

## METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES AND STRATEGIES IN TEACHING WRITTEN COMPOSITION

**Tursunboyeva Robiya Shuxrat kizi**

Namangan State University Faculty of World Languages

Philology and Language Teaching English 4th year student

**Abstract:** This article examines methodological approaches and strategies used in teaching written composition in English language education. Written composition is interpreted not only as the production of correct sentences, but also as a complex cognitive, communicative and socio-cultural activity through which learners plan ideas, organize arguments, select appropriate linguistic means, revise meaning and construct an authorial position. The study systematizes process-based, genre-based, product-oriented, task-based, collaborative, reflective and digital approaches and explains how they may be integrated in a learner-centered classroom. The findings show that effective composition teaching requires explicit instruction, guided practice, peer response, formative assessment and autonomous revision organized as interconnected stages of writing development.

**Keywords:** written composition, teaching methodology, process approach, genre pedagogy, academic writing, EFL learners, feedback, writing strategies, assessment.

**Introduction:** The teaching of written composition occupies a central position in modern language education because writing functions simultaneously as a means of communication, a tool of cognition and a mechanism of academic socialization. In the conditions of English as a foreign language learning, composition is especially demanding: learners are expected not only to know vocabulary and grammar, but also to organize ideas according to disciplinary, cultural and rhetorical conventions. Therefore, the methodological organization of composition instruction cannot be reduced to the correction of mistakes after a text has been produced. It requires a scientifically grounded system of pedagogical actions that gradually transforms the learner from a passive reproducer of sentence patterns into an active author capable of planning, drafting, revising, evaluating and improving a meaningful text[1]. The relevance of the issue is strengthened by international academic mobility, digital communication and competence-based education. Written communication is required in essays, reports, summaries, research proposals, reflective journals, online discussions and professional correspondence. In each of these genres the student must demonstrate linguistic accuracy, logical coherence, rhetorical appropriateness and the ability to present an argument in a socially acceptable form[2]. Consequently, written composition should be considered a multidimensional competence that includes linguistic, cognitive, communicative, strategic, sociocultural and metacognitive components. If only one component is developed, the learner may produce a text that is grammatically acceptable but conceptually weak, or logically interesting but stylistically inappropriate[3]. In traditional practice, writing was often taught through a product-oriented model: the teacher introduced a topic, students wrote a final text, and assessment focused mainly on grammar, spelling and vocabulary errors. This model has a certain didactic value because it encourages attention to formal correctness and textual discipline[4]. However, it is insufficient when the goal is to develop independent composition skills. Modern pedagogy emphasizes that a finished composition is the visible result of a longer invisible process that includes idea generation, audience awareness, selection of content, organization, drafting, peer discussion, teacher feedback, revision and editing. From this perspective, the quality of a text depends not only on



the learner's language level but also on the strategies used before, during and after writing[5]. The process approach has made an important contribution by shifting attention from final product to writing as an iterative activity. Pre-writing activities stimulate conceptual preparation; drafting encourages fluency and risk-taking; revising develops the ability to rethink meaning; editing improves accuracy; and presentation gives the text a communicative purpose. Nevertheless, the process approach alone may not fully explain how different types of texts are structured in academic and professional communities. For this reason, genre-based pedagogy has become equally important. It teaches students to analyze model texts, identify communicative purposes, understand rhetorical moves and use language patterns appropriate for a particular genre[6]. A scientifically effective methodology of written composition must integrate these approaches rather than oppose them. Product orientation provides standards of correctness and textual form; process orientation develops strategic and reflective writing behavior; genre pedagogy builds awareness of audience, purpose and convention; task-based learning creates meaningful communicative situations; collaborative learning strengthens peer interaction; and digital tools expand feedback channels. When these approaches are organized in a coherent instructional system, writing becomes not an isolated school task but a developmental practice connected with thinking, reading, speaking and research activity[7]. The problem is particularly significant for learners whose first language and educational culture differ from English academic discourse conventions. Uzbek learners of English may experience difficulties in thesis formulation, paragraph unity, explicit argumentation, citation practices, cohesion and the balance between personal voice and academic objectivity. These difficulties are not signs of intellectual weakness; they reflect the complex transition from one rhetorical tradition to another. Methodologically, this means that teachers should avoid treating composition errors only as individual failures. Instead, errors should be analyzed as indicators of developmental needs and used as diagnostic evidence for designing instruction[8]. Another important aspect is the role of feedback. In many classrooms, feedback is limited to underlining errors or providing a final grade. Such feedback often informs students that something is wrong but does not explain how to improve the text. Contemporary methodology recommends formative, dialogic and criteria-based feedback. Teacher comments should address content, organization, language and style; peer response should be structured through clear rubrics; self-assessment should help students monitor their own progress; and revision should be required so that feedback becomes a productive part of learning. The purpose of the article is to analyze the main methodological approaches and strategies in teaching written composition, to synthesize Uzbek and international research perspectives, and to identify pedagogical conditions under which learners can develop sustainable writing competence. The scientific significance of the article lies in its attempt to describe composition instruction as an integrated methodological system. Its practical significance is that the proposed ideas can be used by English teachers, curriculum designers and researchers who seek to improve learners' ability to produce coherent, meaningful and academically appropriate written texts.

**Literature Review:** The study of written composition in Uzbek educational and scholarly contexts has gradually moved from a narrow understanding of writing as grammatical accuracy toward a broader interpretation of writing as academic communication and strategic text construction. Among Uzbek researchers, Dilfuza Akhmedjanova's reflection on university students' writing practices in an online Academic English course at Westminster International University in Tashkent is important because it connects composition pedagogy with the realities of digital instruction, learner autonomy and academic discourse. Her work demonstrates that students' written performance is influenced not only by linguistic competence but also by the learning environment, the availability of interaction and the organization of feedback. In this



interpretation, online writing is not a simplified version of classroom writing; it creates new conditions in which students must manage time, respond to digital tasks, revise texts independently and negotiate academic expectations through mediated communication[9]. Another relevant Uzbek contribution can be associated with Abdulkhay Kosimov's research on challenges in instructing English writing among Uzbek EFL learners. His study draws attention to the fact that writing difficulties in Uzbekistan are multidimensional: learners may have limited vocabulary, insufficient command of complex sentence structures, weak paragraph organization, uncertainty about academic style and limited experience in revising drafts. The importance of this perspective is that it does not isolate writing problems from pedagogy. Instead, it links learner difficulties with the methodological choices made in classrooms. If writing is taught mainly through translation, memorization or one-time testing, students may not acquire strategies for planning, developing arguments and editing their texts[10]. When the views of Akhmedjanova and Kosimov are considered together, a coherent national research perspective becomes visible. Akhmedjanova emphasizes the conditions and practices of academic writing in a digital university environment, while Kosimov highlights the pedagogical and learner-related challenges that affect the development of English writing competence in the Uzbek EFL context. Both directions confirm that effective composition teaching requires more than error correction. It requires purposeful modeling, systematic practice, meaningful feedback, technological support, genre awareness and learner responsibility. Their ideas also correspond to broader international theories of L2 writing, especially the process approach, genre pedagogy and socio-cognitive views of composition.

**Methodological Part:** The methodological basis of this article was formed through an integrated research design that combined theoretical analysis, comparative interpretation, pedagogical generalization and didactic modeling. The theoretical-analytical method was used to clarify the concept of written composition and to distinguish it from narrower categories such as sentence writing, controlled exercises or mechanical transcription. Through this method, composition was interpreted as a complex pedagogical phenomenon involving linguistic accuracy, textual coherence, rhetorical purpose, cognitive planning and socio-cultural appropriateness. The comparative method was applied to examine the relationship between product-oriented, process-based, genre-based, task-based and collaborative approaches. This comparison made it possible to identify not only the advantages of each approach but also their limitations when they are used separately. The article also used content analysis of scholarly ideas related to EFL writing pedagogy. This method allowed the study to synthesize Uzbek and foreign research positions and to classify the most relevant instructional strategies for teaching composition. Pedagogical observation was treated as a methodological principle for understanding typical classroom difficulties, including weak thesis statements, insufficient paragraph unity, limited transition devices, grammar interference and the absence of revision habits. The diagnostic-interpretive method was used to view learner errors not as accidental defects but as indicators of developmental stages in writing competence. On this basis, the article proposes that teachers should analyze written products in relation to the processes that produced them. Didactic modeling was employed to construct an integrated sequence of composition instruction: motivation and topic activation, model text analysis, vocabulary and idea preparation, outlining, drafting, peer response, teacher feedback, revision, editing and final reflection. In addition, formative assessment was used as a methodological instrument. Rubrics, self-assessment checklists, peer review forms and revision portfolios were interpreted as tools for making writing criteria transparent to learners. The methodological logic of the article is therefore qualitative and pedagogical rather than statistical: it explains how approaches and strategies can be organized into a coherent instructional system.



**Results:** The analysis shows that the most effective teaching of written composition is achieved when methodological approaches are organized as a balanced system. A purely product-oriented approach may improve surface accuracy, yet it does not sufficiently develop the learner's ability to generate ideas, revise arguments and adapt writing to a specific audience. A purely process-oriented approach may encourage fluency and confidence, but without explicit genre instruction students may produce texts that lack academic structure or rhetorical appropriateness. A genre-based approach gives learners models and conventions, but if it is applied mechanically it may lead to imitation rather than independent expression. Therefore, the first result of the study is the need for methodological integration. Composition pedagogy should combine model analysis, strategic drafting, collaborative response, explicit language focus and reflective revision. The second result concerns the centrality of pre-writing. Learners who begin writing without conceptual preparation often produce texts that are repetitive, poorly organized or dependent on translation from the first language. Pre-writing strategies such as brainstorming, clustering, questioning, reading short model texts, discussing the audience and preparing outlines help students transform general ideas into structured content. These activities reduce cognitive overload because learners do not have to invent content, organize structure and control grammar at the same time. The third result is connected with revision. Revision should be taught not only as grammar correction but also as the reconstruction of meaning, organization and argument. The fourth result indicates that feedback must be dialogic and criteria-based. Effective feedback does not simply evaluate a text; it guides the learner toward the next version of the text. Comments should be specific, manageable and connected with clear assessment criteria. Peer feedback becomes productive when learners are given structured questions rather than being asked to comment freely. The fifth result is that digital tools can strengthen composition instruction when they are used pedagogically. Online platforms, shared documents, electronic portfolios and automated language support can provide opportunities for drafting, commenting and storing revisions. Overall, the results confirm that written composition develops through a sequence of purposeful actions in which language, thinking, genre knowledge and assessment are systematically connected.

**Discussion:** The methodological debate on written composition can be clearly observed in the polemics between two influential foreign scholars: John R. Hayes and Ken Hyland. Hayes, developing the cognitive tradition of writing research together with Linda Flower and later in his own updated models, views writing primarily as a problem-solving process. From this perspective, the writer plans, translates ideas into language, reviews the emerging text and monitors goals through working memory and long-term knowledge. The strength of this position is that it reveals the invisible mental operations behind composition. It explains why students struggle when they lack planning strategies, cannot manage multiple demands simultaneously or do not know how to revise. In pedagogical terms, Hayes's view supports process-based instruction, strategy training, reflective drafting and the gradual development of self-regulation. Hyland, however, argues from a genre and discourse-oriented perspective that writing cannot be understood only as an individual cognitive process. For him, successful writing is participation in socially recognized communicative practices. A student does not simply express thoughts; the student writes within genres that have purposes, audiences, structures, lexical patterns and institutional expectations. From this viewpoint, process pedagogy may become incomplete if it encourages personal discovery but does not explicitly teach how academic and professional texts are organized. Hyland's position supports genre analysis, modeling, corpus-informed instruction and explicit attention to disciplinary discourse. The polemic between these two positions is productive for methodology. If Hayes's cognitive model is absolutized, the teacher may focus too much on planning and revision while underestimating the social conventions that determine



whether a text is acceptable in an academic community. If Hyland's genre pedagogy is absolutized, the teacher may overemphasize models and conventions, limiting the learner's creative and critical engagement with meaning. The present article takes an integrative position: written composition should be taught as both a cognitive process and a social practice. Students need strategies for generating and revising ideas, but they also need explicit knowledge of genre, audience and discourse norms.

**Conclusion:** In conclusion, methodological approaches and strategies in teaching written composition should be understood as an integrated pedagogical system aimed at developing the learner's ability to create coherent, purposeful and linguistically accurate texts. Written composition is not limited to the final written product; it includes planning, drafting, negotiating meaning, receiving feedback, revising, editing and reflecting on one's own progress. The study has shown that process-based, genre-based, product-oriented, task-based, collaborative and digital approaches each contribute important elements to writing instruction, but none of them is sufficient when applied alone. The article also confirms that the development of composition skills requires explicit instruction in both linguistic and rhetorical dimensions. Students should be taught how to formulate a thesis, construct paragraphs, use cohesive devices, develop arguments, integrate examples and maintain an appropriate academic style. At the same time, they need opportunities to write for meaningful purposes, discuss drafts with peers, receive formative feedback and revise their texts on the basis of clear criteria. For the Uzbek EFL context, this means that composition teaching should move beyond translation-based and examination-centered practices toward a reflective and communicative model. Consequently, the strategic improvement of written composition instruction depends on methodological integration, systematic feedback, contextual sensitivity and the teacher's ability to transform writing from a formal assignment into a developmental practice of thinking and communication.

## References

1. Badger, R., & White, G. (2000). A process genre approach to teaching writing. *ELT Journal*, 54(2), 153-160.
2. Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A cognitive process theory of writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
3. Kosimov, A. A., & To'lqinboyeva, N. Sh. (2024). Challenges in instructing English writing among Uzbek EFL learners. Fergana State University.
4. Goziyeva, I., & Shohbozbek, E. (2025). Pedagogik jarayonda talabalarning motivatsiyasini oshirish uchun zamonaviy yondashuvlar. *Global Science Review*, 4(3), 348-355.
5. Ismoilov, T. I. (2018). Provision of information-psychological security in open information systems. *Теория и практика современной науки*, (1 (31)), 24-26.
6. Ismailovna T. G. The Effectiveness of Applying Innovative Pedagogical Technologies in Environmental Education //Nvpubhouse Library for European International Journal of Pedagogics. – 2025. – Т. 5. – №. 08. – С. 30-34.
7. Ergashbaev, S. (2025). O'zbekiston sharoitida uzluksiz ta'lim tizimi orqali yoshlarning ma'naviy dunyoqarashini rivojlantirish. *Объединяя студентов: международные исследования и сотрудничество между дисциплинами*, 1(1), 314-316.
8. Ismoilov, T. (2019). The importance of outdoor games in the upbringing of a harmonious young generation. *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, 1(11), 257-261.
9. Gulbahor, O., & Shohbozbek, E. (2025). O'zbekistonda zamonaviy pedagogik texnologiyalari orqali uzluksiz ta'limni rivojlantirish. *Global Science Review*, 3(4), 77-82.



10. Ismoilov, T. (2020). The development of physical qualities of the pupils of primary forms of secondary schools through mobile activities in the process of study. Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University, 2(11), 391-394.

