

«Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті» КеАҚ
Филология факультеті

НАО «Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилева»
Филологический факультет

NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”
Faculty of Philology



**«МӘДЕНИЕТАРАЛЫҚ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ:
ШЕТЕЛ ТІЛДЕРІН ОҚЫТУДЫҢ ЗАМАНАУЫ МӘСЕЛЕЛЕРІ»**
III Халықаралық ғылыми-практикалық онлайн конференция материалдары

22 ақпан 2024 ж.

**«МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНАЯ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ВОПРОСЫ
ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ»**
Материалы III Международной научно-практической онлайн конференции

22 апреля 2024 г.

PROCEEDINGS
of the III International Scientific and Practical Online Conference
**“MULTICULTURAL COMMUNICATION:
MODERN ISSUES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING”**

April 22, 2024

Астана, Казахстан

УДК 80/81
ББК 81.2
М35

Chief Editor: *Zhanna A. Beisembayeva*, Head of the Foreign Languages Theory and Practice Department, NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Candidate of Philology

Editorial Board:

Jannat Ye. Sagimbayeva, Head of the Foreign Languages Department, NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Candidate of Pedagogy, Associate Professor

Madina Zh. Tussupbekova, Associate Professor of the Foreign Languages Department, NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Candidate of Pedagogy

Roza F. Zhussupova, Associate Professor of the Foreign Languages Theory and Practice Department, NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Candidate of Pedagogy

III International Scientific and Practical Online Conference “MULTICULTURAL COMMUNICATION: MODERN ISSUES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING”: proceedings of the online conference (Astana, April 22, 2024). – Astana: the L.N. Gumilyov ENU, 2024. – 155 p.

Proceedings includes research papers of the participants of the annual International Scientific and Practical Online Conference “Multicultural Communication: Modern Issues of Foreign Language Teaching”, that took place and was organized by the Faculty of Philology (Foreign Languages Department, Foreign Languages Theory and Practice Department) on April 22, 2024. The conference was held according to the university plan. Proceedings of the conference can be of great interest to researchers, teachers and students engaged in research in the field of modern foreign language methodology, linguistics and text issues and contemporary approaches to training foreign language teaching personnel.

Authors are fully responsible for the content of research papers and the correctness of the facts indicated in them.

ISBN 978-601-7697-24-2

CONTENTS

PLENARY REPORTS

- Yelena V. Sazhina** – Francisk Skorina Gomel State University, Gomel, Belarus **5**
“МЕТОДОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ КОГНИТИВНО-КОММУНИКАТИВНОГО АНАЛИЗА ПОЛЕМИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА ПЕЧАТНЫХ СМИ”
- Olga A. Hopiaynen** – Yugra State University, Khanty-Mansiysk, Russia **12**
“LEARNING CULTURE AND COGNITIONS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING”
- Zhypara T. Bekmatova** – Osh State University, Osh, Kyrgyzstan **18**
Aigul S. Mukambetova – J. Balasagyn Kyrgyz National University, Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan
“PRACTICAL NECESSITY OF MULTILINGUALISM IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS OF MATHEMATICS STUDENTS”
- Zhanna N. Kuzar, Zukhra Kh. Shakhputova** – L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan **22**
«ЯЗЫКОВАЯ АДАПТАЦИЯ РЕПАТРИАНТОВ: ПУТЬ К ИНТЕГРАЦИИ»

SECTIONAL REPORTS

- Ainash Alzhanova, Aigul Sadykova, Elmira Kemelbekova** – L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan **30**
“THE ASPECT OF REAL AND VIRTUAL CONTEXTS INTEGRATION IN TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGE”
- Alisher Arinov, Kamar Aldasheva** – NJSC “Al-Farabi Kazakh National University”, Almaty, Kazakhstan **34**
“STUDYING THE LINGUOCULTURAL SPECIFICITY OF THE NAMES OF CHARACTER TRAITS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE: METHODO-LOGY AND APPLICATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION PEDAGOGY”
- Aray Atimtayeva, Kamar Aldasheva** – NJSC “Al-Farabi Kazakh National University”, Almaty, Kazakhstan **39**
“THE DEVELOPMENT OF STUDENTS’ COMPETENCE VIA DIALOGUE IN ENGLISH TEACHING WITHIN THE ADULT EDUCATION FRAME-WORK”

- Zhanar M. Beisenbayeva, Sholpan Kalkabayeva** – Centre for Identification and Support of Gifted Children and Talented Teachers of Astana Akimat, Kazakhstan **43**
“DEVELOPING ENGLISH SPEAKING SKILLS OF INTROVERTED STUDENTS BASED ON STORYTELLING”
- Hatice Nur Yavuz, Züleyha Ünlü** – Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey **47**
“EFFECTS OF DRAMA ON EFL STUDENTS’ SPEAKING AND LISTENING SKILLS: A REFLECTIVE CASE”
- Zhansaya Iskakova, Dinara M. Koishigulova** – NJSC “Al-Farabi Kazakh National University”, Almaty, Kazakhstan **58**
“THE IMPACT OF MNEMONICS ON VOCABULARY RETENTION AND RECALL IN UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION”
- Kymbatgul Khausova** – School-Gymnasium №63, Astana, Kazakhstan **65**
“USING VARIOUS TYPES OF TECHNOLOGY IN TEACHING ENGLISH FOR STUDENTS”
- Malika A. Nurkhanova, Gulmira A. Khamitova** – NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **69**
“DEVELOPMENT OF KEY COMPETENCIES IN THE CONTEXT OF LIFELONG LEARNING FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS”
- Assel Nurmagambetova, Karlygash Zh. Aidarbek** – NJSC “Al-Farabi Kazakh National University”, Almaty, Kazakhstan **73**
“INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES IN THE FORMATION OF PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION SKILLS IN A FOREIGN LANGUAGE”
- Arna Omurzakova** – NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **76**
“THE APPROACHES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS”
- Gauhar O. Orazaly, Aygul A. Tadjibaeva** – NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **82**
“A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO ANALYZING COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN ELT”
- Batagoz G. Smagulova, Kamila Kerimbayeva** – NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, Kazakhstan **88**
“GOOGLE FORMS IMPACT: VOCABULARY AND GRAMMAR FOCUS IN NON-LINGUISTIC GROUPS OF ENU”
- Dariya G. Tileukhan, Gulmira A. Khamitova** – NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **94**
“A TRANSFORMATIVE APPROACH TO TEACHING DIALOGIC SPEAKING: CONVERSATIONAL ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE”

- Nurlugul S. Tussupbekova, Gulnaz M. Mussabayeva, Akmaral A. Niyazbekova, Burul T. Duishonalieva** – NJSC “The L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **101**
“ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING”
- Zhuldyz A. Zhanayeva, Arailym M. Zhandildinova** – NJSC “The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **107**
“THE IMPORTANCE AND METHODS TO DEVELOP CRITICAL THINKING IN THE EFL CLASSROOM”
- Aruzhan Zulkharnay, Akzhan M. Abdykhalykova** – NJSC “The L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **112**
“ADAPTING ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING TO ONLINE ENVIRONMENTS”
- Assel Zhumadilova** – NJSC “Al-Farabi Kazakh National University”, Almaty, Kazakhstan **118**
“LANGUAGE EDUCATION THROUGH CULINARY CULTURE: APPLICATION OF DISH NAMES IN PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE”
- M.D. Abzhaparova** – “Astana IT University” LLP, Astana, Kazakhstan **123**
“АКТИВНЫЕ МЕТОДЫ ИНТЕГРИРОВАННОГО ПОДХОДА В ПРЕПОДАВАНИИ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ ДЛЯ НЕЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИХ СПЕЦИАЛЬНОСТЕЙ НА ПРИМЕРЕ КЕЙС-СТАДИ И ПОДКАСТОВ”
- Zhanna P. Vatutina** – NJSC “The L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **129**
“КОМПЕТЕНЦИИ ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЕЙ ИНОСТРАННОГО ЯЗЫКА В ИНКЛЮЗИВНЫХ ГРУППАХ ПРОЕКТА «СЕРЕБРЯНЫЙ ИНСТИТУТ»
- Oksana L. Zagorulya, Karlygash Zh. Otyzbayeva, Altynai G. Burkitbayeva** – NJSC “The L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **137**
“ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТЬ ПРОЕКТНОЙ РАБОТЫ НА ЗАНЯТИЯХ ПО АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ В ВУЗЕ СО СТУДЕНТАМИ ПЕРВОГО КУРСА (ЭТАПЫ ПРОЕКТА И ЕГО ПОДГОТОВКА)”
- Kamila Kerimbayeva, Botagoz Smagulova** – NJSC “The L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **143**
“АҚПАРАТТЫҚ-КОММУНИКАЦИЯЛЫҚ ТЕХНОЛОГИЯЛАР, ЖЕЛІЛІК ОҚЫТУ ЖӘНЕ ЖАСАНДЫ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТ ОБЪЕКТІСІ АРҚЫЛЫ ЕКІНШІ ТІЛДІ ОҚЫТУ МЕН ОҚЫТУДАҒЫ ЖАҢА ТЕНДЕНЦИЯЛАР”
- Meiirgul Yerkinbek** – Astana International University, **Raissa U. Latanova** – NJSC “The L.N.Gumilyov Eurasian National University”, Astana, Kazakhstan **152**
“PEDAGOGICAL POTENTIAL OF BUSINESS CORRESPONDENCE TEXTS”

3. Park, S. Y., & Lee, J. (2020). *The effects of virtual reality on communication, immersion, and presence: Evidence from Korean learners of English as a foreign language*. *Language Learning & Technology*, 24(1), 113-138.

4. Stockwell, G. (2016). *Investigation of mobile learning: Definitions, instruments, and methods*. *ReCALL*, 28(1), 3-17.

THE APPROACHES TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATIVE ENGLISH WRITING SKILLS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Arna Omurzakova

4-year student with a major in "Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages"
NJSC "The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University", Astana, Kazakhstan
omurzakovaarna31@gmail.com

Аңдатпа: Бұл мақалада Рэймс пен Хармер ұсынған ағылшын тілінде жазу дағдыларын үйрету тәсілдерінің (бақыланатын, еркін, коммуникативті, процессуалды, жанрлық, шығармашылық) салыстырмалы талдауы берілген. Алдымен, жоғары сынып оқушыларының коммуникативті жазу дағдыларын дамытуға баса назар аудара отырып, жазудың мәні ашылады. Содан кейін мақала барлық тәсілдерді шолу мақсатымен әрбір классификацияны жеке қарастырады. Соңында тәсілдерді бір-бірімен салыстыра отырып, олардың айырмашылықтары мен ұқсастықтары анықталады.

Аннотация: Эта статья представляет собой сравнительно-сопоставительный анализ подходов (шаблонный, коммуникативный, процессуальный, жанровый, контролируемое письмо, креативное письмо) к преподаванию навыков письма на английском языке, предложенных Рэймс и Хармером. В статье исследуется суть письма, с акцентом на развитие коммуникативных навыков письма старшеклассников. Затем статья детально рассматривает каждую классификацию, предоставляя обзор всех подходов. Эти подходы далее сравниваются и контрастируются для выявления их различий и сходств.

Abstract: This article provides a comparative analysis of the approaches (controlled-to-free, free-writing, paragraph pattern, grammar-syntax-organization, communicative, process, genre, creative writing, cooperative writing) to teaching writing skills, as proposed by Raimes and Harmer. It starts by exploring the essence of writing, focusing on developing communicative writing skills among high school students. Then it examines each classification in detail, providing an overview of the approaches. Following this, the approaches are compared and contrasted to identify both their differences and similarities.

Түйін сөздер: коммуникативтік дағдылар, ағылшын тілінде жазу дағдылары, жоғары сынып оқушылары, ағылшын тілінде жазу дағдыларын үйрету тәсілдері

Ключевые слова: коммуникативные навыки, навыки письма на английском, старшеклассники, подходы к обучению письма на английском языке

Key words: communicative skills, English writing skills, high school students, approaches to teaching English writing skills

INTRODUCTION

This article aims to conduct a comparative analysis of two classifications of approaches to teaching writing skills in the context of high school students who are foreign language learners, as proposed by Raimes [1] and Harmer [2]. Before delving into these classifications, the essence of writing, particularly in the context of English language learning, will be discussed. Emphasis will be placed on the significance of communicative writing skills, highlighting the need for a communicative context, audience awareness, and clear purpose in writing. The article will then provide an overview of the classifications by Raimes [1] and Harmer [2], followed by a comparative

analysis of their respective approaches. Finally, the article will conclude with recommendations for teachers of high school students based on the insights gained from the comparative analysis.

In today's globally interconnected world, the role of writing skills in English has evolved significantly. Ur [3] states that writing has always been viewed as a tool for practice and assessment, with less focus on developing the writing skill itself. The emphasis on communicative skills in students has traditionally leaned towards the other three language skills - reading, listening, speaking - with writing receiving considerably less attention [3]. Despite this historical trend, Harmer [2] recognizes the essential role of writing as a powerful tool for fostering communicative skills [2].

Nunan [4] defines *writing* as a multifaceted cognitive activity which requires control over diverse components, both at the level of individual sentences and in a broader context. At the sentence level, the writer must demonstrate the control over elements such as content, format, sentence structure, vocabulary, spelling, and letter formation. Moving beyond the sentence, the writer is expected to be able to structure and integrate information to create a cohesive and coherent paragraph and text [4].

Harmer [2] adds to this by categorizing writing into two distinct purposes: *writing-for-learning* and *writing-for-writing*. Writing-for-learning involves tasks aimed at helping students learn language or test their understanding of particular concepts. For example, the purpose of asking students to write sentences using a specific grammatical structure is more about consolidating their knowledge of grammar rather than practicing actual writing skills. On the other hand, writing-for-writing focuses on tasks where the primary goal is to enhance students' writing abilities. For instance, tasks such as designing a magazine advertisement or creating a story address the cultivation of writing skills in writing advertisements or storytelling, respectively [2].

Harmer's [2] perspective complements Nunan's [4] definition by emphasizing the importance of understanding the context and communicative goal apart from linguistic proficiency at the sentence and beyond sentence levels. Effective writing goes beyond just technical aspects of language such as grammar and vocabulary usage, requiring understanding of why someone is writing (the communicative goal) and the circumstances or context in which the writing is intended to be used. Writing-for-writing tasks effectively address these aspects of writing, challenging students to understand the specific purpose of their writing, whether it is to persuade, inform, or entertain, and consider the context in which their writing will be consumed [2; 4].

It can be concluded that writing is a sophisticated cognitive activity that involves mastery of linguistic elements at both sentence and beyond sentence levels, with an emphasis on not only technical proficiency but also a nuanced understanding of the *communicative goal and context* for effective communication. This means that writing in English involves considering the purpose, audience, and context along with adhering to the language rules. It makes proficiency in English writing a communicative skill which is an integral part of the communicative competence [2; 4].

Kunanbayeva [5] defines *competence* as a blend of intellectual and skill-based elements of education, playing a pivotal role in determining the educational content. As students engage with this educational content, they acquire competence in a particular field. Consequently, competence can be understood as an outcome of the learning process, demonstrating an individual's overall capability in a specific area, such as proficiency in English language in this context [5].

Proficiency in communication is another example of competence known as *communicative competence*. Yusupov et al. [6] expand on this concept, stating that communicative writing competence, along with communicative speaking competence, is a subset of the communicative competence. It is defined as the ability to effectively express oneself in a foreign language through written communication, understanding the context, audience, and purpose [6].

Dragomir and Niculescu [7] agree with the afore-stated statement, highlighting that there are three crucial communicative aspects to take into account when teaching communicative writing: task, audience, purpose [7].

The task should be contextualized and framed to address key questions like who, what, to whom, and why. For example, "You (who) have to read an advertisement for a specialized course you have long been interested in. Write a letter of request (what) to the institution organizing the course (to whom) in order to find out more details (why) [7].

The audience is an essential aspect of communicative competence, shaping how individuals tailor their language based on the recipients' status, gender, and age. Not considering this factor leads to failure to adjust vocabulary, grammar, tone, register, and style, which in turn leads to inappropriate and flawed communication. For instance, writing an informal letter to a friend requires the use of colloquial language and an informal register, while composing a military report for superiors demands formal language, register, and style [7].

The purpose is directly related to the writing objective such as giving information, making invitations, requesting information, making a complaint, expressing opinion. Additionally, it is linked with language functions, including to narrate, to describe, to explain, to inform, to argue, to convince, etc. These factors play an important role in the writing process as they affect the choice of vocabulary, grammar, style, and register. To illustrate, writing a compare and contrast paragraph aims to discuss similarities and differences between people, objects, places, or events, using descriptive language (vocabulary) and comparative adjectives (grammar) [7].

Therefore, it can be concluded that *communicative skills in writing in English* are an integral part of communicative competence. This encompasses not only the ability to convey thoughts, ideas, information via written means but also the nuanced understanding of the context, audience, and the purpose. Mastering these skills is important for students to navigate diverse communicative scenarios, contributing to their overall competence in English language proficiency [5; 6].

METHODOLOGY

Shifaei [8] states that teaching students these necessary communicative writing skills requires teachers to incorporate specific strategies and techniques, considering the specific peculiarities and needs of the learners [8]. Building on this, Selvaraj and Aziz [9] emphasize the difference in teaching writing skills to non-native speakers. Researchers, recognizing this peculiarity, have developed diverse *approaches* to teaching a foreign language writing skills [9].

Raimes [1] and Harmer [2] are two of the most prominent methodologists who contributed greatly to the study of teaching English writing skills to non-native learners. They developed their classifications of approaches to teaching writing skills in English as a Second Language (ESL) and English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms.

Raimes [1] proposes a classification comprising six following approaches:

- controlled-to-free approach
- free-writing approach
- paragraph pattern approach
- grammar-syntax-organization approach
- communicative approach
- process approach

The *controlled-to-free approach* is a sequential method that begins with sentence-level tasks, gradually transitioning to free composition. As students progress in their writing, the focus shifts from emphasizing grammar, syntax, and mechanics initially to fostering fluency and creativity over time [1].

One disadvantage of this approach is that it highlights grammar, syntax, and mechanical accuracy, placing a greater emphasis on correctness rather than fluency or creativity. In essence, this approach mainly concentrates on instructing students on specific language structures which is artificial [1]. Mastering accurate sentence formation does not mean students are able to produce appropriate texts tailored for specific communicative goals [10].

Conversely, the *free-writing approach* prioritizes quantity of writing over its quality, encouraging fluent expression without worrying about grammar rules. As a result, students feel more confident in expressing their thoughts and ideas as they are not constrained by strict language rules [1].

An example writing task for this approach involves conducting freewriting sessions where students write freely without thinking about grammar or spelling. Findings from Hwang's [11] study reveal significant improvements in writing fluency among students who participated in eight weeks of freewriting exercises. Moreover, participants noted a boost in their confidence levels regarding English writing proficiency [11].

The *paragraph pattern approach* is an approach which emphasizes effective organization of ideas into paragraphs to enhance reader comprehension. It involves a diverse set of activities such as analyzing model paragraphs, arranging sentences, and selecting topic sentences, helping students learn to organize their writing in a more logical way [1].

Gugin [10] mentions one notable challenge of this approach which is ensuring that students maintain their original by only prioritizing text's structure. Focusing solely on organizing the writing may result in the loss of thoughts, leading to logically structured but irrelevant content [10].

If the paragraph pattern approach only deals with the organizational aspect of the language, the *grammar-syntax-organization approach* integrates teaching organization skills with grammar and syntax, so that all necessary skills needed for writing are developed simultaneously. It suggests that writing skills should be developed as a single skill, not as separate ones [1].

El Oudanu and El Baghdadi [12] further explain that this approach helps students understand a fundamental aspect of writing: the importance of having a well-defined purpose. By doing so, students can see their writing intentions, the task requirements, and the underlying rationale are interconnected. Therefore, this approach ensures that the purpose of writing, which affects the choice of grammar and syntax, is closely linked with its structure (organization) [12].

The *communicative approach* emphasizes authentic use of the language by considering the audience, purpose, and context for a more effective interaction. Teachers can specify the audience when assigning a writing activity so that learners can tailor their writing considering the intended readers [1].

An illustrative task for this approach could begin with a simple and straightforward prompt such as "Describe your room at home." However, to make it more meaningful, it can be phrased as the following: "Describe your room at home to your pen pal." Framing the task this way adds purpose and context, making students consider the audience (the pen pal) to tailor their writing to suit the communicative situation [13].

The *process approach* shifts focus from the final product of writing to the process of writing itself, guiding students through prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing stages. These stages help learners view writing as a continuous process, where they share drafts, receive feedback from teachers, and then revise pieces accordingly [1].

Tangkiengsirisin [13] highlights a challenge associated with this approach: not completely understanding how students approach the process of writing itself. Teachers encounter difficulty in comprehending students' unconscious processes while writing. Overemphasizing the cognitive aspect of writing may cause students to overlook other important aspects such as cultural and social factors [13].

Analyzing Raimes' [1] categorization of approaches, it can be concluded that these approaches offer a comprehensive framework for addressing the diverse needs of learners. This is because each approach emphasizes a distinct aspect of writing development, from grammar and syntax to organization and fluency [1].

Harmer [2] categorizes the approaches to teaching English writing skills in ESL and EFL classrooms into four main types:

- process approach

- genre approach
- creative writing approach
- cooperative writing approach

The *process approach* is an approach that is focused on guiding students through various stages of writing, from prewriting to editing. It helps students concentrate on the writing process itself by making them think about creating a high-quality piece of writing [2].

However, a notable drawback of this approach is its time-consuming nature. The stages of brainstorming, drafting, reviewing, and editing require a significant amount of time. As a result, this approach might not be well-suited for quick writing tasks, such as situational writing, which demand immediate responses [2].

In the *genre approach*, students engage in reading and analyzing different examples of writing before composing their own piece. In other words, the actual writing stage comes after the 'research' phase, where students collect all the necessary data for writing their piece by studying the real examples of writing by others [2].

While one disadvantage of this approach is its restrictiveness which requires students to copy or follow a particular style of writing, it is primarily considered an instructional measure. After all, students have the autonomy to determine how they utilize the information they have gathered [2].

The *creative writing approach* is an approach that encourages students to write imaginative writing pieces such as poems and stories which are connected with their personal lives and experiences. It emphasizes self-expression by making students write about things they can relate to, thus motivating them to perform better and learn effectively [2].

Nevertheless, creative writing can present challenges for certain students, particularly those who struggle with generating ideas. It is crucial for teachers to provide support and avoid expecting students to produce a complete story right away. Instead, this approach advocates for starting with smaller tasks, such as creating phrases and sentences, before progressing to complete stories as students become more accustomed to the creative process [2].

In the *cooperative writing approach*, students cooperate together in small groups to craft a piece of writing. This collaborative effort benefits everyone involved by enhancing idea generation and fostering peer feedback [2].

One thing to mention about this approach is its integrativeness. It may be integrated with process and genre-based approaches. Within the process framework, involving multiple students in reviewing and evaluating contributes to the overall quality of the work. The process of generating ideas becomes more dynamic when two or more people are engaged. Similarly, within genre approach, the analysis and creation of texts often leads to greater success through collaborative efforts involving multiple participants [2].

It can be concluded that Harmer's [2] classification offers educators a diverse toolkit to address the varied needs and preferences of learners, complementing Raimes' [1] classification. Both classifications offer valuable insights into effective approaches for teaching English writing skills, helping teachers to choose the most suitable one that meets all the needs of learners [1; 2].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Raimes and Harmer have each proposed classifications of approaches to teaching English writing skills to non-native learners. Raimes' classification encompasses six distinct approaches: controlled-to-free, free-writing, paragraph pattern, grammar-syntax-organization, communicative, and process. These approaches range from sequential methods starting with sentence-level tasks to holistic approaches focusing on fostering fluency and creativity over time. Raimes' model emphasizes various aspects of writing development, such as grammar, syntax, organization, and communicative competence, offering a comprehensive framework to address learners' varied needs [1; 2].

On the other hand, Harmer presents a classification with four approaches: process, genre, creative, and cooperative writing. Harmer's approaches cover a wide range, from methods that

involve analyzing examples of writing genres before composing personal pieces, to tasks that encourage self-expression by creating complete stories. While Harmer's classification shares some similarities with Raimes', such as the process approach, it also includes unique elements like genre analysis and collaborative writing, providing additional perspectives on teaching writing skills [1; 2].

Therefore, it can be concluded that Raimes' classification is more extensive, covering a wide range of strategies, from focusing on sentence-level tasks to emphasizing the overall writing process. On the other hand, Harmer's offers a more condensed classification, placing greater emphasis on aspects like genre analysis, creativity, and collaboration [1; 2].

As it can be observed, each classification has its own peculiar characteristics. Zhou and Niu [14] develop this idea by stating that there is no one-size-fits-all method that works for everyone in any situation. However, it is essential to choose the correct one as it greatly affects the learning outcome and motivation level of both teacher and students. Therefore, teachers have to carefully select the approach they are going to use according to different factors such as students' age, proficiency level, etc. [14].

Harmer [2] and Ur [15] highlight that age is one of the most crucial factors determining the process of choosing the right approach in teaching a foreign language. *High school students*, who are considered to be teenagers/adolescents, are generally said to be great language learners. However, they demonstrate their creativity skills and learning capacity generally only when they are truly interested and engaged in the topic [2]. If it is not the case, teenagers tend to misbehave and disrupt the learning process. Apart from boredom, disruptive behavior might be caused by the need for self-esteem, seeking peer-approval, outside problems, issues related to identity, relationships with parents, friends, and classmates, and physical changes [2; 15].

Taking into account these peculiarities of teaching high school students, it is important to adapt the teaching methodology and activities so they align with the unique needs and challenges of students. When teaching writing skills, it is important to design *writing prompts* in accordance with learners' personal interests and experiences. This approach makes students feel the relevance of the task, thus fostering motivation to complete it. Additionally, it is also essential to acknowledge the significant capacity of adolescents to learn foreign languages by assigning them challenging writing tasks. Such tasks not only boost their self-esteem but also enhance their motivation to perform better [2; 15].

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is clear that the journey toward proficiency in communicative skills in English writing involves more than just mastering grammar and syntax. It is about encouraging students to express themselves effectively, communicate their thoughts, ideas, and emotions with clarity and purpose.

Drawing from the insights shared by the scholars like Yusupov et al., Dragomir and Niculescu, communicative writing competence involves a nuanced understanding of the context, audience, and purpose of writing. As teachers, it is of utmost importance to teach students the ability to tailor their writing to different communicative scenarios, whether it is persuading, informing, or entertaining.

Reflecting on the insights shared by scholars such as Ur, Harmer, Nunan, and others, educators are reminded by the existence of a wide range of strategies available to them. Comparing Raimes' and Harmer's classifications of approaches to teaching foreign language writing skills reveals both similarities and differences. Each classification presents its own advantages and challenges. Navigating through these nuances is essential for teachers seeking to effectively implement these approaches in their classrooms.

Therefore, I would recommend teachers to be more flexible and adaptable. While it is pivotal to have a framework at hand, it is also crucial to be able to tailor the approach to the unique needs and characteristics of learners. High school students, in particular, are a dynamic group with diverse backgrounds and experiences, alongside the challenges they are confronted at their age. By

incorporating activities which resonate with their personal interests and aspirations, teachers can foster a deeper level of engagement and motivation.

REFERENCES

1. Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press, 200 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10016 (ISBN-0-19-434131-3, \$5.95).
2. Harmer, J. (2001). The practice of English language teaching. *London/New York*, 401-405.
3. Ur, P. (2012). *A course in English language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology* (Vol. 192). New York: prentice hall.
5. Kunanbayeva, S. (2013). *The modernization of foreign language education: the linguocultural-communicative approach* (pp. 48-50). London, UK: Hertfordshire Press.
6. Yusupov, O., Abdazimov, A., Muradov, U., Kuchkeldiyeva, U., & Mirkasimova, M. (2021). Improving writing skills using Communicative competence. *International Journal of World Languages*, 1(2).
7. Dragomir, I. A., & Niculescu, B. O. (2020). Different Approaches to Developing Writing Skills. *Land Forces Academy Review*, 25(3), 201-206.
8. Shafaei, A. (2012). *Frontiers of Language and Teaching, Vol. 2: Proceedings of the 2011 International Online Language Conference (IOLC 2011)*. Universal-Publishers.
9. Selvaraj, M., & Aziz, A. A. (2019). Systematic review: Approaches in teaching writing skill in ESL classrooms. *International Journal of Academic Research in Progressive Education and Development*, 8(4), 450-473.
10. Gugin, D. (2014). A Paragraph-First Approach to the Teaching of Academic Writing. In *English Teaching Forum* (Vol. 52, No. 3, p. 24). US Department of State. Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Office of English Language Programs, SA-5, 2200 C Street NW 4th Floor, Washington, DC 20037.
11. Hwang, J. A. (2010). A case study of the influence of freewriting on writing fluency and confidence of EFL college-level students.
12. EL OUIDANI, Y. O. U. S. S. E. F., & EL BAGHDADI, S. Y. Main Approaches to Teaching Writing in EFL/ESL Contexts: A Literature Review.
13. Tangkiengsirisin, S. (2006). Approaches to teaching second language writing. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, 3, 1-26.
14. Zhou, G., & Niu, X. (2015). Approaches to language teaching and learning. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 6(4), 798.
15. Ur, P. (2009). English as a lingua franca and some implications for English teachers. *Plenary handouts*, 1-7.

A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO ANALYZING COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES IN ELT

Gauhar O. Orazaly

2-year master's student with a major in "Foreign Language: Two Foreign Languages",
NJSC "The L.N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University", Astana, Kazakhstan

eunbiased00@gmail.com

Aygul A. Tadjibaeva

PhD, Senior Lecturer of the Foreign Languages Theory and Practice Department,