



## **SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEMS OF TEACHING WRITING SKILLS IN ENGLISH IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS BASED ON FOREIGN MANUALS**

Mustaeva Guldora Salaxiddinovna

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) Philological Sciences,  
Tashkent state Transport University, Uzbekistan

### **Annotation**

In teaching writing, there are number of strategies that can be used. This study was intended to explore the teaching writing strategies used by the teacher, the differences in teaching, and the problems encountered by the English teacher in teaching writing skill. This study was a descriptive qualitative study. They were observed during the teaching and learning process and also interviewed. The data taken from observation and interview were analyzed in order to find out the answer the research questions.

**Keywords:** Writing intervention, Evidence-based, Elementary grades.

### **Introduction**

To be defined as a good English speaker, there are four major skills that should be mastered namely: listening, reading, writing and speaking. Among the four skills, writing is one of the most difficult skills to learn especially for foreign language students. It is because students need to consider many linguistic aspects such as grammar and vocabulary. However, writing is important for students. Besides as a form of communication, writing is a necessary activity in everyday lives such in business, creativity, and in scholarly pursuits. In EFL context, explains that writing skill stimulates thinking, compels students to concentrate and organize their ideas, and cultivates their ability to summarize, analyze, and criticize. Along the process of writing, students have major writing difficulties in grammatical, cohesion and coherence terms. Moreover, they also identified students' minor writing difficulties such as paragraph organization, dictions, and vocabulary misspelling. they also identified students' minor writing difficulties such as paragraph organization, dictions, and vocabulary misspelling. This indicated that writing is not an easy task for students especially EFL students. Therefore, the present of teacher is very essential for students during their writing process. Teachers are required to teach writing to the students effectively. In teaching writing, the teacher's role is facilitator. As a facilitator, the teacher offers guidance in helping students to engage in the thinking process of writing. However, the teaching writing is a very demanding task and there





will be challenges for teacher. The challenges are related to: the linguistic and the cultural differences between the target language and the native language, the learners, the teachers, and the teaching context. In facing the challenges, suggests that teachers can use different strategies of teaching to achieve the teaching-learning goals. A correct and appropriate strategy may help the students along the process of writing. It can be said that in teaching writing, teaching strategies become a very important aspect in the teaching and learning process. Selecting the right strategy enables teacher and students to achieve the learning goals. In addition, the use of appropriate strategy can motivate students in the learning process of writing. There are many strategies that teachers can use in teaching writing. These strategies have their advantages and disadvantages. Seeing the importance of the role of teaching writing strategies, this research was conducted to explore teaching writing strategies used by teachers. In addition, this research will also explore the difficulties faced by teachers in teaching writing.

Given all of the possible knowledge sources teachers can access or experience, there is an abundance of information, recommendations, and teaching materials on how to teach writing that is available to teachers. This blessing experiences at least one serious limitation. Too often, there is limited, circumscribed, or no evidence that the proffered advice, know-how, or wisdom works. There are many claims about what is effective, but too little proof. Unfortunately, this observation applies to much of the lore that teachers acquire about writing instruction. Teaching lore mainly involves writing practices teachers experienced when they learned to write, instructional practices teachers develop and apply with their students, writing practices they see other teachers apply, and teaching practices promoted by experts. While we have no doubt that teachers and experts possess considerable knowledge and insight about how to teach writing, basing the teaching of this complex skill on such lore alone is risky. Why is this the case? One reason is that it is difficult to determine which aspects of teaching lore are valid. For example, there are many things a teacher does while teaching writing. When their students' writing improves, they may attribute this change to specific procedures they applied. While this evaluation may be correct, it is also possible that this judgment is incorrect or only applies to some students or to a procedure in a given context. Teachers are not the only ones who can succumb to such selective bias. Specific teaching lore promoted by writing experts are also susceptible to misinterpretation in terms of their effectiveness. To illustrate, writing experts can overestimate the impact of favored instructional methods, forming judgments consistent with their philosophical views on writing development or instruction. For instance, proponents of the whole language approach to learning to read and write





believed that writing and reading develop naturally just like oral language. Consistent with these beliefs, they championed an approach to literacy instruction based on the use of informal teaching methods, while at the same time deemphasizing explicitly and systematically teaching students foundational writing and reading skills and strategies. Instead, these skills are only taught when the need arises, mostly through short mini-lessons. Advocates for whole language frequently promoted the effectiveness of this two-pronged approach, without providing much in the way of empirical evidence that it was effective, or perhaps even more importantly, that it was as effective as other alternatives such as reading and writing programs that emphasized reading and writing for real purposes, coupled with systematic and explicit skills and strategy instruction. Even for fundamental writing skills such as spelling, there is considerable evidence that both informal teaching and explicit instruction are effective, while whole language approaches are fundamentally misguided about what is written language. Whole language is not the only approach to teaching writing that has suffered from questionable claims about its effectiveness. Even the venerable Donald Graves was guilty of this to some degree with the process approach to writing that he supported and advocated. The evidence he offered in support of his favored approach to teaching writing relied in large part on testimonials and exemplar writing of selected students, presenting a potentially overly optimistic assessment of this approach. This is not to say that the process approach is ineffective, as there is now considerable empirical evidence supporting the opposite conclusion. Instead, this example illustrates that adopting whole cloth even highly popular and widely used teaching lore without careful consideration of its effectiveness and the evidence available to support it can be risky. The lack of evidence or the type of evidence provided can make it extremely difficult for teachers or other interested parties to determine if the testimonials or evidence used to support specific teaching lore in writing are representative or atypical. A third issue that makes some teaching lore risky is that it may be based on the experience of a single or a very small number of teachers. As an example, this can occur for knowledge a teacher acquires as a result of his or her experience teaching writing. The teaching practice(s) may in fact be effective for the students in this teacher's classroom, but they may not be effective when applied by another teacher or with different students. Until this proposition is tested, there is no way to determine if this teaching lore will produce reliable results when applied more broadly. As these concerns demonstrate, the validity, generalizability, and replicability of instructional practices based on teaching lore are uncertain. This is not to devalue what teachers or experts know, but to demonstrate the limits of this knowledge.





Related to students' initial sentence, spelling, and reading skills. In another study focused on improving students' sentence construction skills, and her colleagues in Italy examined the effectiveness of an oral language intervention to improve the sentence construction skills of fifth and tenth grade students. This oral treatment did enhance the sentence writing skills of the younger fifth grade students. This study provides needed evidence that interventions aimed at improving oral language skills transfer to writing. Chung and his colleagues in the United States examined if sixth grade students' writing can be improved through self-assessment, planning and goal setting, and self-reflection when they revised a timed, on-demand essay. These students as well as students in the control condition were also taught how to revise such an essay. Treatment students evidenced greater writing gains, and were more confident about their revising capabilities than control students. Lastly, Graham and his colleagues in the United States examined if the revising behavior of fourth grade students experiencing difficulties with writing can be enhanced through the use of revising goals that focused attention on making substantive when revising stories. Applying such goals across four stories had a positive effect on the revising behavior of these students when these goals were not in effect, resulting in more text-level revisions, more revisions that changed the meaning of text, and more revisions rated as improving texts.

## References

1. <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JERE/article/viewFile/23682/14624>;
2. <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11145-021-10188-9.pdf>;
3. Begeron, B. (1990). What does the term whole language mean? constructing a definition from the literature. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 22, 301–329. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10862969009547716>;
4. Graham, S. (2018). The writer(s)-within-community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53, 258–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406>;
5. Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2018). Evidence-based writing practices: A meta-analysis of existing metaanalyses. In R. Fidalgo, K. R. Harris, & M. Braaksma (Eds.), *Design Principles for teaching efective writing: Theoretical and empirical grounded principles* (pp. 13–37). Brill Editions.;
6. Sandmel, K., & Graham, S. (2011). The process writing approach: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 104, 396–407. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2010.488703>;

