International Journal of Pedagogics

Principles for Developing Written Speech Skills of English Philology Students

Maxsetova Zuxra Torebayevna

Teacher at Almalyk State Technical Institute, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines the principles for developing the written speech skills of English philology students in higher education. The relevance of the topic is determined by the growing role of academic and professional writing in language education, as well as by the shift in second-language writing research from product-centered teaching toward process, genre, and context-sensitive instruction. Contemporary scholarship shows that effective L2 writing pedagogy is shaped by an understanding of writing as a recursive process, a socially situated practice, and a discipline-related communicative skill. The purpose of the article is to identify and theoretically substantiate the core pedagogical principles that ensure the effective development of written speech skills among English philology students. The study is based on theoretical analysis, synthesis, comparison, and interpretation of research in second-language writing, academic literacy, and writing pedagogy. The results show that the most productive foundation for developing written speech skills lies in the integration of communicative orientation, processuality, genre awareness, systematic language support, feedback, academic autonomy, and reflective revision. The article argues that writing instruction for English philology students should be organized not as isolated grammar practice, but as a gradual formation of the ability to produce coherent, purposeful, contextually appropriate, and critically shaped texts. It is concluded that the development of written speech skills becomes more effective when pedagogical work is based on principled integration of linguistic, cognitive, rhetorical, and disciplinary dimensions of writing.

Keywords: Written speech skills, English philology students, second-language writing, academic writing, process approach, genre approach, feedback, revision, writing pedagogy, communicative competence.

Introduction: Writing occupies a central place in the preparation of English philology students because it serves not only as a language skill, but also as a medium of academic thinking, literary interpretation, linguistic analysis, and professional self-expression. In philological education, students are expected to summarize, interpret, compare, argue, critique, and produce research-oriented texts. For this reason, written speech cannot be treated as a secondary or merely technical component of language teaching. It is one of the main instruments through which philological knowledge is formed, demonstrated, and deepened.

In modern second-language writing studies, writing is no longer understood as a linear transcription of thought into grammatically correct sentences. It is interpreted as a recursive and socially situated activity that involves planning, drafting, revising, rhetorical awareness, and sensitivity to communicative context. Ken Hyland's overview of second-language writing emphasizes that different conceptions of writing lead to different pedagogical practices, and that effective teaching requires attention to the skills, knowledge, and purposes involved in actual text production. Research in Language Teaching similarly shows that the field has moved beyond rigid oppositions between process-based and genre-based pedagogies and now recognizes the need to integrate both perspectives in classroom practice.

This shift is especially important for English philology

students. Unlike learners in more general English programs, philology students must write not only for everyday communication, but also within academically shaped forms of discourse. Their texts often require disciplinary vocabulary, interpretive precision, conceptual structure, and stylistic control. Research on teaching academic writing in higher education underscores that writing development is closely connected with disciplinary practices and with the conventions of specific knowledge communities. Therefore, the development of written speech skills among English philology students should be guided by principled pedagogical choices rather than by occasional writing assignments or isolated correction of errors.

The purpose of this article is to identify the main principles for developing written speech skills of English philology students and to explain their pedagogical significance in the context of higher language education.

The study is based on qualitative theoretical methodology. It employs analysis, synthesis, comparison, and interpretation of research in second-language writing, academic writing pedagogy, and language education. The theoretical basis of the article includes works on writing as process, genre-based instruction, academic writing development, assessment, and the teaching of writing in higher education. Particular attention is given to recent syntheses that show how writing pedagogy has evolved from narrow grammar-elicitation practices toward integrated approaches that consider writing as both cognitive process and social action.

The analytical procedure focused on identifying pedagogical regularities that recur across influential frameworks of L2 writing instruction. These regularities were interpreted as instructional principles rather than as rigid methods. The study examined how such principles contribute to the development of written speech skills specifically in English philology education, where students' writing must meet both language-learning and disciplinary-analytic goals. The article does not present a new experiment; instead, it synthesizes established insights to construct a coherent principle-based model for writing development.

The analysis shows that the effective development of

written speech skills among English philology students depends on a set of mutually related pedagogical principles. These principles should not be understood as isolated recommendations. They work productively only when combined in a coherent instructional system.

The first and most fundamental principle is the principle of communicative orientation. Writing develops most effectively when students understand that a text is not merely a grammatical exercise but an act of communication addressed to an intended reader for a particular purpose. Research on L2 writing repeatedly stresses that writing instruction should be grounded in authentic conceptions of meaning-making rather than in sentence-level correctness alone. Hyland's account of writing pedagogy makes clear that teaching practices are shaped by how writing itself is conceptualized, and that productive instruction requires viewing writing as purposeful communication. For English philology students, this principle is especially important because they often write analytical and interpretive texts where audience awareness, textual logic, and rhetorical precision matter as much as linguistic accuracy. When communicative purpose is foregrounded, students begin to shape their texts more consciously, selecting language not only for correctness but also for adequacy and effect.

The second principle is the principle of processuality. Writing competence is formed not through immediate production of polished texts, but through staged activity involving planning, drafting, revising, and editing. Research on guiding the development of L2 writing processes confirms the educational value of distinguishing planning and drafting stages and of helping learners work through them systematically. Process orientation allows students to experience writing as development rather than as one-time performance. This is especially beneficial for philology students, whose texts often require idea formation, source engagement, quotation management, and conceptual restructuring. When the writing process is made visible and teachable, students are less likely to treat the first draft as the final version. Instead, they learn to see revision as an essential component of scholarly expression.

The third principle is the principle of genre awareness. English philology students encounter a wide variety of written genres, including summaries, reviews,

interpretive essays, linguistic commentaries, research abstracts, and academic articles. Genre research in second-language writing has shown that students need exposure to the purposes, structures, and language resources of different genres in order to write effectively in academic settings. Genre awareness helps students understand that writing is shaped by socially recognized patterns rather than by individual intuition alone. In philological training, this is particularly relevant because students must often move between literary interpretation, linguistic argumentation, and academic reporting. The ability to recognize genre expectations supports not only textual organization but also the development of disciplinary identity.

A fourth principle is the principle of integration between language form and meaning. Writing instruction becomes ineffective when grammar, vocabulary, and syntax are practiced separately from actual text production. At the same time, writing quality cannot improve if linguistic support is entirely implicit. Effective pedagogy therefore requires meaningful integration of language resources into writing tasks. Cambridge guidance on genre pedagogy explicitly notes that language focus should be embedded within purposeful text construction rather than detached from context. For English philology students, this means that lexical precision, syntactic variation, cohesion, and register control should be developed through real writing work. Students should learn how linguistic choices shape interpretation, stance, and scholarly voice. In such an approach, language knowledge becomes functional rather than inert.

The fifth principle is the principle of disciplinary relevance. Writing in higher education is not uniform across contexts, and scholarship on academic writing emphasizes the disciplinary specificity of writing practices. For English philology students, written speech development should therefore be connected with the actual content of philological study. Assignments should involve literary texts, linguistic phenomena, translation issues, stylistic observations, and research-based discussion. When writing tasks reflect disciplinary content, students do not simply learn to write in English; they learn to think and communicate as emerging philologists. This strengthens motivation and makes writing instruction more intellectually grounded.

The sixth principle is the principle of scaffolded

independence. Writing development requires support, but support must gradually lead to autonomy. If students are given only models and fixed formulas, they may produce acceptable texts without genuine development of authorial control. If they are left entirely on their own, they may not know how to organize or improve their writing. Effective instruction therefore moves from guided practice toward independent performance. Research on writing pedagogy in higher education shows that instructional models shape how students are introduced to academic literacy, and that the educational challenge lies in helping learners internalize these models rather than merely imitate them. In the case of philology students, scaffolded independence can be achieved through model analysis, guided drafting, collaborative review, and progressively more independent assignments. Over time, students should be able to formulate their own thesis statements, manage textual evidence, and revise for rhetorical effect.

The seventh principle is the principle of feedback-based development. Written speech improves when learners receive feedback that is timely, meaningful, and oriented toward improvement rather than mere evaluation. Research on L2 writing pedagogy consistently treats feedback as a central mechanism in writing development, especially when it helps learners notice textual problems and revise strategically. For philology students, feedback should address not only grammar, but also argument structure, cohesion, interpretive depth, register, citation practice, and the use of evidence. Productive feedback does not simply mark shortcomings. It guides students toward seeing their text from the reader's perspective. Such feedback can come from teachers, peers, corpus tools, or guided self-assessment, but its educational value depends on whether it stimulates revision and reflection.

The eighth principle is the principle of revision and reflection. Writing skill does not fully develop unless learners return to their texts and rethink them. Revision is where language control, metacognition, and rhetorical awareness intersect. Research on writing development emphasizes that drafting alone is insufficient; what matters is how writers evaluate and reshape their texts. For English philology students, revision is especially important because their writing often involves nuanced interpretation and conceptual

distinctions. Reflection on revision helps students become aware of how their wording affects meaning, how paragraph structure supports argument, and how textual coherence emerges. In this sense, revision is not just correction. It is the practical school of written thought.

The ninth principle is the principle of reading-writing interdependence. Writing develops more effectively when it grows from intensive engagement with texts. Philology students read literary works, criticism, linguistic analyses, and scholarly articles; these texts serve not only as sources of content but also as models of discourse. Research on academic writing pedagogy stresses that students learn to write partly by analyzing how texts in their field organize meaning, stance, evidence, and voice. Therefore, the development of written speech should be linked with close reading, genre analysis, and rhetorical observation. Students who learn to read like writers become more capable of writing like specialists.

The tenth principle is the principle of criterion-based assessment. Writing instruction becomes inconsistent when students do not know on what basis their texts are evaluated. Assessment for writing development should therefore rely on transparent criteria that reflect the actual goals of instruction. Recent work on assessment and writing development indicates that formative assessment practices enhance students' awareness of quality and strengthen revision-oriented learning. In philological education, criteria should include not only correctness but also coherence, genre appropriateness, lexical adequacy, argument development, originality of interpretation, and textual organization. When students understand these criteria, they can internalize standards of good writing and regulate their own progress more effectively.

Taken together, these principles show that written speech development is not reducible to one preferred method. It requires an integrated pedagogical ecology in which communication, process, genre, language, discipline, feedback, reflection, and assessment support one another.

The results of the analysis confirm that the development of written speech skills among English philology students should be grounded in a multidimensional understanding of writing. The older model that treated writing mainly as the application of grammatical rules is insufficient for contemporary higher education. Research in second-language writing has already demonstrated that learners need more than sentence-level practice; they need support in managing the writing process, understanding genre expectations, and participating in disciplinary discourse. This conclusion is especially significant for English philology programs, where writing is inseparable from interpretation, critical thinking, and scholarly communication.

One of the key implications of this study is that writing instruction should be organized around development rather than correction alone. If students receive assignments only after instruction and are judged mainly by the final product, the formative dimension of writing remains weak. Process-oriented and feedback-sensitive pedagogy, by contrast, turns writing into an arena of gradual competence formation. Studies on the development of L2 writing processes indicate that planning, drafting, and revising are teachable and assessable components of learning. This has practical consequences: teachers of philology should structure courses so that students produce multiple drafts, receive intermediate guidance, and revisit their texts in light of criteria and reader response.

Another important implication concerns the relationship between genre and disciplinary identity. Genre-based approaches are sometimes misunderstood as rigid template teaching, but research shows that genre awareness actually helps learners understand how meaning is shaped within socially recognized forms. For philology students, genres are not neutral containers. A literary commentary, a stylistic analysis, and a linguistics research summary each require different ways of organizing evidence and formulating claims. Teaching genre explicitly therefore supports not only better writing, but also deeper participation in philological modes of thinking.

The analysis also suggests that autonomy in writing does not arise spontaneously. It must be developed through carefully designed scaffolding. This is consistent with research on writing instruction in higher education, which shows that students benefit from instructional models when these models are used to support gradual internalization of writing practices. For English philology students, scaffolding can take the form

of model texts, guided outlines, lexical frames for academic stance, peer review protocols, and reflective revision tasks. The goal, however, is not dependence on scaffolds but growing authorial control.

A further issue concerns the role of language accuracy. Accuracy remains important, especially in philology, where students are expected to display advanced command of English. Yet the findings of this study indicate that accuracy should be embedded within broader text-level goals. If accuracy becomes the sole focus, students may produce cautious but rhetorically weak writing. If it is ignored, texts may lose clarity and credibility. The pedagogical challenge is therefore integrative: students should learn that grammatical and lexical choices are meaningful because they shape coherence, nuance, and interpretive force.

Finally, the study shows that written speech development is closely related to the broader educational culture of the institution. If writing is practiced only occasionally, assessed opaquely, or disconnected from reading and disciplinary content, student progress is likely to remain limited. If, however, writing is treated as a central mode of academic formation, then the principles identified in this article can function as a realistic basis for curriculum design.

The article has shown that the effective development of written speech skills among English philology students depends on a principled pedagogical framework rather than on isolated exercises. The most important principles are communicative orientation, processuality, genre awareness, integration of language and meaning, disciplinary relevance, scaffolded independence, feedback-based development, revision and reflection, reading-writing interdependence, and criterion-based assessment. These principles do not operate separately; they form an interconnected system through which students gradually acquire the ability to produce coherent, purposeful, and academically appropriate texts.

The study also demonstrates that writing for English philology students is not merely a technical skill. It is a form of intellectual and disciplinary participation. Through writing, students learn to interpret texts, formulate arguments, express analytical judgments, and construct scholarly voice. For this reason, writing development should occupy a central place in philological education.

Thus, the principles discussed in this article may serve as a theoretical and methodological basis for improving writing instruction in English philology programs. When applied systematically, they create conditions in which students move from controlled practice to reflective and independent written expression, which is one of the main indicators of advanced philological competence.

REFERENCES

1. Арутюнова, Н. Д. Дискурс // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. — Москва : Сов. энциклопедия, 1990. — С. 136–137.

2. Гальперин, И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования. — Москва : Наука, 1981. — 139 с.

3. Зимняя, И. А. Психология обучения иностранным языкам в школе. — Москва : Просвещение, 1991. — 222 с.

4. Hyland, K. Second Language Writing. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2019. — 328 p.

5. Hyland, K., García Mayo, M. del P. Teaching Second Language Academic Writing. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2025. — Cambridge Elements.

6. Leontjev, D., de Haan, J. Guiding and assessing development of L2 writing process // Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching. — 2023. — Vol. 17, No. 4. — P. 688–702.

7. Matsuda, P. K. Second language writing in the twentieth century: A situated historical perspective // In: Kroll, B. (ed.). Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing. — Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2003. — P. 15–34.

8. Paltridge, B. Genre and second-language academic writing // Language Teaching. — 2014. — Vol. 47, No. 3. — P. 303–318.

9. Racelis, J. V., Matsuda, P. K. Integrating process and genre into the second language writing classroom: Research into practice // Language Teaching. — 2013. — Vol. 46, No. 3. — P. 382–388.

10. Rose, D., Martin, J. R. Learning to Write, Reading to Learn: Genre, Knowledge and Pedagogy in the Sydney School. — London : Equinox, 2012.

11. Schmidt, N., et al. Unpacking second-language

writing teacher knowledge through corpus-based pedagogy training // ReCALL. — 2023. — Vol. 35, No. 3. — P. 292–309.

12. Tribble, C. Writing. — Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1996. — 128 p.

13. Ezza, E.-S. Y., Drid, T. (eds.). Teaching Academic Writing as a Discipline-Specific Skill in Higher Education. — Hershey, PA : IGI Global, 2019.

14. Kaufhold, K., et al. Literacy practices introduced: Instructional models for academic writing in higher education // Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research. — 2025.

15. Ruegg, R. Assessment of written assignments in first-year humanities subjects // Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education. — 2025.

16. Segaran, M., et al. Lower secondary school teachers' facilitation of students' writing through assessment for learning principles // Computer Assisted Language Learning. — 2025.

17. Cambridge English. Teach academic writing through genre pedagogy // Cambridge English Teacher Blog. — 2020.