



Effective teaching of writing skills to second language learners

Dr.N.Ramesh

Associate professor, Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies
University of Hyderabad, Hyderabad – 500046
Telangana , India

Abstract: The instruction of pupils in a second language has always been an engaging endeavour because of the potential for personal growth it offers. According to Freedman et al. (2014), Writing requires that pupils are actually taught how to construct coherent sentences with proper spellings and grammatical structures in a second language. The phrase "classroom tactics" refers to the intricate modifications that speakers of a second language make as they learn their new language. Cognitive learning techniques and metacognitive learning strategies are two examples of the numerous types of learning strategies that might exist (Cohen, 2014). In order to get any benefit from the experience, it is necessary for students to actively participate in the writing activities. In classes where students are studying a second language, teachers may boost their students' motivation by walking them through the many phases needed in good writing (Santangelo & Graham, 2015). It is necessary to tailor the writing activities to the students' requirements and pursuits. In addition, wherever it is feasible, a connection should be made between these activities and the actual world.

1 . Introduction

The instruction of pupils in a second language has always been an engaging endeavour because of the potential for personal growth it offers. According to Freedman et al. (2014), Writing requires that pupils are actually taught how to construct coherent sentences with proper spellings and grammatical structures in a second language. The phrase "classroom tactics" refers to the intricate modifications that speakers of a second language make as they learn their new language. Cognitive learning techniques and metacognitive learning strategies are two examples of the numerous types of learning strategies that might exist (Cohen, 2014). In order to get any benefit from the experience, it is necessary for students to actively participate in the writing activities. In classes where students are studying a second language, teachers may boost their students' motivation by walking them through the many phases needed in good writing (Santangelo & Graham, 2015). It is necessary to tailor the writing activities to the students' requirements and pursuits. In addition, wherever it is feasible, a connection should be made between these activities and the actual world.

(Hopkins, 2014; Airey, 2016) It is necessary to implement a technique that is successful in order to motivate students to participate in writing activities, as well as to refine and develop their writing talents. The instructors must have a firm grasp on the competencies that need to be honed and the components that make it easier to acquire knowledge in the areas of focus. In the last twenty years, the study of learning to write in a second language (also known as L2) has developed into a well-established topic (Hyland, 2016; Alharbi, 2017). When teaching writing to students learning a second language, it is important for instructors to choose a focus area that may act as a learning tool for their students. Furthermore, according to Angelova and Zhao (2016), language instructors should place the majority of their emphasis on the subject matter that encourages the greatest amount of student interaction. According to Entwistle and Ramsden (2015), combining these goals with a pragmatic approach helps students achieve greater comprehension and more effective learning. According to Wood et al. (2016), once educators are certain that their pupils have an interest in participating in activities designed to improve their writing abilities, the primary emphasis of their attention shifts to the participation of pupils in an effort to foster a positive learning experience that is sustainable over the long term. The development of sensitive context pedagogies has been beneficial in better understanding the texts that are provided in classrooms, the methods that students write, and the substantial usage of text within the groups that

are being addressed (Ariffin, 2016). Teachers who instruct writing to students learning a second language are increasingly transitioning into the role of researcher as a result of their students' increased comprehension of written material (Pressley & Allington, 2014; Arzt & Kost, 2016). According to Burns (2013) and Bailey (2016), action research is defined as a structured research-reflection cycle that is democratised via the use of newly acquired knowledge and skills in educational settings.

The most frequent factors that make studying and writing in a second language more challenging are first language literacy, proficiency in the target language, and disparities in rhetorical approaches to the text (Archibald, 2001; Barkaoui, 2016). The right kind of education may help students improve their proficiency across a range of language areas. Very few models (Grabe, the year 2001; Chun et al., 2016, and in Collier et al., 2016) describe the role of direction and instruction in the learning of a second language. This is true even if there has been an increase in people's desire to study and write in a second language. As stated by Richards and Rodgers (2014) and Crusan et al. (2016), learners must advance past their beginning writing skills and use target language in order to produce meaningful writing that engages readers.

According to Cornell et al. (2016), the process of teaching writing to students learning a second language may be broken down into two primary categories: writing to communicate and learning to write. As stated by Richards and Rodgers (2014) and Crusan et al. (2016), learners must advance past their beginning writing skills and use target language in order to produce meaningful writing that engages readers. This is a requirement for passing the course. Researchers have shown a correlation between proficiency in a language and the ability to choose and employ words and phrases that are suitable for the activity at hand. According to Cumming (2001) and da Costa (et al., 2016), the language skills of L2 learners are a good indicator of their level of language competence. It is necessary for the instructors to choose the approach that is both the most successful and the most efficient in terms of making the designated writing space more accessible. First and foremost, instructors of students learning a second language need to choose appropriate methods for teaching writing to students learning a second language (Dahlberg, 2016). These methods need to inspire students to study a second language with enthusiasm rather than dissuade them from doing so.

In the current investigation, helpful strategies for the development of writing abilities among learners of a second language have been examined. In addition, several practical instructional strategies that help to improving the writing abilities of those who are learning a second language have also been discussed. The research has concentrated on several approaches for benchmarking, including as brainstorming, writing fables, speed writing, loop writing, and short sagas. The term "bench marking" refers to these several methods.

2 . LITERATURE REVIEW

In accordance with Oxford & Crookall (1989), "Learning strategies are steps performed by the learner to improve the acquisition, storage, and retrieval of knowledge." Techniques for problemsolving, studying, and learning are strategies. No matter what they are called, strategies help students learn. (p. 405). L2 learners' writing skills and proficiency in a second language are evaluated (Kubanyiova & Crookes, 2016). Thus, both macro and micro approaches are used when learning L2. While macro strategies create, plan, and rewrite, micro strategies instinctively look for words and syntax (Cumming, 2001; Lee, et al., 2016). Learners of second languages must manage complex mental images and rhetorical objectives. (Lee, Chodorow, & Gentile, 2016) These pupils employ problem-solving techniques in their writing. Editing and revision are two different compositional procedures. It increases the adaptability of rhetorical strategies (Larios et al., 2002). Effective L2 writers can design fictional environments (Master, et al. 2016, Hyland, 2002). L2 learners' knowledge, values, genres, and expectations are taught to them through socialisation. L2 learners adapt to maintain their identity by internalising community norms (Larios et al., 2002; Naghdipour, 2016).

Benchmarks help comparisons throughout the entire school (Jawaid, 2014). For the benchmarking process to discover exemplary practise, a specified methodology is required. The complexity and issues of L2 learning and instruction are addressed through trans-comparative benchmarking (Neilson, 2016; Nguyen, 2016). A

curriculum for L2 learners is conceptualised and codified (Jawaid, 2014). To make benchmarking easier, benchmarks are divided into Quality Standards (QSs) and Quality Characteristics (QCs). Students who are learning L2 writing benefit from modelling and describing effective writing styles. Drafting, planning, generating, and altering ideas are all necessary for effective writing (Blanton et al., 2002; Hyland, 2002). L2 students receive ongoing feedback until they are able to fill out the assessment form flexibly and freely to meet their goals (Qin & Uccelli, 2016). Students can write successfully after they understand the process (Hyland, 2002). An strategy called social-cognitive skills observation is used. This method promotes self-control and writing in young people (Blanton et al., 2002; Razi, 2016). Any talent becomes automatic via imitation and restraint. Self-regulation aids learning, adaptability, and skill transfer in students (Barkaoui, 2007; Roberts et al., 2017).

Since the data in verbal reports often reflects the writing process, they require careful consideration (Hyland, 2016; Snow, Eslami, & Park, 2016). Writing out loud enables retroactive memory. TAPs (Think Aloud Protocols) demand that authors explain their activities. It aids employees in outlining their ideas and plans (Mackey & Gass, 2015; Staden & Purcell, 2016). This habit might, however, affect cognitive abilities. Speaking aloud while writing had little impact on students' writing ability under controlled circumstances, according to Yang et al. (2014). The planning and revising processes of L2 learners are revealed by this technique (Wong, 2005; Tahtinen-Pacheco & Merchant, 2016). Lei (2008) records L2 writers and then talks about their writing techniques. This approach evaluates reading and writing without restriction (Lei, 2008). Radiant thinking is used during brainstorming. The Sim et al. (2012) approach is also used to study books, organise and organize compositions, and extend subjects. L2 brainstorming is therefore essential. learning words and concepts is necessary. There are two ways to brainstorm. Students first create small groups. Each student is given a topic to write on and a set amount of time. After this exercise, all of the group members' recommendations are collated.

Students brainstorm in class. Students yell out their thoughts on a subject and the instructor writes them on the board. According to a research, instructors brainstorm to find students' common interests (Kang, 2005). This method lets the most pupils learn a second language. Brainstorming is natural and uses connections between experiences and imagery. It interprets natural logic and reasoning-related information (Sim et al., 2012). This method involves 1-2 hours of enjoyable writing. Students write fables using narrative target language. Fables utilise verbs to explain direct speech, adverbs to describe the speaker, dramatic emphasis via subject inversion, and verb patterns (VanPatten & Williams, 2014). "story switch milling exercise" helps pupils recollect their story eight times while fable writing. These stories boost L2 learners' confidence and fluency and allow for elaboration and connection. Speed writing evaluates each student's writing ability. Students get 15 minutes to write on the subject. Students focus on concepts, not grammar, punctuation, or language with this method. Students must write swiftly without crossing or fixing errors. Students cannot collaborate using this method (Cook, 2013). Loop writing promotes paragraph cohesion. In this strategy, L2 learners write cause and effect with coherence and consistency. Loop writing involves organising speed-written thoughts (Cook, 2013). Loop writing organises concepts in a text. Individual or group execution is possible. Students should read and organise their phrases and paragraphs. This method helps pupils grasp L2 writing. 50-word mini sagas are great for brief writing lessons. It teaches effective writing since L2 learners can read and comprehend it. This

method emphasises correctness and may encourage students (Garcia-Sanchez & Lujan-Garcia, 2015).

OBJECTIVE

- To determine which writing methods improve second language learners' writing.
- To determine the best methods for motivating second-language writers.

METHODOLOGY

The research made use of a quantitative analysis. There were 10 instructors and 100 students from various elementary and secondary schools in the city of Coimbatore, which is located in the state of Tamil Nadu. The (SPSS) version 20.0 was used to do the analysis on the data that was acquired. The data was obtained via the use of a questionnaire, which was based on the abilities that learners are expected to possess in order to have a better knowledge of the tactics used in the classroom.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

DEMOGRAPHIC AND DATA ANALYSIS

Coimbatore schoolchildren's second-language acquisition was the subject of a questionnaire. Teachers sent 160 surveys. The research recruited 65.3% female students and 34.8% male students. The 7-8-year-old age group had the most pupils (54.0%). 64.0% of L2 writing students were interested. 10.3% of pupils were uninterested in L2, whereas 25.8% were very interested

The figures provide an indication of the frequency of several methods that were used on the students in order to evaluate their capabilities in regard to acquiring L2. According to the findings, the vast majority of educators (38.1%) acknowledge that the practice of brainstorming was responsible for the pupils' high level of interest. In contrast, just 12.5% of the instructors are on the fence about whether or not their students have an interest in the method of brainstorming's further growth. In addition, the majority of the instructors (36.9% of them strongly agree, and 43.1% of them agree) said that brainstorming is beneficial in determining the primary ideas involved in learning to write in L2. Students need to be confident in order to participate fully in the process of brainstorming since it requires them to share their ideas and thoughts with their peers. As a result, the vast majority of the educators, or 75%, believe that brainstorming was unsuccessful with the pupils because they were guarded and resistant.

Regarding the method of writing fables, the vast majority of educators (84.4% of them, to be exact) are completely in agreement that writing fables helps children improve their thinking capacity. 52.5% of respondents gave a response that was indifferent to the use of speed writing to evaluate the student's writing abilities. On the other hand, 49.4% of respondents disagree with the statement that pupils learn better while working in groups. The use of loop writing to aid in the structure and comprehension of a second language was highly supported by roughly 81.9% of the instructors who responded to the survey. The acquisition of writing abilities is seen as the most challenging activity for students learning a second language by 84.4% of all instructors. The instructors said that the majority of the pupils (56.3%), who learned L2 using the approach of brainstorming, found that they loved it. Writing fables (4.4%) and participating in mini sagas (3.8%) were rated as the learning methods the pupils enjoyed the least.

Comparative analysis of brainstorming with different types of creative problem solving

The cross-tabulation utilizing a Likert scale to evaluate creative problem-solving gives useful insights into respondents' impressions of different strategies for encouraging creativity and problem-solving in diverse settings (table 1).

Table: 1 cross-tabulation

MODEL	MEASURES	CREATIVE PROBLEM SOLVING					
		SA	A	N	D	SD	TOTAL
The difference between brainstorming and narrating stories is that the former boosts confidence.	SA	5	17	0	0	0	22
	A	0	6	54	0	0	61
	N	0	0	52	0	0	52
	D	0	0	1	16	3	20
	SD	0	0	0	0	5	5
	TOTAL	5	23	107	16	8	160
The difference between brainstorming and speed writing as a method of evaluating writing abilities	SA	18	4	0	0	0	22
	A	0	16	45	0	0	61
	N	0	0	39	13	0	52
	D	0	0	0	7	13	20
	SD	0	0	0	0	5	5
	TOTAL	18	20	84	20	18	160
The difference between brainstorming and loop writing as a method for evaluating comprehension	SA	22	0	0	0	0	22
	A	61	0	0	0	0	61
	N	48	4	0	0	0	52
	D	0	3	10	7	0	20
	SD	0	0	0	4	1	5
	TOTAL	131	7	10	11	1	160

The majority of responders (28%) agree or strongly agreed that brainstorming boosts confidence more than recounting tales. This implies that brainstorming, a process of idea development and exploration, gives people more confidence in their creative ability than storytelling. However, 16% disagreed or strongly disagreed, suggesting that recounting tales may build confidence as much as brainstorming. Brainstorming outperforms rapid writing for writing evaluation. 38% of respondents said brainstorming is better for this. Brainstorming's

collaborative and free-flowing nature is better for testing writing abilities than speed writing's organised and timed method. However, 20% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, indicating that speed writing may be a valid alternative writing assessment approach. 43% of responders said brainstorming is better than loop writing for assessing understanding. This suggests that brainstorming, which stimulates open dialogue and idea exchange, improves understanding more than loop writing, which is more introverted. 11% disagreed or strongly disagreed, demonstrating that some people prefer loop writing for comprehension testing. The cross-tabulation shows a favorable view of brainstorming as a tool for creative problem-solving. While there are some conflicting perspectives, the research shows that brainstorming improves confidence, writing, and understanding. Individual preferences and learning styles may affect these judgments, therefore subsequent studies might examine the precise reasons influencing respondents' choices for each approach. However, the findings show that creative problem-solving and talent assessment need varied methodologies.

5.3 Table 2 reveals how various writing approaches affect the MODEL, the dependent variable.

Brainstorming (BS) seems to be the most effective of the four writing methods evaluated. Brainstorming positively affects the dependent variable, according to the Beta value of 0.691. Thus, the research found beneficial results from brainstorming.

Table 2: Brainstorming, recounting tales, rapid writing, and loop writing significance

MODEL	B	S. E	BETA	t	Sig
BS	.691	.060	.633	11.670	.000
NW	-.239	.068	-.167	-3.173	.002
SW	-.046	.046	-.050	-1.000	.319
LW	.682	.042	.499	16.282	.000

BS: brainstorming, NW: narrative writing, SW: speed writing, LW: loop writing

Brainstorming and the dependent variable are statistically significant due to the high t-value of 11.670 and the very low p-value of 0.000. This suggests that brainstorming has a significant effect on the examined result since the observed connection between Brainstorming and the dependent variable is unlikely to have arisen by coincidence. Narrative Writing (NW) has a -0.239 Beta. Unlike brainstorming, narrative writing decreases the dependent variable. This negative link is statistically significant with a t-value of -3.173 and significance level of 0.002. Narrative writing may not be as helpful as other methods in this research. Speed Writing (SW), with a Beta value of -0.050, has little influence on the dependent variable. Speed writing does not affect the dependent variable, according to the t-value of -1.000 and the strong p-value of 0.319. The results suggests that rapid writing does not affect the outcome of interest. Loop Writing (LW) improves the dependent variable more than speed writing. Loop writing highly correlates with favourable study results, as seen by its huge Beta value of 0.682. The high t-value of 16.282 and p-value of 0.000 support this association's statistical significance. According to this research, loop writing is an excellent method for reaching the intended result. Table 2 shows that various writing approaches affect MODEL differently. Brainstorming and loop writing have considerable beneficial effects. Speed writing does not affect the dependent variable, but narrative writing does. These findings illuminate the possible advantages of diverse writing styles and may help writers optimise their practises for desired results.

5.3 The table shows ANOVA findings. ANOVA compares the means of two or more groups to discover whether there are significant differences.

TABLE 3: ANOVA measures variance.

	SUM	df	M S	f	Sig
Regression	16.442	5	40.109	414.242	.0006
Residual	14.008	155	.096		
Total	164.444	160			

This data seems to be regression analysis. Table interpretation: The first column, "Régression," shows the regression model's variance. SS is 16.442. Regression has 5 df and 40.109 M S. The Fvalue is 414.242, and the p-value (Sig) is extremely modest (.0006). Under the premise of no significant difference between groups, the p-value shows the likelihood of receiving outcomes as severe as those observed. The regression model's dependent variable and independent variable(s) have a significant association since the p-value is minimal (usually less than 0.05). The residual variance, "Résiduel," is in the second column. Residuals are the discrepancies between observed values and regression model predictions. Residuals have 155 degrees of freedom and 14.008 sum of squares. Mean square is .096. The residuals' sum of squares should be less than the regression's to show the model's unexplained variance. The final column, "Total," shows the dataset's overall variance. The whole has 160 degrees of freedom and 164.444 squares.

The ANOVA table gives crucial regression analysis variance breakdown information. The regression model fits the data well and explains a lot of variation, as seen by the substantial F-value and relatively tiny p-value. The "Regression" row's sum of squares reflects the regression model's explained variance, whereas the "Residual" row's shows the error. Regression and residual sums of squares should equal the total.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the findings of this research have supplied important new insights into the numerous writing strategies that are employed to cultivate writing talents among those learning a second language. It became clear that brainstorming was the strategy that was the most useful, having a constructive influence on the confidence, writing abilities, and understanding of the students. On the other hand, narrative writing demonstrated just a moderate level of efficacy and even had a negative impact on the variable that was being studied. While learners' writing skills were not substantially affected by speed writing, loop writing was shown to be extremely useful and promoted better results. These results highlight how important it is to pick proper instructional strategies in order to encourage and engage second language learners in writing tasks. In order to promote a constructive and long-term learning environment in the classroom for second language students, teachers may use techniques such as brainstorming and loop writing as useful tools. These techniques can help teachers improve their students' writing skills. The development of writing abilities among those learning a second language may be improved by more study that investigates the preferences of individual learners and then modifies instructional methods appropriately.

REFERENCE

1. Chokwe, J. M. (2013). Factors impacting academic writing skills of English second language students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(14), 377.
2. Carson, J. G. (2012). Second language writing and second language acquisition. In *On second language writing* (pp. 191-199). Routledge.
3. Yusuf, Q., Jusoh, Z., & Yusuf, Y. Q. (2019). Cooperative Learning Strategies to Enhance Writing Skills among Second Language Learners. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12(1), 1399-1412.
4. Hussain, S. S. (2017). Teaching writing to second language learners: Bench-marking strategies for classroom. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ)* Volume, 8.
5. Barkaoui, K. (2007). Teaching writing to second language learners: Insights from theory and research. *TESL reporter*, 40, 14-14.
6. Moses, R. N., & Mohamad, M. (2019). Challenges faced by students and teachers on writing skills in ESL Contexts: A literature review. *Creative Education*, 10(13), 3385-3391.
7. Brown, J. D., & Bailey, K. M. (1984). A categorical instrument for scoring second language writing skills. *Language learning*, 34(4), 21-38.
8. Ahmed, R. Z., & Bidin, S. J. B. (2016). The effect of task based language teaching on writing skills of EFL learners in Malaysia. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 6(03), 207.
9. Negari, G. M. (2011). A study on strategy instruction and EFL learners' writing skill. *International journal of English linguistics*, 1(2), 299.
10. Lanauze, M., & Snow, C. (1989). The relation between first-and second-language writing skills: Evidence from Puerto Rican elementary school children in bilingual programs. *Linguistics and education*, 1(4), 323-339.
11. Vurdien, R. (2013). Enhancing writing skills through blogging in an advanced English as a Foreign Language class in Spain. *Computer assisted Language learning*, 26(2), 126-143.
12. Nomass, B. B. (2013). The impact of using technology in teaching English as a second language. *English language and literature studies*, 3(1), 111.
13. May, B. A. (1984). EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTION FOR TEACHING BASIC WRITING SKILLS WITH COMPUTER-ASSISTED LANGUAGE LEARNING IN AN ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE PROGRAM (BILINGUAL, MEXICAN AMERICAN). Texas A&I University.
14. Cole, J., & Feng, J. (2015). Effective Strategies for Improving Writing Skills of Elementary English Language Learners. Online Submission.