from
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the first writing session. In addition, due to the amount of effort and time that researchers need to transcribe, analyze and collect all the data, it was impossible to conduct the study with more than 9 participants. It could have been more favorable to have a larger number of participants to include more data to the research study. This would have given the researchers the chance to explore more writing strategies between different proficiency levels. However, having more participants would have caused a problem in the research process and it might have been impossible to schedule sessions for all of them.

The researchers planned to evaluate the writing quality of each task performed by hiring an external supervisor. Nevertheless, the cancellation of classes and the country’s problems led to the fact that a person could not be hired to assess the quality of writing. Due to this, the researchers could not guarantee that the writing strategies were effective. Due to the time constraints the present study did not attempt to assess the impact of the strategies on proficiency. The researchers managed to detect the strategies and investigate the use of the mother tongue according to the participant’s English level. However, by not having the data on the quality of writing, the development of the study can be affected since there was no certainty that the writing tasks were successful. With the purpose of evaluating these elements, further research will be needed. Finally, the researchers wanted to conduct interviews in order to verify and answer certain questions regarding the strategies used by the participants. However, the situations mentioned above caused that it was not possible to schedule interviews to the participants.

5.3. Implications for Pedagogy

Regarding pedagogy, writing is a skill which plays an important role in the overall performance of L2 learners. To improve this skill, strategies are necessary because the effective use of these may enhance writers working memory functions, which may result in successful writing (De Silva, 2014). Considering how well the strategies are developed, it is important to construct strategy training from what the learners had already known and not to try to teach them with something they already did (Leki, 1995). In doing so, it is reasonable to refer to the learners on what
strategies they are already consciously applying and assist them to bring to their
consciousness other strategies that they may use and not be aware of using, and
perhaps suggest yet others that they have not thought of before. In the present study,
these strategies were analyzed, and researchers could draw different conclusions
and implications for writing strategies’ instruction. One significant implication of this
study is that teachers should be aware of individual differences between their
students in their writing process. Therefore, they should try to use different
approaches to meet the students’ different needs at schools as well as colleges. In
order to do that, teachers should encourage students to recognize their flaws in the
writing skill. Once students are able to identify what they need to improve, teachers
can plan their classes based on their students’ needs. For example, during the
writing sessions, students did not plan their arguments before starting to write, which
reflects the lack of planning instruction in their English courses. Therefore, explicit
instruction of different type of writing strategies needs to be implemented in EFL
programs, so students can have a better understanding of writing composition. In
fact, EFL programs usually have a communicative approach, but mainly focus on
oral production rather than providing a balanced instruction on every communicative
skill.

The findings of this study suggest that language teachers should provide
adequate strategy instruction especially for those strategies that are considered to
be closely related to a successful writing performance. L2 writing teaching should
address the techniques that can help learners to increase their knowledge in the use
of rhetorical conventions, coherence and cohesion devices, and syntactic diversity
in L2 writing. An important point to mention is the case of advanced and intermediate
learners who were more successful in expressing and organizing their ideas than
the elementary learners. These findings recommend that L2 writing teachers should
provide some model options and activities in writing, especially for learners with low
writing proficiency to expand their repertoire of writing skills and strategies. Even
though some learners can improve the use of strategies as when improving their
proficiency level, it is not always the same case. Therefore, it is also important to
have the time for writing instruction so learners can utilize different writing strategies.
Writing teachers need to identify the problems of low writing proficiency learners and find out effective ways to help them to develop their writing skill (Chien, 2012). These students present several problems in L2 writing, so their skills are quite different from those of high writing proficiency. Therefore, explicit writing instruction would be very effective in helping less-skilled writers to raise their metacognitive awareness about L2 writing. In addition, educators should also try to figure out different ways to increase students’ motivation towards writing in English, to read and revise their writing performance, and give them feedback accordingly.

Teachers may recommend the use of instructional procedures they judged to be effective in their classroom (Atwell, 1987). Unfortunately, there is no direct evidence that many of the instructional practices developed by teachers result in improvements in students' writing. When evidence is provided, it often takes the form of testimonials (e.g., the presentation of selected students' writing), making it difficult to determine if the evidence is representative. Further, if a recommended practice is based on the experiences of just one teacher, regardless of how effective that teacher is, there is no way to predict if it will be effective with other teachers.

The purpose of writing instruction is to teach students to write skillfully. Researchers agree on the fact that this can only be accomplished if students write frequently. This viewpoint is evident in the classrooms of effective literacy teachers (Graham & Perin, 2007) where students write frequently across the curriculum and for different purposes (e.g., entertain, inform, persuade). While such an analysis cannot establish that a particular practice is responsible for improvements in students' writing performance, it is reasonable to assume that practices commonly applied by expert teachers are potentially more important than those applied idiosyncratically. However, just because the instruction method was effective in one or more research studies, it does not guarantee its effectiveness in other contexts (Graham, McKeown, Kiuhara, & Harris, 2012).
5.4. Recommendations for Future Research

There are many variables to consider when conducting a research study regarding writing strategies. Factors such as type of task, writing assessment and strategy instruction are some of the variables that influence the skill and performance of writing. In this study, only two types of tasks were carried out, which were the composition of one argumentative and one narrative text that made impossible generalizing our findings across genres (Wang & Wen, 2002; Woodall, 2002). However, essays and other types of extensive type of writing tasks should be considered as well in order to assess writing and the different strategies employed for these written products. Therefore, further research should not only include multiple texts per learner, but also several different types of texts to determine whether L1 use differs between types of tasks such as descriptive, expository, persuasive, narrative, technical, and poetic.

There was no attempt to measure the effectiveness of strategy use, only the frequency and type. The researchers could not tell if high and low proficient students who used the same strategy would produce the same writing in terms of quality. Therefore, this issue is quite important to consider for future investigations.

In addition, an empirical study on the instruction of metacognitive strategies may contribute to this specific research field. Metacognitive strategies may be combined with instructional activities to promote learner autonomy so that learners can be encouraged to become more in control of their language learning and be equipped with concrete tools and strategies to exercise autonomy in planning and monitoring their writing skills.
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APPENDICES

Appendix A: Information Sheet

UNIVERSIDAD ANDRÉS BELLO
FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Using the L1 in the L2 Writing:
The Role of Writing Strategies Across Proficiency Levels and Writing Tasks

 Está siendo invitado a participar en un estudio. Es importante que entienda las razones de su participación y lo que esto implica. Si requiere más información antes de decidir participar, por favor hágalo saber.

¿Cuál es el propósito del estudio?

El propósito principal del estudio es investigar la cantidad y tipo de estrategias de escritura utilizadas por alumnos chilenos que estudien inglés como lengua extranjera, para esto su participación consiste en la realización de tareas de escritura (argumentativas y narrativas). Esta es una tesis de Pregrado realizada por Bárbara Correa, Felipe Garrido, Nelly Jordán, Carla Pacini, Andrea Verdugo, estudiantes del octavo semestre del programa de Pedagogía en inglés.

¿Por qué he sido elegido?

El estudio se enfoca en investigar la cantidad y tipo de estrategias de escritura utilizadas por alumnos chilenos que estudien inglés como lengua extranjera que tengan un determinado manejo de la misma. Se espera que la información obtenida en este estudio sea generalizable a otros grupos.

¿Tengo que participar? ¿Cuáles son los riesgos?

La decisión de participar es suya. Los detalles personales y resultados que se obtengan se manejarán confidencialmente. Su nombre no aparecerá en la tesis, y sus datos no serán identificados. Si decide participar, estará ayudando a entender en qué forma el tópico de interés puede afectar el aprendizaje de una segunda lengua. Usted puede terminar su participación en cualquier momento si lo estima necesario, sin ningún tipo de penalizaciones.

¿Qué sucederá con los resultados de la investigación?

Los resultados de la investigación serán parte de nuestra tesis de Pregrado y pueden ser enviados a una revista de investigación.

Contacto para mayores informaciones
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Si tiene dudas o consultas sobre la investigación, puede contactarme a mí, Felipe Garrido, alumno del programa de Pedagogía en Inglés de la Universidad Andrés Bello. f.garrido.montalva@gmail.com. Gracias por su participación.

Appendix B: Consent Form

UNIVERSIDAD ANDRÉS BELLO
FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN Y CIENCIAS SOCIALES

Using the L1 in the L2 Writing:

The Role of Writing Strategies Across Proficiency Levels and Writing Tasks

Hoja de Consentimiento

El propósito principal del estudio es investigar la cantidad y tipo de estrategias de escritura utilizadas en Inglés y además investigar el rol de la lengua materna (Español) al momento de escribir en la segunda lengua (Inglés). Esta es una tesis de Pregrado realizada por Bárbara Correa, Felipe Garrido, Nelly Jordán, Carla Pacini, y Andrea Verdugo, estudiantes del octavo semestre del programa de Pedagogía en inglés.

1. He leído y comprendido la información acerca de este estudio y he tenido la oportunidad de consultar dudas. He considerado todos los aspectos involucrados con la investigación.
2. Comprendo que puedo retirarme del estudio en cualquier momento y sin ninguna consecuencia, simplemente informando al investigador de mi decisión.
3. Entiendo quién tendrá acceso a mis datos personales y lo que pasará con los datos al final de la investigación.
4. Sé a quién contactar si tengo más preguntas acerca de mi participación en el estudio.

Acepto participar en este estudio.

Su nombre: ____________________________________________
Fecha: ____________________________
Firma: ____________________________

Investigador: ____________________________________________
Fecha: ____________________________
Firma: ____________________________
Appendix C: E-mail to the Tourism Program students

Estimado estudiante,

Junto con saludarte, te contamos que somos alumnos de Pedagogía en Inglés y nos encontramos realizando nuestra tesis llamada “Using the L1 in the L2 writing: the role of writing strategies across proficiency levels and writing tasks” la cual tiene como objetivo investigar el uso de las estrategias de escritura usadas en diferentes niveles del Inglés y la influencia de la lengua materna en la producción de textos en la segunda lengua (Inglés).

Para llevar a cabo nuestra investigación es de suma importancia la participación de alumnos que tengan conocimientos del idioma inglés (básico, intermedio o avanzado). Es por esto que te invitamos a participar de la primera etapa del proceso de investigación, la cual consiste en una prueba que evalúa tus conocimientos generales del Idioma Inglés. Después de este proceso, es posible que te contactemos para pedirte que realices una tarea de escritura.

Sería de gran ayuda que pudieras ser parte de nuestra investigación y respondas a nuestro e-mail para coordinar un horario para la aplicación de la prueba. Tenemos el siguiente rango de horarios disponibles. Por favor responde con el que te acomode, o si ninguno aplica, también infórmanos!

**Miércoles**: Desde 14:30 pm Hasta 16:30 pm.
**Jueves**: Desde 09:00 am - Hasta 16:00 pm.
**Viernes**: Desde 09:00 am - Hasta 14:00 pm.

Esperamos con ansias tu respuesta.

Saludos cordiales,
Bárbara Correa
Felipe Garrido
Quick Placement Test

Oxford University Press and University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate

Name: ................................................................. Date: .................

Este test consiste en 60 preguntas de selección múltiple. Recuerda escribir tu nombre en la hoja de respuestas

Tiempo: 30 minutos
Part 1

Questions 1 – 5

- Where can you see these notices?
- For questions 1 to 5, mark one letter A, B or C on your Answer Sheet.

1. Please leave your room key at Reception.
   
   A. in a shop  
   B. in a hotel  
   C. in a taxi

2. Foreign money changed here
   
   A. in a library  
   B. in a bank  
   C. in a police station

3. AFTERNOON SHOW BEGINS AT 2PM
   
   A. outside a theatre  
   B. outside a supermarket  
   C. outside a restaurant

4. CLOSED FOR HOLIDAYS
   Lessons start again on the 8th January
   
   A. at a travel agent’s  
   B. at a music school  
   C. at a restaurant

5. Price per night:
   £10 a tent
   £5 a person
   
   A. at a cinema  
   B. in a hotel  
   C. on a camp-site
Questions 6 – 10

In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the text below.
For questions 6 to 10, mark one letter A, B or C on your Answer Sheet.

**Scotland**

Scotland is the north part of the island of Great Britain. The Atlantic Ocean is on the west and the North Sea on the east. Some people (6) .......... Scotland speak a different language called Gaelic. There are (7) .......... five million people in Scotland, and Edinburgh is (8) .......... most famous city.

Scotland has many mountains; the highest one is called ‘Ben Nevis’. In the south of Scotland, there are a lot of sheep. A long time ago, there (9) .......... many forests, but now there are only a (10) .......... .

Scotland is only a small country, but it is quite beautiful.

6 A on B in C at

7 A about B between C among

8 A his B your C its

9 A is B were C was

10 A few B little C lot
Questions 11 – 20

- In this section you must choose the word which best fits each space in the texts.
- For questions 11 to 20, mark one letter A, B, C or D on your Answer Sheet.

Alice Guy Blaché

Alice Guy Blaché was the first female film director. She first became involved in cinema whilst working for the Gaumont Film Company in the late 1890s. This was a period of great change in the cinema and Alice was the first to use many new inventions, (11) ... sound and colour.

In 1907 Alice (12) ... to New York where she started her own film company. She was (13) ... successful, but, when Hollywood became the centre of the film world, the best days of the independent New York film companies were (14) ... . When Alice died in 1968, hardly anybody (15) ... her name.

11  A bringing       B including       C containing       D supporting
12  A moved          B ran             C entered          D transported
13  A next           B once           C immediately     D recently
14  A after          B down           C behind           D over
15  A remembered    B realised       C reminded        D repeated
UFOs – do they exist?

UFO is short for ‘unidentified flying object’. UFOs are popularly known as flying saucers, (16) ................. that is often the (17) ................. they are reported to be. The (18) ................. “flying saucers” were seen in 1947 by an American pilot, but experts who studied his claim decided it had been a trick of the light.

Even people experienced at watching the sky, (19) ................. as pilots, report seeing UFOs. In 1978 a pilot reported a collection of UFOs off the coast of New Zealand. A television (20) ................. went up with the pilot and filmed the UFOs. Scientists studying this phenomenon later discovered that in this case they were simply lights on boats out fishing.

16  A because      B therefore  C although  D so
17  A look        B shape     C size     D type
18  A last        B next      C first    D oldest
19  A like        B that      C so       D such
20  A cameraman   B director  C actor    D announcer
Questions 21 – 40

- In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best completes each sentence.
- For questions 21 to 40, mark one letter A, B, C or D on your Answer Sheet.

21 The teacher encouraged her students .................. to an English pen-friend.
   A should write  B write  C wrote  D to write

22 They spent a lot of time .................. at the pictures in the museum.
   A looking  B for looking  C to look  D to looking

23 Shirley enjoys science lessons, but all her experiments seem to .................. wrong.
   A turn  B come  C end  D go

24 .................. from Michael, all the group arrived on time.
   A Except  B Other  C Besides  D Apart

25 She .................. her neighbour’s children for the broken window.
   A accused  B complained  C blamed  D denied

26 As I had missed the history lesson, my friend went .................. the homework with me.
   A by  B after  C over  D on

27 Whether she’s a good actress or not is a .................. of opinion.
   A matter  B subject  C point  D case

28 The decorated roof of the ancient palace was .................. up by four thin columns.
   A built  B carried  C held  D supported

29 Would it .................. you if we came on Thursday?
   A agree  B suit  C like  D fit

30 This form .................. be handed in until the end of the week.
   A doesn’t need  B doesn’t have  C needn’t  D hasn’t got

31 If you make a mistake when you are writing, just .................. it out with your pen.
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32 Although our opinions on many things .................. , we're good friends.
   A differ       B oppose       C disagree       D divide

33 This product must be eaten ................ two days of purchase.
   A by              B before        C within         D under

34 The newspaper report contained ................ important information.
   A many              B another      C an             D a lot of

35 Have you considered ................ to London?
   A move             B to move       C to be moving    D moving

36 It can be a good idea for people who lead an active life to increase their ............... of vitamins.
   A upturn          B input          C upkeep        D intake

37 I thought there was a ................ of jealousy in his reaction to my good fortune.
   A piece          B part            C shadow        D touch

38 Why didn't you ................ that you were feeling ill?
   A advise           B mention       C remark         D tell

39 James was not sure exactly where his best interests .................
   A stood           B rested         C lay            D centred

40 He's still getting ................ the shock of losing his job.
   A across          B by             C over           D through
Part 2

Do not start this part unless told to do so by your test supervisor.

Questions 41 – 50

- In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best fits each space in the texts.
- For questions 41 to 50, mark one letter A, B, C or D on your Answer Sheet.

The tallest buildings - SKYSCRAPERS

Nowadays, skyscrapers can be found in most major cities of the world. A building which was many
(41) ……………… high was first called a skyscraper in the United States at the end of the 19th
century, and New York has perhaps the (42) ……………… skyscraper of them all, the Empire
State Building. The (43) ……………… beneath the streets of New York is rock,
(44) ……………… enough to take the heaviest load without sinking, and is therefore well-suited
to bearing the (45) ……………… of tall buildings.

41 A stages B steps C storeys D levels
42 A first-rate B top-class C well-built D best-known
43 A dirt B field C ground D soil
44 A hard B stiff C forceful D powerful
45 A weight B height C size D scale
SCRABBLE

Scrabble is the world’s most popular word game. For its origins, we have to go back to the 1930s in the USA, when Alfred Butts, an architect, found himself out of (46) …………………. He decided that there was a (47) ………………… for a board game based on words and (48) ………………… to design one. Eventually he made a (49) ………………… from it, in spite of the fact that his original (50) ………………… was only three cents a game.

46 A earning        B work        C income        D job
47 A market         B purchase    C commerce      D sale
48 A took up        B set out     C made for      D got round
49 A wealth         B fund        C cash          D fortune
50 A receipt        B benefit     C profit        D allowance
Questions 51 – 60

In this section you must choose the word or phrase which best completes each sentence.
For questions 51 to 60, mark one letter A, B, C or D on your Answer Sheet.

51  Roger’s manager ................ to make him stay late if he hadn’t finished the work.
    A insisted       B warned       C threatened    D announced

52  By the time he has finished his week’s work, John has hardly ................. energy left for the weekend.
    A any            B much          C no            D same

53  As the game ................ to a close, disappointed spectators started to leave.
    A led            B neared        C approached    D drew

54  I don’t remember ................ the front door when I left home this morning.
    A to lock        B locking       C locked       D to have locked

55  I ................ to other people borrowing my books: they always forget to return them.
    A disagree      B avoid         C dislike      D object

56  Andrew’s attempts to get into the swimming team have not ................ with much success.
    A associated    B concluded     C joined       D met

57  Although Harry had obviously read the newspaper article carefully, he didn’t seem to have ................. the main point.
    A grasped       B clutched      C clasped      D gripped

58  A lot of the views put forward in the documentary were open to ................ .
    A enquiry       B query         C question     D wonder

59  The new college ................ for the needs of students with a variety of learning backgrounds.
    A deals          B supplies      C furnishes    D caters

60  I find the times of English meals very strange – I’m not used ................. dinner at 6pm.
    A to have       B to having     C having       D have
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### Auswertung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Punkte</th>
<th>Kursstufe</th>
<th>Niveau entspricht etwa</th>
<th>Abschlüsse allgemeines English</th>
<th>Abschlüsse Business English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-17</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>Hauptschule Klasse 9/10</td>
<td>KET Key English Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>zwischen mittlerer Reife und Abitur</td>
<td>FCE First Certificate in English</td>
<td>BEC V Business English Certificate Vantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-54</td>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>Abitur Leistungsstufe</td>
<td>CPE Cambridge Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sie können uns anrufen und sich beraten lassen

Bitte wenden Sie sich an:

Frau Myriam Fischer  
Programmbereichsführung Englisch  
Telefon: 06021/ 3868860  
E-Mail: fischer@vhs-aschaffenburg.de

Frau Sylvia Dornhofer  
Sekretariat  
Telefon: 06021/ 3868810  
E-Mail: dornhoefer@vhs-aschaffenburg.de
Think Aloud Protocol (Explicación)

Los protocolos de pensamiento en voz alta (Think aloud protocol) son instrumentos metodológicos que implican a participantes pensando en voz alta mientras llevan a cabo una actividad. Los pensamientos articulados siguiendo esta técnica se graban para poder ser transcritos y son analizados con la ayuda de unas categorías preestablecidas para reflexionar sobre los objetivos del trabajo de la investigación.

Durante este protocolo, es importante que expreses en voz alta tu razonamiento al escribir usando Ingles o Español como lo harías normalmente mientras escribes. Es importante que te mantengas concentrado en el formato de la prueba y que digas en voz alta lo que piensas.
TAREA DE ESCRITURA NARRATIVA I

INSTRUCCIONES

★ Individualmente, escribe una historia de 300 palabras.

★ Usa las fotografías de la página 2 como referencia para tu historia.

★ Escribe tu historia en el cuadro abajo de las fotografías de la página 2.

RECUERDA

★ Realiza la tarea en el formato en “Pensar en voz alta”.

★ No está permitido utilizar ningún traductor online o diccionario.

★ En caso de tener alguna duda o pregunta, diríjase al supervisor.

FROG, WHERE ARE YOU?
I- Utilizando las siguientes imágenes, escribe una historia de 300 palabras. Puedes agregar más detalles a tu historia además de los eventos ilustrados en las imágenes.

Appendix G: Argumentative Writing Task
TAREA DE ESCRITURA ARGUMENTATIVA I

INSTRUCCIONES
★ Lee atentamente el siguiente fragmento
★ Escribe un ensayo de 300 palabras

RECUERDA
★ Realiza la tarea en el formato en “Pensar en voz alta”
★ No está permitido utilizar ningún traductor online o diccionario
★ En caso de tener alguna duda o pregunta, diríjase al supervisor

1. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? With the help of technology, students nowadays can learn more information and learn it more quickly. Use specific reasons and examples to support your answer.

2. ¿Está de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con la siguiente declaración? Con la ayuda de la tecnología, los estudiantes de hoy en día pueden aprender más información aprenderla más rápidamente. Use razones y ejemplos específicos para apoyar su respuesta.

Appendix H: Transcription Sample - Elementary Participant
Narrative Task + Convention Table For Transcriptions
{Okay, the first imagine… Ehm, the first picture is a boy with a dog with a frog.} {Is a story? Okay.} ..... Once upon a time, ahm... a beautiful and magic frog and she had the power go. {eh..... I don’t know.} She had the power...... {Okay, I delete this.} And she had a two best friends, “she had two best friends”. A point. These friends are a dog and a boy called Simón. One night, they are... no, they were in... in the country and they were so tired that... Ahm, they start to dream. Ehm..... All in one night. {Okay, ahm}... In this dream, the dog jump, no, jumped for, no... (Por la ventana). {For? To? ¡Rayos!} {Okay, ehm}, jumped to the window and fall while... slept in the bed with the ehm cute Simón! {The very, very cute Simón!} Maybe I will... delete, change the frog jumped to the window! While the dog slept with the cute Simón. {Then maybe}... Then, approximately 10 minutes the boy the dog, no, ehm, the dog waked up and he also jumped... Okay, I change the frog jumped to the window. {Me desconcentra éso, jaja.} Okay, ehm, and he waked to the, no, to the Simón. Another point. {¿Con cuánto llevo 300 palabras, jaja? Llevo 1,2,3,4,5,6...} {Mentira que las cuenta} Ahm, and..... While they (buscaban)... searched to the frog, she walked to the forest, no, to the country, and he... when he...... she... surrounded by a tree. “A tree”. No, no, no... Surrounded by... {Cuando ella} She’s surrounded by many trees.
“While she’s surrounded by many trees…” She, she say oh, I’m very confused, and I don’t know the walk… for return, for to return, no, to return. While, the dog and the boy… searched {his or her, I don’t know}. “While, the dog and the boy searched her”, they also losed, {I don’t know…} them. In a moment … the frog finded the walk to return of the house… To the house! When she come back to the house, she think oh! Where are the… no, where are my friends? And in this moment, the dog and Simón… the cute Simón, finded the walk to return home … {¡Estoy escribiendo lo mismo siempre!} farm. And I’m changing these sentences … “The frog finded the walk to return” to the farm. “And in this moment, the dog and the cute Simón, finded the walk to return to the farm” … thanks to the frog, because she sended a birds … with the power of their mind. {Shut up, please!} “And in this moment, the dog and the cute Simón, finded the walk to return to the farm” … thanks to the frog, because she sended a birds … with the power of their mind.” For this….. “because she sended a birds with the power of their mind", in the walk to return to the farm, the cute Simón {le dió un ataque cardíaco, no, jaja} {Ay, se me olvidó cómo se dice tropezar…} feel a cold in your neck and then he say oh! I think that I’m very sick, I don’t… {no}, I can’t return. {Uh, ¡216!} The dog, very interested in the cute Simón, with the intention to help… to help his ….. he say Simón, I can help… {no}, can I help you? And the cute Simón … {I don’t know what…} Yes, and the cute Simón say yes, please. Take my hand. {Qué cuento más feo} And when the dog and Simón returned to the farm, the frog felt too much happiness. And the three friends ….. were happy forever. The end”.

Argumentative Task

“I am a student of Engineering, {oh, no sé cómo se escribe mi Carrera en Inglés, qué triste}, Engineering … in Tourism and Hospitality, and in my career, eh , we use too much the technology, the tech-no-lo-gy, ah, technology ….. I think that, I think that this tool, this digital tool is very useful in the new world. A world ….. that is full of new technology and new invents. {No sé si así se dice inventos, pero éso}. In my opinion, this tool ….. is useful for all areas of communication, for example, all areas
using the L1 in L2 writing

to, (no), of service, services or others. One of the reasons, for me is that the technology open a world, one world of possibilities, “one world of possibilities” for the employee, maybe or employer ….. or the creater of the company, (no), of any company. For example a new software, (a new software, no, I change this sentence for this one … okay). In my area, of tourism and hospitality, the employee need for example softwares for the … “for the” reservations for keep a organization in the company. The objective of this is that no exist, (no, maybe), overbooking, or mistakes in the check in or check out of the passengers. For this reasons, reason, the technology in my area to work, work … is very important because, because the … because the time in ….. one of our service or experience, experiences, while, (or, no, (mientras)), less time is better por the passengers or intern client. In the tourism I sell a experience, and in this experience I have too much, (no). In this experience I haven’t only one client, because always I have aproximately of five, six, three to six clients and….. and for this I … must to be very efficient and proactive in my work. The technology is very useful for to have more time in other activities, because the reservations, for example or the data frame is … (no), created for a software and system that is technology”.

Appendix I: Transcription Sample - Intermediate Participant
Narrative Task

{So,} “using these images write a story from 250 to 300 words…. to you story besides the images” ….. {30 minutes right? also? okay… So, I’m seeing the kid…… so, I am, ya. So, basically. So, first I’m gonna write this, so, first of all we can see a kid playing in his room- I have to write also 300 words? okay…..}

First of all we can see a kid playing in his room….. with a frog and a dog… “with a frog and a dog(…) with a frog and a dog”….. basically we are seeing the… with this…
with all the images the moment….. the moments the kid is having with their puppets… puppets or mascot? mascots, with their mascots.

“So, first of all we can see a kid playing in his room with a frog and a dog basically we are seeing with all the images” the kid living … having. I’m gonna delete living and I’m gonna put having…. it is having… with the mascots.

Through the images we can see he loves the dog and frog, but in a moment both of them disappear while he was sleeping. The first thing he does, does when he realize their were in their house is to look out of the window….. He went outside….. I just realize by seeing the images that the mascot who disappeared was the frog and not the dog... “dis- a -ppear... was the frog and not the dog”.

He wanted to search it… his frog with the help of his dog..... {Now that we know that we are saying constantly the “dog” and “frog” word, I decided to put them names, the frog is called Pepe and the dog is Athos}… Athos. Basically, continuing with the story…. the kid..... decided to got outside with Athos to… to find his frog… the first thing he does is yell… is to yell at the air screaming Pepe! .... And he receives no response… Immediately, “immediately”, the frog and Athos ran away, ran very fast like if he smelt something… That started to follow him..... he realized there was beers and a lot of them, and that’s why Athos got there, he was interested on beers...

{beers... how do you say beers? b-e-e-r-s no, beers is (cerveza)... BEES!}
I realize there was bees and a lot of them and started to follow him.... He realized “he realized” there was a lot of bees.... and Athos was interested on bees not in Pepe, so Alex that time was very confused, so he decided..... very confused and sad...So he decided to look... to find… I’m gonna delete look and put find so he decided to find right there the frog. “The frog.”
He started at searching in different trees and..... and at the grass... “the grass”. After a couple of hours, both of them.... after a couple of hours both of them find..... after a couple of hours both of them find a family. Pepe’s family..... find pepe’s family.....
pepe’s family…. both of them find pepe’s family there were find in the river alongside with many tiny and little frogs… with many tiny and little frogs… their were so happy to be founded but pepe wanted to stay with this family… and alex understand the situation and….. realize that he has to free pepe… free pepe….. to free pepe….. and both… the dog… Athos and Alex, finally both Athos and Alex are coming back to the house…… a little bit sad, but also with…..with a lot of joy….. because they thinking….. that Pepe has a family now which is very happy.
“Finally both, Athos and Alex are coming back to the house a little bit sad, but also with a lot of joy because he is thinking Pepe now has a family…. now has a family and he is very happy”.

{Now I’m gonna count the words…. 300 and 22.. i have to change it or i leave it like that? i have to correc it? se me olvido poner una T..... and that’s it}”

**Argumentative Task**

“So, first of all, do you agree or disagree with the following statement? With the help of technology, students nowadays can learn more information and learn it more quickly”. Yes, I think with the help of technology the students are more capable to study or... and learn different cases, examples, or situations... documents “Yes, I think with the help of technology the students are more capable to study and learn different cases, examples, or documents” via internet. Thanks to that, the... the... today students... the students from today are more capable to learn and figure out new stuff and develop new tastes on this study.... On the homework..... homework. For example, in the case of hotel management, my career... we have to learn how to pronounce and use English for foreign people... costumers and perhaps {no} sometimes they don’t speak very well, so we are getting trained to learn how to listen them by... thanks... thanks... “so we are getting trained to learn how to listen them thanks” to the internet... that’s because... we are searching videos, videos in youtube about for example, Australian accent “that’s because we are searching videos in youtube about for
example, Australian accent” and how to pronounce and listen them. “Australian accent and how to pronounce them”.

Thanks to this technology of getting in internet to find a video of an Australian speaking allows us to be more prepared for new challenges and… “in internet to find a video of Australian speaking allows us to be more prepared for a new challenge” and ready to… understand what an Australian is saying….. hmm {no sé si llevo 300} In the other, another case, on the other hand….. technology in medicine is quite important because they are living from it. When… when you go inside a hospital or Clinique, every {no} almost everything what you are seeing is coming from technology, different type as the internet, but it’s still technology….. “still technology”… hmm “it’s still technology” and allow, and allow them to… prepare or medicate different people, also by finding different issues or diseases on their bodies thanks to this type of technology….. Finally, another example would be with… “another example would be with”….. hmm….. {I’m gonna read the question again} “Do you agree or disagree with the following statement. With the help of technology, students nowadays can learn more information and learn it more quickly.” {ya.} In the past, in the past, the students has to go to b… {I don’t know how to say “biblioteca” in English, biblary? No….. No}… {I have to put the word in Spanish if I don’t know?... I’m going to try to say another word} “In the past, the students has to go to” search books and read all of them to learn how to proceed and get experiences. “In the past, the students has to go to search books and read all of them to learn how to proceed and get experienced” in different matters, so basically is way more slow than nowadays than “so basically is way more slow than” nowadays when a student is in his house reading and learning information lying at the bed, at the bed. “Lying at the bed” while he is learning quite comfortable. So basically, I agree with the statement by saying that technology allow us, students, and more people to learn new issues… to learn quickly {I’m gonna check now…..287…..} uuhm “basically, I agree with the statement by saying that technology allow us, students, and more people to learn quickly” and… see different types of views, but also it’s quite difficult for older people to realize that this really could help us because they were more sociable… and had to figure out
more physically the information, so there are many points of view, but I think I support this statement in this case.

Appendix J: Transcription Sample - Advanced Participant

Narrative Task

“Ya de primera empiezo a ver las imágenes…. Estoy sacando la información de cada una y empezando como a conectar ideas.. empezando a imaginarme ya no se un nombre ya para el niño el perro y para la rana solamente para sumar palabras …. Veo que la pieza esta como media desordenada, la rana se escapa, el perro está jugando.. empiezo como a generar en mi mente una posible historia…..

Escribiendo….. le di nombre al niño, se llama Octavio y también al perro. Entonces con la primera imagen empiezo a conectar las ideas y empezar a generar alguna historia….. agregue personajes a la historia porque la rana de algún lugar salió y me imagino que fue un regalo de alguien y quizás se la encontró … sigo describiendo la primera imagen ahora voy a saltar a la segunda.. estoy como añadiéndole información, poniéndola en contexto… escribiendo... pase a la segunda imagen y voy a describir lo que esta pasando... escribiendo ... estoy juntando las ideas para, en verdad estoy uniendo las palabras, poniéndolas como en orden para que la historia esté tomando cierto sentido según lo que estoy viendo en la imagen … escribiendo… y ahora estoy viendo como se llama el yard quizas es un yard donde la rana se encuentra … escribiendo... ahora genere otra idea para darle significado a por qué la rana se escapó y cómo se escapó … escribiendo… le di nombre a la rana solamente para contextualizar….. pasé a la tercera imagen y voy a describir lo que sucede.... Escribiendo... estoy agregándole contenido a la tercera imagen... escribiendo... eem describo lo que sigue pasando en la tercera imagen intentando unir las ideas ...... escribiendo..... estoy escribiendo que la rana se escapó y que este niño se dio cuenta..... escribiendo..... pasé a la cuarta imagen..... escribiendo..... estoy describiendo la cuarta imagen uniendo al niño mirando por la ventana y al perro con el recipiente en la cabeza creo …
escribiendo... describo y pienso en que le estoy agregando información al niño como sorprendido porque no encuentra la rana y el perro ahí .. colao... escribiendo.... Pase a la quinta imagen donde el niño ya empieza a buscar eeh voy a sumarle información... escribiendo... estoy pensando entre que termino ocupar para definir como el niño y el perro fueron en busca de literal en busca de la rana y voy a ocupar la frase eeh in the morning the kid and the dog went and then look out ... escribiendo... estoy escribiendo como el perro y el niño fueron en busca de , buscando en diferentes lados, iniciando como la búsqueda... escribiendo... pase a la sexta imagen... escribiendo... estoy escribiendo como el niño sigue buscando y como el perro está jugando.... Escrbiendo ... voy a unir acá la sexta y séptima imagen .. en dos frases yo creo ... escribiendo... describo como el perro anda jugando por ahí y como el niño sigue buscando a la rana... escribiendo... le estoy dando una segunda historia al perro y el bee hive... nest, creo que se llama esto... escribiendo... en la séptima imagen... ya empecé a describir como el niño y el perro encuentran a la rana y una familia de ranas... y voy imaginando como unir el encuentro y un cierre llegando ya a la ultima imagen... escribiendo.... Estoy contextualizando, generando como, alargando como la imagen, sumándole información para contextualizar a la persona .... Escrbiendo.... Uno la idea de cómo la rana en un principio era un regalo de su padre, pero esta rana quería escapar y volver con su familia, ya que el niño ya tenia una mascota ... escribiendo.... Estoy llegando a un cierre de la historia, uniendo como.. describir que la rana también tenía su familia y que quería volver con ella..... escribiendo.... Concluí con que una idea de que la rana ya tenia su familia y que no necesitaba una nueva ... y la última imagen la estoy intentando descifrar.. el niño tiene a la rana en la mano .. pero ahora se la lleva.. entonces significa que... bueno acá hay una vuelta porque pensaba que la rana no volvía con ellos, pero al parecer si entonces vamos a darle un quiebre y vamos a apuntar como que la rana decidió volver con su nueva familia dejando a su familia atrás porque quería verla por una última vez... escribiendo... estoy dándole un cierre cuando la rana se devuelve con el niño y el perro de vuelta a casa... y agrego los últimos detalles y termino la historia.... Escrbiendo... agrego información y comienzo como a concluir como con alguna frase que no se, cierre
bien…escribiendo… estoy ideando como… unir una frase improvisada como de cierre para esta historia.. creo tenerla pero ahí voy uniendo las palabras…escribiendo… eemmm sumo las ultimas palabras, dando… generando el cierre, terminado de unir como las ideas.. eee generando como una frase, normalmente cuando hago un informe o cuando estoy uniendo ideas.. y tengo que llegar a una conclusión.. me gusta unir ciertos aspectos de lo que se fue presentando en el informe… y cerrarlo como ..citando ciertas cosas .. entonces … ahora estoy uniendo esas ideas como uniendo puntos a través de la historia y llegando a un cierre y que sea como.. no el motivo pero si como con sentido.. escribiendo…”

**Argumentative Task**

“Bueno.. voy a comenzar con la segunda tarea de escritura argumentativa pero que dice tarea de escritura argumentativa 1… ese es el nombre del Word ..

Bueno.. de primera leyendo la pregunta.. yo.. altiro se me viene la idea de… cómo mi papá antes al no entender algo eeeh… bueno o le podía preguntar al profesor o si le dejaban una tarea, él tenía que ir después de clases en la tarde a la biblioteca y buscar un libro para poder responder ciertas dudas, contextualizar y … y eso era lo que el tenía al alcance.. una biblioteca era lo mas cercano para aprender nueva información… y lo conecto en como la tecnología el día de hoy eem me ayuda a mi en estando en la misma clase sin tener que esperar hasta después de clase.. agarro mi teléfono, busco la palabra que no entendí si es que no quiero preguntarle al mismo profe o si es que no quiero interrumpir su clase… en ese mismo momento ocupo Google y eem.. lo busco, busco el significado, busco como poner en alguna frase nueva, en que aplicarlo, y así es como aprendo.. nuevas cosas en un par de minutos gracias a la tecnología.. entonces ahora, comienzo, empiezo a introducir y comento que si estoy de acuerdo con la declaración… escribiendo… voy a describir lo mismo que dije en el ejemplo pero.. eemmmm en palabras lo estaba haciendo en español…..escribiendo… eemmm empiezo a pensar en las palabras como ee.. i agree with this statement because…. Escribiendo… escribir en español se hace un
poco más fácil porque uno ya conoce las teclas, pero en escribir en inglés soy más cuidadoso en tocar el teclado ... escribiendo... describo como en cinco minutos hoy en día uno ya puede tener la respuesta a algo... o la definición de algo... escribiendo... intento asociarlo como a un ejemplo, que puede ser lo último que busque en clases... o ... antes una persona podía también preguntarle a una persona mayor pero si esta persona no sabía, y ahora llego otra idea a mi mente que es como que uno tiene que cultivar el pensamiento porque si después tus hijos te preguntan que es algo y no sabes, o sea les podí decir googlealo o podí explicarles tu mismo.. pero yo creo que cuando mi papa me explica algo es más entendible, porque me lo dices con tus palabras, en Google es una definición más estricta... mi papa como que entiende como hacérmelo entender.. eso puede ser igual... igual una desventaja..... escribiendo... entonces ahora estoy uniendo el primer ejemplo con el segundo ejemplo quizás haya un poco de silencio mientras uno da estas ideas ... estoy leyendo una y otra vez, eemmm para que tenga sentido, se entienda y haya coherencia ... escribiendo... ahora estoy ejemplificando el ... o sea estoy describiendo el segundo, la segunda idea de cómo .de como antes tenían que ocupar un libro o preguntarle a una persona que tuviera ese conocimiento... pero lo más común era como ir a la biblioteca según mi papa, ir a la biblioteca y buscar el significado de la cosa y hacer ejercicios con esto para después aplicarlo y aprender nuevos ... como.. en verdad como aplicarlo en el día a día... entonces by searching it on Google or in your computer.. bac in the days you have to wait in the classes ... escribiendo.... Estoy describiendo como.. como .. eeeh las personas se tenían que acercar a la biblioteca y eemmm ocupar los recursos que habían en ella, que eran los libros.. y eee como tenían que buscar la palabra.. por ejemplo si era en el diccionario y tenían que buscar un diccionario, tenían que buscar la palabra, describirla o ocuparla en una oración y así .. después sabían cómo usarla en diferentes contextos y como a diferencia de ee esto que acabo de describir... tardas ciertos minutos y como ocupando tu teléfono.. dependiendo de si hay una buena conexión a internet.. lo cual eso igual puede ser una desventaja... nos ayuda a en cinco minutos ya entender la palabra y volver a la clase.. sin desconcentrarse mucho, teniendo ya quizás una palabra nueva, aprendida.. escribiendo... hice una
nota mental acá.. para comprender lo que tengo que ir uniendo.. para que no pierda
la idea…..escribiendo… ahora estoy dando el ejemplo lo ultimo que busque que fue
que era aaa que era lo que estaba sucediendo en Hong Kong debido a la, a las
protestas que se han dado.. escribiendo… eeem me pasa mucho que escribo..
como puedo hablar en ingles y español.. y irme apoyando en lo que me sienta mas
cómodo con las palabras.. es que si no se me un término en español y si me lo sé
en inglés.. rápidamente lo digo en inglés, por ejemplo acá literal escribí for ejemplo
in Hong Kong  y es for example, entonces lo cambié…pero se me da eso de que
puedo pasar de uno a otro y no dar.. o sea, no darme cuenta pero a veces se pasa
… escribiendo… esa es la otra cosa, que el internet me pudo dar información
actualizada de cómo es la situación en este momento en Hong Kong y volviendo a
el pasado por así decirlo mi papá debió haber esperado las noticias o la radio hasta
que nombraran ese asunto en especifico entonces había que estar atento o el diario
al día siguiente… entonces el tiempo ha disminuido en como antes había que
esperar por algo y ahora está simplemente en la palma de la mano a cinco
minutos….escribiendo… eemm ahora sigo desarrollando la idea como para
contextualizar lo que esta sucediendo en Hong Kong y compararlo y luego poner
como las personas antes tenían que esperar a que llegara el diario o escucharan la
radio … escribiendo… y también nombré la televisión pero.. no todas las personas
tenían televisión… entonces mi papa me contaba que a veces al ir a ver un partido,
tenía que ir a la casa de un vecino y no sólo llegaba él, llegaban diferentes familias
con su aporte para comer algo y ver el partido…. escribiendo… al igual que los
teléfonos, no todos tenían teléfonos… escribiendo… estoy… me desconcentré,
ahora volví… estoy terminando la idea de lo sucedido en Hong Kong, ya quitándole
un poco de información para no contextualizar tanto porque no es tan necesario, es
sólo para ejemplificar algo simple… escribiendo… estoy buscando la palabra
correcta para describir a… la palabra es extradición… y ahora estoy escribiendo en
mis palabras a lo que me refiero… porque primero doy una definición como formal
y luego lo describo con mis palabras para que se entienda lo máximo posible…
escribiendo… estoy ocupando la misma frase que lei en el, en el, en internet que es
que Hong Kong quiere mantener su alma o espíritu y los políticos le están intentando
quitársela, lo que queda de ella… escribiendo… termino la última idea del ejemplo que es que los políticos quieren hacer cambios que le van a quitar esta alma restante… escribiendo… entonces termine el ejemplo y ahora termino paso a el de mi padre en el que describo como él se podría haber enterado de la situación sucedida… escribiendo… estoy de nuevo… ya lo nombré pero ahora lo estoy pasando como a la hoja… como tienen que esperar en periodos largos de tiempo para saber la información actualizada… escribiendo… es como… compararlo a como antes, el diario en algún punto de Chile, por ejemplo se imprimía acá en Santiago y de Santiago se iba a regiones y llegaba en la tarde… o llegaba, antes llegaba el día siguiente… el diario del día anterior, el de las noticias de Santiago del día anterior y ahora llegan en la tarde y bueno en un tiempo llegaban en la tarde y ahora llegan en la mañana… de hecho son enviados en el vuelo, en el primer vuelo de la mañana o creo que de la noche… entonces ya ejemplifique por qué estaba de acuerdo en dos cosas, voy por un tercer ejemplo y luego se me vino a la mente como cerrar con una buena conclusión y agregarle más información… leyendo … eemm leyendo lo que voy escribiendo,, ee hay ciertas cosas que no tienen sentido porque estaba como explicando lo que quería escribir y escribo algo breve y si estuviera solo describiéndomelo a mi mismo, en mi mente… creo que escribiría de mejor manera, entonces el pensar esto en voz alta me ha desconcentrado de lo que voy escribiendo, entonces voy a seguir quizás en silencio para retomar la idea, concentrarme y ahí tome más sentido… me gusta que haya coherencia en lo que voy escribiendo, no ideas sueltas, entonces voy a intentar, o voy intentando unir cada cosa para que se entienda a donde va el artículo o el texto… escribiendo… explico como hoy en día los tiempos de espera… y estoy pensando cómo decir la palabra tiempos de espera, son más cortos sin embargo que los tiempos de antes eran más largos, y cómo la tecnología ha ayudado en que estos tiempos sean más cortos, antes si uno quería hacer una llamada, y eso se me viene el tercer ejemplo a la mente, como cuando uno intenta hacer una llamada, se le hace más fácil… ya que es solo agarrar la mano en el bolsillo, o sea el teléfono en el bolsillo, hacer la llamada y antes, uno tenia que ir al almacén o a la casa de un vecino y pedirles que les prestaran el teléfono un poco porque necesitaban hacer una llamada a tal hora,
o que a tal hora iban a recibir una llamada y esa otra cosa, antes había mucha puntualidad… entonces a las seis tu ibas a recibir una llamada y tenías que estar ahí a las seis cincuenta, o sea a las cinco cincuenta porque a las seis ibas a recibir esa llamada y si o si tenías que estar ahí…..pensando…. empiezo a describir como… eemm como voy a contextualizar este ejemplo… comienzo diciendo… mmm back in the days, not everyone had a cellphone…. Estaba escribiendo con block mayus pero bueno, la siguiente idea es mmm there was a disadvantage compare to nowadays, como era una de las desventajas… aunque quizás todo era más simple, no sé…escribiendo... agrego la idea de que también el tener un teléfono es una distracción…escribiendo… estoy anotando como antes el salir en una cita con una persona era diferente debido a que… uno no estaba conversando todo el día con esta persona por whatsapp sino que había que decir un día, juntarse en una hora, en un lugar y llegar al lugar a la hora, uno no estaba así como, oye ya llegaste o oye nos juntamos al final o la cuestión o sea lo que se decía se hacía y si no llegabas era por algo… entonces describo como era más fácil y voy having a date was easier because you had..escribiendo.. como uno tenía que acercarse y hablar de una vez con la persona y no mandarle solicitud, esperar un mensaje de vuelta y la cuestión…escribiendo… estoy describiendo como el nuevo proceso de solicitud…escribiendo… solicitud, like y eee bueno direct message…escribiendo… agrego la frase things were simple, more simple…escribiendo… y ahora conectando con esa idea… digo pero, a lo que yo más rescato es como eee el acceso a información de una manera rápida, en poco tiempo, entonces rescato esto comparado con el pasado y como se ha avanzado, que la tecnología es un aporte para mi y esta es la forma en la que lo voy a expresar en el papel como para cerrar y es que la tecnología nos ha ayudado a cerrar estos gaps de tiempo y a facilitado la comunicación…escribiendo… eemm conecto la idea de cómo el ser humano quiere las cosas más fáciles y como eem la tecnología responde a .. satisfacer necesidades que van cambiando con el tiempo, entonces voy a intentar pasar eso a una frase que suene cool pero que se entienda…escribiendo… estoy viendo cómo escribir easier deletreando E A S I R maybe… entonces describí que el ser humano quiere las cosas más fáciles por eso
es que crea avances tecnológicos para satisfacer estas necesidades… escribiendo… eemmm estoy describiendo la palabra vehicles y tratando de recordar como se escribe, normalmente no la ocupo en mi vocabulario.. mmm voy a escribirla en español y por ejemplo en este momento la buscaría en Google, no tendría que buscarla en un diccionario…. Y emm se me ocurre otra idea como para el cierre o conclusión, que es que como al ser humano al querer facilitar o querer acortar los tiempo de espera, los cinco minutos del teléfono o antes eran horas caminando, ahora pueden ser una hora en bus y luego puede ser media hora en un auto o en moto, entonces cómo hemos querido facilitar las cosas y creamos objetos que nos faciliten este tipo de cosas…escribiendo… describo como estas cosas hacen más fácil nuestro traslado o comunicación…escribiendo… emm agrego un breve ejemplo de cómo antes ir a Europa tardaba varios días y como hoy en día en un día o unos, ya antes había que tomar un tren…escribiendo… y lo caro que era y como solo, bueno, eso es lo otro, que antes las cosas eran mas accesibles, menos accesibles y hoy en día son más accesibles…escribiendo… empiezo a, dejé la idea anterior inconclusa, empiezo a escribir la conclusión intentando unir los puntos…escribiendo… ocupó la frase things get easier as the time goes by…escribiendo… cierro con una pregunta, solamente para ocupar… ocuparía la frase spice things a little bit…escribiendo… pienso como plantear la pregunta… y cómo ocupar una palabra mmm.. lento, así como que se tarde mucho así como simple and… mmm…. porque sería compararlo, porque hoy en día si comparamos los tiempos… uno pesa mucho más que el otro, uno tarda mucho más que el otro… y…. bueno tengo tres ideas inconclusas… comienzo a redactar la última pregunta …escribiendo… quizás, ahí ya planteé la pregunta, de la manera que si a la persona, al lector les gustara las cosas fáciles, simples, pero bacanes porque seguiría de otra manera el proceso… o rápido, fácil y quizás losing this process porque quizás saltando estos gaps de tiempo, estamos perdiendo el peso de ciertas cosas y estamos olvidando que no todo es tan fácil…escribiendo… ee ahora volví al ejemplo de cómo había que tomar un tren para ir a Argentina, después a Brasil y de Brasil un barco a Portugal y ahora solamente en un vuelo sin escalas ya se puede llegar ahí… escribiendo… ocupé la frase book a flight… escribir mal
less…escribiendo… terminé el ejemplo y eem pongo como con esto me refiera a...
with this… escribiendo… intento unir la frase como en el campo de los viajes con
alguna palabra acertada, with this, i mean that time and traveling… mmm entonces
ahora no supe como seguir esa oración por lo tanto la voy a plantear de otra manera
y la borro… escribiendo… eemm describo nuevamente la idea de cómo las cosas
se ha hecho más easy, más fáciles por los aviones y diferentes
cosas…escribiendo… y ahora alargué la idea y puse como todo se ha hecho más
fácil, gracias a los teléfonos, a la tele, las máquinas para lavar, los autos…
escribiendo… invent.. inventions…escribiendo… entonces puse la frase luego,
things get easier as the time goes by because we make it that way, we get to do
things that make our lives easier y terminó con la pregunta how do you like things?
Like they were before, simple but cool and kind of long or fast, easier and maybe
losing the y voy a poner source of the process y ahí terminé".