

FOREIGN AND NATIONAL METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES TO DEVELOPING ARGUMENTATIVE WRITING SKILLS IN ENGLISH

Isroilova Dildora Muhtorovna

Uzbekistan state world language university

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences (DSc), Professor

dilquv@gmail.com.

+998941055364

Alisherova Mohinur Muhiddin qizi

Researcher at Namangan State University

, mohinuralisherova@gmail.com.

+998997941909

ABSTRACT

The teaching of argumentative writing in English occupies a significant place in modern language education, as it contributes to learners' academic literacy, reasoning ability, and written communicative competence. This article explores foreign and national methodological approaches to developing argumentative writing skills in English. The study focuses on identifying theoretical foundations, instructional principles, and methodological distinctions between international and locally developed approaches.

Keywords: argumentative writing, methodology, academic writing, foreign approaches, national approaches.

INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization and the expansion of international academic communication, mastery of written discourse in English has become an essential educational objective¹. Among various types of written discourse, argumentative writing holds a special position due to its role in expressing opinions, defending viewpoints, and constructing logically coherent texts. Scholars emphasize that argumentative writing is not merely a linguistic activity but also a cognitive process that reflects learners' critical thinking and analytical skills².

In recent years, both foreign and national researchers have proposed diverse methodological approaches aimed at improving students' argumentative writing competence. However, these approaches differ in their theoretical foundations,

¹ Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

² Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

instructional strategies, and pedagogical priorities. Therefore, a comparative analysis of foreign and national methodological approaches is necessary to identify their strengths and limitations and to determine possibilities for their integration in English language teaching.

METHODS.

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research methodology based on systematic analysis and synthesis of scientific and methodological literature. The methodological framework is grounded in comparative analysis, which allows for the identification of similarities and differences between foreign and national approaches to teaching argumentative writing in English. Foreign methodological approaches are examined through internationally recognized scholarly works on academic writing, genre analysis, and second language writing pedagogy³. These sources are selected due to their theoretical significance and widespread application in international educational contexts. National methodological approaches are analyzed using studies developed within the local pedagogical tradition, which reflect curriculum requirements, instructional norms, and language learning conditions specific to the national context. The analytical procedure involves several stages:

1. Selection of relevant sources based on their thematic focus on argumentative writing;
2. Identification of key methodological principles and instructional strategies;
3. Comparison of teaching stages and techniques employed in foreign and national approaches;
4. An interpretation of findings in relation to their pedagogical implications. Particular attention is paid to how argumentative writing is conceptualized, the role of teacher guidance versus learner autonomy, and the balance between linguistic accuracy and critical thinking development. This methodological approach enables a comprehensive and objective examination of existing practices and provides a reliable basis for discussing the integration of foreign and national methodologies in the development of argumentative writing skills in English.

RESULTS.

The analysis of foreign methodological approaches demonstrates that contemporary international research on argumentative writing strongly relies on genre-based pedagogy and process-oriented writing models⁴. Within this framework, argumentative writing is viewed as a socially situated academic practice governed by

³ Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Pearson Education.

⁴ Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 87–102.

disciplinary conventions and communicative purposes. Instruction typically begins with explicit analysis of model texts, enabling learners to identify structural components such as thesis statements, supporting arguments, counterarguments, and conclusions. This genre awareness facilitates students' understanding of how arguments are constructed and evaluated in academic contexts. Furthermore, foreign approaches emphasize recursive writing processes, including pre-writing, drafting, peer review, revision, and editing. These stages are designed to foster metacognitive awareness and encourage learners to critically assess both their own and others' written arguments. As a result, students develop the ability to substantiate claims with evidence, employ logical reasoning, and anticipate opposing viewpoints. Such practices significantly contribute to the development of higher-order thinking skills and academic autonomy. In contrast, national methodological approaches prioritize the gradual and systematic formation of argumentative writing skills through teacher-guided instruction and structured exercises⁵. Instruction often begins with sentence-level and paragraph-level tasks, focusing on grammatical accuracy, lexical appropriateness, and the correct use of cohesive devices. Only after these foundational skills are established are learners introduced to more complex argumentative structures, such as extended essays and opinion-based texts.

National methodologies also place strong emphasis on alignment with curriculum standards and assessment requirements. Argumentative writing tasks are carefully sequenced to match learners' linguistic proficiency and cognitive readiness. This approach ensures consistency and reduces cognitive overload, particularly for learners in secondary education. However, the emphasis on controlled practice may limit opportunities for independent argument construction and critical engagement with diverse perspectives.

DISCUSSION.

The findings indicate that the differences between foreign and national methodological approaches are rooted in distinct pedagogical traditions and educational priorities. Foreign approaches are grounded in constructivist and learner-centered paradigms, which view students as active participants in knowledge construction. Through engagement with authentic texts and problem-based tasks, learners are encouraged to negotiate meaning, evaluate evidence, and develop independent argumentative voices. By contrast, national approaches reflect a more structured and teacher-centered orientation, emphasizing accuracy, clarity, and adherence to established norms. From a pedagogical standpoint, these differences should not be interpreted as methodological shortcomings but rather as context-

⁵ Jalolov, J. J. (2012). *Chet tillarni o 'qitish metodikasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, pp. 145–162

sensitive responses to specific educational conditions. Each approach addresses particular instructional needs and learner profiles.

A potential solution lies in the integration of foreign and national methodologies. Combining genre awareness and process writing with systematic linguistic training may result in a balanced instructional model that supports both critical thinking and language accuracy. Such an integrated approach can enhance learners' argumentative competence while maintaining methodological rigor and curricular relevance⁶. The comparative analysis indicates that foreign and national methodological approaches differ not only in instructional techniques but also in their underlying pedagogical philosophy. While foreign methodologies prioritize learner autonomy and critical engagement, national approaches emphasize teacher guidance and controlled practice. From a pedagogical perspective, the integration of these approaches may lead to more effective instruction by combining cognitive independence with linguistic accuracy and methodological consistency⁶.

CONCLUSION.

The study concludes that both foreign and national methodological approaches play a crucial role in developing argumentative writing skills in English. Foreign approaches contribute to the development of critical thinking and academic independence, whereas national approaches ensure structured skill formation and linguistic correctness. A balanced integration of these methodologies can enhance the effectiveness of teaching argumentative writing and better prepare learners for academic communication in English.

REFERENCES

1. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 58–72.
2. Hyland, K. (2003). *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 12–27.
3. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (5th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, pp. 334–356.
4. Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 87–102.
5. Jalolov, J. J. (2012). *Chet tillarni o 'qitish metodikasi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi, pp. 145–162.
6. Erkaboyeva, N. (2020). *Yozma nutqni rivojlantirish masalalari*. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, pp. 88–101.

⁶ Erkaboyeva, N. (2020). *Yozma nutqni rivojlantirish masalalari*. Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, pp. 88–101.