DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION FOR TEACHING WRITING SKILLS

DIFERENCIÁLNA VÝUČBA ZRUČNOSTÍ PÍSANIA

KATARÍNA CHVÁLOVÁ

Abstract: The paper aims to investigate the role of differentiated instruction in teaching writing skills. It seeks to demonstrate how individual personality traits, known as the Big Five factors, influence writing skills and students' performance. Based on the research, openness to experience is strongly correlated with creativity, cognitive flexibility, and originality in writing. At the same time, conscientiousness predicts structural accuracy, coherence, and adherence to academic conventions. The study points to the need to adapt writing instruction to learners' individual needs and incorporate differentiated teaching strategies, which are essential for enhancing both the cognitive and stylistic dimensions of learners' written expression.

Keywords: differentiated instruction, writing skills, BIG five factors, cognitive flexibility, stylistic dimensions.

Abstrakt: Cieľom príspevku je preskúmať úlohu diferencovaných pokynov pri výučbe zručností písania. Snaží sa poukázať na to, ako individuálne osobnostné črty, ktoré sa označujú ako "model veľkej päťky", ovplyvňujú zručnosti písania a výkony študentov. Na základe výskumu sa ukázalo, že otvorenosť voči novým skúsenostiam úzko súvisí s kreativitou, kognitívnou flexibilitou a originalitou v písaní. Zároveň svedomitosť predurčuje štrukturálnu presnosť, koherentnosť a dodržiavanie akademických konvencií. Štúdia poukazuje na potrebu prispôsobiť výučbu písania individuálnym potrebám študentov a uplatnenie diferencovaných výučbových stratégií, ktoré sú nevyhnutné pre zlepšenie kognitívnych aj štýlových dimenzií písomného prejavu študentov.

Kľúčové slová: diferencovaná výučba, písomné zručnosti, model veľkej päťky, kognitívna flexibilita, štýlové dimenzie.

Introduction

Writing is often regarded as one of the most complex linguistic skills due to its cognitive, emotional, and linguistic demands. In contrast to speaking, writing necessitates planning, structuring, revising, and conscious linguistic decision-making (Kellogg, 1994, 2008). Currently, writing skills are underrated and should be further developed. As a result, students in lower- and upper-secondary schools need more frequent differentiated instruction. To support students' individual needs, learners should be engaged in more practical topics through a multisensory approach. This not only boosts their motivation but also creates a positive attitude towards writing (Chválová, Židová, 2024). Therefore, teachers should pay attention to individual

personality traits, the so-called Big Five factors, which can help them organise the teaching process more productively, and make writing instruction more effective, as these individual variables significantly shape productive and receptive skills. In addition, these personality traits not only enhance the quality of teaching and learning but also improve performance outcomes when appropriate writing strategies are implemented. This view supports Bandura's social-cognitive theory, which emphasises the interaction of cognitive and environmental factors influencing behaviour and learning (Bandura, 1986, 1997). His perspective is supported by Doll and Ajzen (1992), who see them as broadly applicable characteristics of an individual that could be applied across different situations. Thus, the Big Five personality framework offers valuable insights into individual differences in writing behaviour. Furthermore, recent studies indicate correlations between openness, conscientiousness, and creative written expression (Furnham, 2012; Zhang, 2010). These links are also investigated in Filová and Chválová's (2025) empirical research, which points out that personality traits are significant predictors of writing outcomes, thereby highlighting the importance of differentiated writing instruction based on personality profiles.

The following chapters will shed light on writing as a skill and a process, the role of personality traits, and the Big Five factors in writing development. Besides that, approaches to teaching writing, techniques, and strategies will be introduced, along with the role of formative assessment in a differentiated writing classroom.

Writing as a skill and a process

Writing as a complex linguistic and cognitive skill

Writing in a foreign language involves integrating several components that function simultaneously: linguistic knowledge (grammar, vocabulary, spelling), a familiarity with discourse analysis (structure and cohesion), and advanced cognitive skills such as planning, monitoring, and revising. Kellogg's (1994) writing model highlights that writers need to synchronise working memory, long-term knowledge, and executive control, rendering writing more cognitively challenging than speaking.

In lower- and upper-secondary EFL classrooms, learners often struggle with writing tasks because they require advanced cognitive skills. Teachers often find it time-consuming and therefore endeavour to avoid it. Consequently, they need to consider how to motivate learners who find this process slow, effortful, and risky, given their limited linguistic capabilities and the perceived risk of the written product, especially as they approach their final evaluation. Kapustová (2023) emphasises that learners face significant challenges when generating ideas, structuring content, and revising their work; most learners tend to submit the first draft while focusing more on accuracy than on message development. This approach to global studies indicates that students often see spelling and grammar as the main obstacles, while fundamental issues such as planning and content are overlooked (Fareed, Ashraf, Bilal, 2016).

When approaching writing in classes, teachers need to bear in mind its complexity and apply a differentiated instruction perspective, which can enable them to shape this concept as a developable competence rather than a fixed talent.

As a result, the entire process may require different types and levels of scaffolding, taking into account individual learners' profiles, i.e., personality traits, learning styles, and cognitive styles. It is also recommended to use a multisensory approach, which can support students with learning disabilities (Chválová, 2018).

Writing as a process

Process-oriented approaches view writing as an integrated process that guides learners through several stages, such as planning, drafting, redrafting, revising, and editing (Montague, 1995). Compared to Chueng's (2016) approach, focusing on grammatical accuracy, organising ideas, individual work, and the final product, Montague, on the other hand, emphasises the importance of teacher and peer feedback, conferencing, thus supporting learners to take risks, reflect on their writing, and eventually gain control over both form and content.

In addition, Raimes (1983) highlights that providing learners with feedback encourages them to come up with new ideas, improve their work, and thus supports them in shaping their creative potential.

To meet learners' individual needs and develop their creative potential, teachers should be aware of differentiation and modes, allowing learners to work collaboratively with peers. By individualising instruction, implementing a multisensory teaching approach, and using formative assessment tools, students have the opportunity to assess their learning in a wide array of ways. In order to ensure effective writing instruction, key process components relevant for differentiated instruction should be included (Chvalova, 2023):

- **Planning** – brainstorming, mind-mapping, goal setting, outlining.
- **Drafting** – converting concepts into a written form with an emphasis on content rather than accuracy.
- **Revising** – reorganising content, elucidating meaning, enhancing cohesion and coherence.
- **Editing** – correcting grammar errors, spelling mistakes, punctuation, and formatting inconsistencies.

Research conducted by Kapustová (2023) shows that many learners either incline to skipping the planning stage or restrict their revision efforts to merely correcting superficial mistakes.

Differentiated instruction, therefore, intends to explicitly teach planning and revising, tailoring support to the varying levels of self-regulation and personality traits of learners (for instance, conscientious students might engage in extensive planning but exhibit perfectionism, whereas those with high openness may prioritise originality, potentially sacrificing structural coherence (Filová, 2024).

Affective and motivational dimensions

Writing also constitutes an affective experience: factors such as anxiety, self-efficacy, and attitudes towards writing significantly affect how learners interact with tasks. Chválová and Židová (2023) highlight that a diminished focus on writing in foreign language lessons can result in learners perceiving it as peripheral or meaningless. As

a result, teachers should think about ways to enhance students' motivation. This can be done through :

- selecting practical and meaningful tasks, while involving learners in creative topics;
- incorporating multisensory input (images, video clips, realia);
- implementing technology tools (blogs, collaborative documents, digital storytelling);
- letting students choose a genre, target audience, and media.

These components are essential for all types of learners, especially those who frequently link writing with failure and frustration; they also correspond well to the needs of students who score high on openness to experience, as these individuals thrive on challenging and varied tasks.

Personality traits, Big Five factors, and writing development

Personality traits as individual differences in SLA

To develop writing skills more effectively, the entire process needs to be more thorough, considering students' individual personality characteristics, which can be observed in their thoughts, feelings, and behaviour. Being aware of these individual variables can help learners approach their activities and interact with their environment.

Dubovská's (2021) research on personality traits and productive skills emphasises that personality is one of the most influential individual variables in education, shaping learners' involvement, persistence, and strategy choice.

In second language acquisition, personality traits have been associated with motivation, willingness to communicate, risk-taking, and the selection of learning strategies (Zafar, Meenakshi, 2012).

Although significant research has investigated speaking, analogous mechanisms are at play in writing: an individual's personality may influence willingness to experiment with language, attention to detail, tolerance for ambiguity, and emotional response to feedback.

The Big Five model

The Big Five (OCEAN) model is currently the most widely recognised framework for defining personality traits: openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism. Dubovská (2023) specifies their behavioural expressions in communication as follows:

- **Openness to experience** – linked with creativity, imagination, preference for complex and challenging tasks, reflective and analytical approach.
- **Conscientiousness** – associated with organisation, diligence, persistence, and meticulous attention to detail.
- **Extraversion** – typical for sociability, positive affect, and active participation.
- **Agreeableness** – linked with cooperativeness, empathy, and the tendency to avoid conflict.

- **Neuroticism** – related to emotional instability, anxiety, and heightened sensitivity to stress.

Her empirical findings indicated a significant positive impact of openness and conscientiousness on productive skills (especially discourse management and overall fluency). On the other hand, a moderate positive impact of extraversion on grammar and vocabulary is observed, while neuroticism appears to have a negligible or non-significant effect.

These results align with Filová and Chválová's (2024) research on writing, which indicated that openness was a predictor of creativity and originality in written works, while conscientiousness predicted structural accuracy and coherence, and neuroticism exhibited a negative correlation with overall cohesion and fluency among ninth-grade students.

Consequences of Big Five traits for writing

Based on the research conducted by Chvalová, Dubovská, and Filová, we can imply potential strengths and challenges:

- **Openness to experience**
    - *Strengths*: abundant ideas, creative topics, eagerness to explore new genres, flexible approach to using language.
    - *Challenges*: potential disregard for task specifications, casual tone, vague structure, and difficulty completing tasks.
- **Conscientiousness**
    - *Strengths*: meticulous planning, compliance with conventions (formatting, citations), precise grammar and spelling, and comprehensive revision.
    - *Challenges*: perfectionistic tendencies, apprehension towards risk-taking, slow output, excessive focus on accuracy at the cost of content.
- **Extraversion**
    - *Strengths*: willingness to engage in collaborative planning, sharing ideas, and providing peer feedback; active participation in communicative activities.
    - *Challenges*: impatience during solitary drafting, preference for verbal communication over written expression, inclination to overlook thorough revision.
- **Agreeableness**
    - *Strengths*: collaborative attitude in peer evaluation, awareness of audience needs, courteous tone.
    - *Challenges*: hesitance to voice strong viewpoints, excessive dependence on group consensus, difficulty critiquing peers' work.
- **Neuroticism**
    - *Strengths*: In some instances, heightened self-awareness may result in meticulous editing.
    - *Challenges*: feelings of anxiety, avoidance of demanding writing tasks, exaggerated responses to feedback, propensity to surrender easily.

Identifying these patterns enables educators to foresee areas where students may require additional scaffolding and to create personality-sensitive writing tasks.

Personality traits and differentiated writing instruction

To support students with effective writing instruction, the above-mentioned personality traits need to be provided. The so-called BIG five factors give teachers a valuable insight into students' thinking, feeling, and behaving, thus enabling them to differentiate between their individual profiles (Cattell, 1947; McCrae & Costa, 1983). Matching teaching strategies to learners' profiles can therefore enhance both performance and self-efficacy, aligning with Bandura's social-cognitive theory, which highlights reciprocal interactions among personal factors (such as traits and beliefs), behaviour (e.g., strategy use), and the environment (e.g., classroom activities).

As traits allow predicting students' typical behaviour and emotional responses (Cattell, 1947; McCrae & Costa, 1983), they enable teachers to anticipate how learners will engage with activities and to modify content, and provide students with appropriate intervention in the writing process.

According to the research conducted by Dubovská and Filová (2023, 2024), differentiated instruction in writing ought to:

- harness the creative capabilities of students with high openness through open-ended and project-based writing activities;
- utilise the organisational skills of conscientious students by designating them roles in peer-editing and planning;
- offer structured scaffolding aimed at reducing anxiety for learners scoring high on neuroticism;
- motivate extraverted students to direct their oral energy into collaborative pre-writing and oral rehearsal sessions;
- capitalise on agreeableness to foster supportive peer feedback and co-creation of assessment rubrics.

In this manner, personality traits truly provide valuable insight and guide teachers in differentiating among diverse learners' needs rather than viewing them as a source of deficit labels.

Approaches to teaching writing and differentiated instruction

Traditional approaches to writing

In the realm of EFL/ESL pedagogy, four primary approaches to writing are identified: product, process, genre, and process-genre. The product approach is characterised by its focus on form and is centred around the teacher; it depends on model texts, controlled practice, and the production of an accurate final product (Harmer, 2004; Scrivener, 2011). Conversely, the process approach views writing as a recursive process involving planning, drafting, revising, and editing, prioritizing fluency and idea development over accuracy (Harmer, 2007). The genre approach emphasizes the social purposes, audience expectations, and structural conventions associated with specific text types, thereby assisting learners in writing for authentic communicative

contexts (Harmer, 2004; Hyland, 2003). The process-genre approach synthesizes these perspectives by guiding learners through the stages of writing while explicitly addressing genre characteristics (Badger & White, 2000). From a differentiated instruction perspective, each approach offers unique advantages for different learner profiles. Product-oriented instruction may particularly benefit learners who are highly conscientious and appreciate clear models and explicit accuracy objectives. However, it may also demotivate those who need additional support in generating ideas or who excel at creative, less-structured tasks, such as students with high openness. When differentiated, process and genre approaches enable educators to support both creativity and control through staged drafting, feedback, and modeling. In practical application, teachers can differentiate content by varying topics and genres, process by modifying the amount and types of scaffolding, and product by establishing different expectations regarding length, complexity, and accuracy. Additionally, they can differentiate the learning environment by providing opportunities for pair and group writing, as well as diverse feedback methods. Such a principled application and integration of product, process, genre, and process-genre practices cater to learners' cognitive, affective, and personality differences while ensuring consistent curricular outcomes for written communication in a second language (Tomlinson, 2013, 2014; Scrivener, 2011).

Differentiated instruction and Universal Design for Learning

Building on the alignment of writing methodologies with various learner profiles, differentiated instruction provides a comprehensive pedagogical framework for systematically addressing differences in learners' readiness, interests, and learning profiles. Differentiated instruction is typically characterised as responsive teaching that intentionally modifies content, process, product, and learning environment to enhance access and challenge for all learners (Tomlinson, 2014). Within the realm of writing, this framework offers a principled approach to implementing the product, process, genre, and process-genre methodologies mentioned earlier in ways attuned to individual personality traits and emotional needs. In more specific terms, differentiated writing instruction may encompass: Content – by adjusting topics, texts, and model genres in accordance with learners' interests, prior knowledge, or cultural backgrounds; Process – by providing multiple pathways to achieve the same learning objective, such as graphic organizers, oral rehearsals, sentence starters, checklists, or staged feedback; Product – by permitting various formats, lengths, or modes of output (e.g., digital narratives, presentations, or traditional essays) while upholding common assessment standards; Environment – by arranging flexible groupings, offering quiet areas, or ensuring access to suitable assistive technologies. Chválová and Židová (2024) further highlight the importance of a multisensory and inclusive approach, drawing on the principles of Universal Design for Learning (UDL). From a UDL standpoint, information should be delivered through multiple modalities (visual, auditory, kinesthetic), learners should be provided with diverse means of action and expression (e.g., typing, handwriting, voice-to-text tools), and engagement should be fostered through choice, relevance, and meaningful challenges. These principles closely align with differentiated

instruction, as both frameworks aim to eliminate unnecessary obstacles and to create writing tasks that are both accessible and suitably challenging for a diverse array of learners.

For students with special educational needs (SEN), differentiated writing instruction may encompass specific modifications such as larger fonts, shortened text, alternative assessment methods, clear and explicit criteria, or sequential scaffolding (Chvalová & Židová, 2024; Kapustová, 2023). Crucially, these modifications frequently also benefit so-called "exceptional" learners, especially those who exhibit high levels of neuroticism (who may feel anxious about writing) or low levels of conscientiousness (who may find it challenging to maintain organisation and persistence). Thus, differentiated instruction and Universal Design for Learning (UDL) offer complementary frameworks for crafting writing pedagogy that is inclusive, responsive to individual differences, and aligned with the overarching curricular objectives of second language education.

Writing strategies and SRSD

Strategy instruction is a key element of effective writing teaching. Chválová (2024) and Kapustová (2023) both highlight the importance of self-regulated strategy development (SRSD), initially developed by Graham and Harris (2004), which links cognitive strategies (what to do) with self-regulation strategies (how to manage behaviour and emotions). Chválová describes several empirically validated SRSD-based strategies:

- **POW + WWW, What = 2, How = 2** – a mnemonic that encourages learners *to pick ideas, Organise notes, write and say more*; and remember *Who, When, Where; What happened; and How it ended, How the characters felt* for narrative writing.
- **TREE** – a strategy used for opinion/argumentative writing: *Topic sentence, Reasons, Explain reasons, Ending*.
- **LESSER** – aimed at summarising and organising shorter texts.
- **COPS** – an editing strategy encourages learners to check *Capitalisation, Organisation, Punctuation, Spelling*.

These strategies are invaluable for learners who score low on conscientiousness or high on neuroticism, who may feel overwhelmed by open-ended activities. Similarly, they can serve as flexible guidelines for high-openness learners, providing them with guidance throughout the writing process. Differentiation can be supported by:

- teaching a common core of strategies, while enabling learners to select which ones they acquire;
- offering more intensive modelling and guided practice for students who require it;
- providing advanced strategy combinations (e.g., TREE + rhetorical moves) to high-performing or highly conscientious students.

Techniques and activities for developing writing

To shape learners' writing competence, Kapustová, Chválová, and Židová, together with Raimes (1983), Byrne (1993), Harmer (2004), and Filová (thesis), emphasise a wide array of techniques that can be tailored to accommodate various proficiency levels and student characteristics. Techniques prior to writing, such as brainstorming, mind maps, visual organisers, storyboards, and questioning frameworks, facilitate generating ideas and discourse planning. Meanwhile, the multisensory approaches, including picture sequences, comic strips, role-plays, and later written-up, hands-on projects, promote richer lexical input and contextualisation through visual and kinaesthetic modalities. Engaging learners with pictures and reading texts further enhances these benefits by providing vocabulary, cultural content, and models of discourse that can be exploited for description, comparison, grammatical analysis, summarising, and parallel writing. Guided and controlled writing, such as sentence frames, gap-filling exercises, partially completed or model-based texts, offers a reliable framework for composition, allowing practice in organisation at the sentence and paragraph level. Techniques that encourage collaboration and integrated skills, including pair and group compositions, "round-robin" storytelling, discussions, interviews, and note-taking. Bring classroom writing closer to authentic communication. A variety of activity types – copying and reinforcement activities, sentence-linking and sequencing, communicative and comprehension activities, as well as creative tasks such as emails, blogs, posters, questionnaires, quizzes, or short stories. Differentiation is accomplished by providing a choice of tasks (e.g., narrative versus diary entry), adjusting the level of scaffolding, and incorporating flexible grouping strategies, such as pairing more open-minded learners with more conscientious peers to maximise support and autonomy.

Differentiated writing strategies based on personality profiles

Although educators are not qualified to diagnose personality traits clinically, straightforward questionnaires or observational methods can uncover tendencies that help tailor instruction. Drawing upon the research conducted by Dubovská and Filová (2023, 2024), the subsequent guidelines demonstrate how differentiation can be implemented in practice.

Learners high in openness to experience
- Offer **choice of topic and genre** (i.e., a fantasy story, a blog post, an alternative ending of a text).
- Incorporate **project-based activities** that encourage creativity and integration of images and technology.
- Support **risk-taking in language use** (metaphors, unusual collocations) while gradually reinforcing structural clarity through strategies like TREE.
- incorporate **reflective activities** (such as learning journals, writer's logs) that resonate with their analytical and introspective tendencies.

Learners high in conscientiousness
- Leverage their **organisational skills** by assigning roles such as group editor or "structure expert".
- Offer **clear rubrics and checklists**, which they typically appreciate and follow carefully.
- Mitigate perfectionism by establishing time constraints and praising attempts at more ambitious content, not only correctness.
- Use **formative assessment** to assist them in prioritising: a draft may be "good enough" for now.

Extraverted learners
- Integrate **oral rehearsal techniques** (such as pair discussions, role-plays) before writing, enabling them to verbalise their texts into existence".
- Utilise **collaborative writing tools** (shared documents, peer planning) that incorporate social interaction into the writing process.
- implement **brief, timed writing bursts** and competitive but low-stakes challenges to channel their energy.

Agreeable learners
- Engage them in **peer tutoring** and **feedback activities**, as their supportive nature fosters a safe environment.
- Provide explicit training to **express disagreement politely**, so their texts can include critical evaluation rather than only agreement.
- Implement **audience-awareness activities** (letters, advice columns) where empathy is encouraged.

Learners high in neuroticism
- Offer **highly structured activities** with clear models, sentence starters, and small, manageable steps.
- Incorporate **private written feedback** and one-to-one conferences to reduce performance anxiety.
- Provide **self-regulation strategies** from SRSD (self-instructions, goal setting, self-monitoring) to support them in managing negative emotions.
- Highlight **effort and progress** over comparison with others; incorporate portfolios to document growth.

These personality-sensitive models do not necessitate separate lessons; instead, they promote flexible implementation of strategies, grouping, and materials, integrated with the principles of differentiated instruction and UDL.

Formative assessment of writing in a differentiated classroom

Principles of formative assessment in writing

Formative assessment is a continuous process of collecting evidence about learning, interpreting it, and applying it to enhance teaching and learning strategies. In writing, practical formative assessment:
- highlights specific, actionable feedback rather than global grades;
- verifies learning goals and success criteria (e.g., via analytic rubrics);

- incorporates self-assessment and peer assessment;
- enables revision and redrafting after feedback;
- reviews individual progress over time rather than comparing learners to a single norm.

Kapustová's findings reveal that many students prioritise spelling and grammar during revision, while giving insufficient attention to content and organisation. Formative assessment can help redirect their focus toward higher-order components, including idea development, coherence, and audience awareness, by explicitly including them in rubrics and feedback (2024).

Personality-informed formative assessment

Dubovská (2023) designed a self-assessment rubric addressing self-confidence, self-esteem, and attitude to English, which can inspire similar tools for writing. When adopted into the writing process, such rubrics can encourage students to reflect on:

- how confident they feel about expressing ideas in writing compositions;
- how they see their strengths (creativity, structure, vocabulary, etc.);
- how often they implement strategies (planning, revising, checking).

In a differentiated writing classroom, formative assessment can be incorporated as follows:

- For conscientious learners, highlight *macro-level feedback* (content and organisation) to balance their focus on surface accuracy.
- For high-openness learners, emphasise *clarity and coherence* and ask them to clarify how their creative choices align with their communicative purposes.
- For anxious learners, apply *comment-only marking* and negotiated targets rather than grades, to reduce fear of failure.
- For extraverted and agreeable learners, implement *peer assessment* with clear guidelines to prevent comments that are either over-lenient or overly critical.

Portfolio assessment, where students collect drafts, final versions, and reflective commentaries, adheres to SRSD principles and enables educators to monitor the impact of differentiated strategies on each learner's journey.

Conclusion

Writing is a multifaceted skill and process that requires cognitive, linguistic, and affective components. In the context of EFL at lower- and upper-secondary levels, it is often neglected, partly due to its time-consuming nature and partly because instruction often fails to address individual learners' needs and personality types.

As a result, the Big Five model offers a valuable framework and insight into how traits such as openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism shape learners' writing competence. Building on Dubovská's findings on productive skills and Filová's and Chválová's study on writing performance, the paper asserted that openness to experience and conscientiousness, in particular, are key predictors of creativity and structural quality, whereas neuroticism may hinder fluency and cohesion.

Additionally, differentiated writing instruction—rooted in process and genre approaches, informed by UDL principles, and enriched with SRSD-based strategies—provides a promising way to respond to these individual differences. Techniques such as a multisensory approach enable teachers to involve learners in pre-writing, structured planning and revising, collaborative writing, and flexible task design, which can be modified according to learners' personality profiles and special educational needs, as demonstrated in the works of Chválová, Židová (2024, and Kapustová (2023). Finally, formative assessment plays an essential role in facilitating differentiated instruction. When feedback is continuous, specific, and growth-oriented, learners are part of the self-assessment and peer assessment processes, and writing becomes not only a product to be judged but also a process to be consciously developed. Aligning personality-sensitive feedback and self-regulation strategies can further enhance students' motivation and autonomy.

Overall, integrating differentiated instruction, personality traits, and formative assessment can therefore provide teachers with a robust framework for developing writing skills in diverse EFL classrooms and guide each learner to find their individual path towards more effective and confident written expression.

References

BADGER, R., WHITE, G. 2000. A process genre approach to teaching writing. In: *ELT Journal,* 54 (2), pp. 153 – 160.

BANDURA, A. 1986. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.

BANDURA, A. 1997. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman.

CATTELL, R. B. 1947. *Personality: A psychological interpretation*. New York: Holt.

BYRNE, D. 1993. *Teaching Writing Skills.* Singapore: Longman Group UK Limited, 1993. 154 p.

CHVÁLOVÁ, K., ŽIDOVÁ, M. 2024. Shaping Writing Skills in Students with Learning Disabilities. In: *To Understand Is to Be Free: Interdisciplinary Aspects of Comprehensibility and Understanding.* Wien : Praesens Verlag, pp. 239 – 256. Available at: https://depot.phaidra.at/api/object/o:361/preview?force=1Shaping Writing Skills in Students with Learning Disabilities

CHVÁLOVÁ K., STRANOVSKÁ, E. 2018. Differentiated approach to teaching foreign languages based on individual psychological variables. In: *Cudzie jazyky v premenách času 8*, 2018. Bratislava: Ekonóm, s. 299 – 315.

CONGJUN, M. 2005. A taxonomy of ESL writing strategies. In: *Redesigning Pedagogy: Research, Policy, Practice.* Singapore: National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University.

CHEUNG, Y. L. 2016. Teaching Writing. In: *RENANDYA, W. A., WIDODO, H. P. (Eds.)*. English Language Teaching Today: Linking Theory and Practice. New York: Springer Cham, pp. 179 – 194.

DOLL, J., AJZEN, I. 1992. Accessibility and stability of predictors in the theory of planned behaviour. In: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 63 (5), pp. 754 – 765.

DUBOVSKÁ, P. 2021. *Consequences of personality traits on shaping productive communicative skills.* University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, Faculty of Arts, Department of British and American Studies.

FAREED, M., ASHRAF, A., BILAL, M. 2016. ESL learners' writing skills: Problems, factors, and suggestions. In: *Journal of Education and Social Sciences*, 4 (2), pp. 81 – 92.

FILOVÁ, V., CHVÁLOVÁ, K. 2025. *The role of personality variables in developing writing skills.* (Master's thesis). Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Faculty of Education.

FLOWER, L., HAYES, J. R. 1981. A cognitive process theory of writing. In: *College Composition and Communication*, 32 (4), pp. 365 – 387.

FURNHAM, A. 2012. Personality and creative thinking. In: *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52 (1), pp. 78 – 81.

GRAHAM, S. 2018. A revised writer(s)-within-community model of writing. In: *Educational Psychologist*, 53 (4), pp. 258 – 279.

GRAHAM, S., HARRIS, K. R., CHORZEMPA, B. F. 2002. Contribution of SRSD instruction to the writing and self-regulation of students with learning problems. In: *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94 (3), pp. 687 – 698.

GRAHAM, S., HARRIS, K. R., MACARTHUR, C. A. 2004. Writing instruction. In: *B. Y. L. Wong (Eds.) 2004. Learning about learning disabilities*, 3rd ed., pp. 281 – 313.

GRAHAM, S., McKEOWN, D., KIUHARA, S., HARRIS, K. R. 2012. A meta-analysis of writing instruction for students in the elementary grades. In: *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104 (4), pp. 879 – 896.

HARRIS, K. R., GRAHAM, S. 2009. Self-regulated strategy development in writing: Premises, evolution, and the future. In: *British Journal of Educational Psychology Monograph Series* 2 (6), pp. 113 – 135.

HARMER, J. 2004. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Harlow: Pearson Longman.

HARMER, J. 2004. *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.

HARMER, J. 2007. *How to Teach English*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.

HARRIS, K. R., GRAHAM, S., MASON, L. H., FRIEDLANDER, B. 2013. Bring powerful writing strategies into your classroom – Why and how. In: *The Reading Teacher*, 66 (7), pp. 538 – 542.

HYLAND, K. 2003. *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KAPUSTOVÁ, A. 2023. *Development of writing skills in SEN learners in lower secondary schools.* Constantine the Philosopher University in Nitra, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language and Culture.

KELLOGG, R. T. 1994. The psychology of writing. Oxford University Press.

KELLOGG, R. T. 2008. Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective. In: *Journal of Writing Research,* 1 (1), pp, 1 – 26.

MATHER, N., WENDLING, B. J., ROBERTS, R. 2009. *Writing assessment and instruction for students with learning disabilities*. Jossey-Bass.

McCRAE, R. R., COSTA, P. T. 1983. Social desirability scales: More substance than style. In: *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 51 (6), pp. 882 – 888 [online]. [cit. 2021-03-31]. Available from:. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.51.6.882

RAIMES, A. 1983. *Techniques in teaching writing*. Oxford University Press.

SANTANGELO, T., HARRIS, K. R., GRAHAM, S. 2007. Self-regulated strategy development: A validated model to support students who struggle with writing. In: *Learning Disabilities: A Contemporary Journal*, 5 (1), pp. 1 – 20.

SCRIVENER, J. 2011. *Learning Teaching: The Essential Guide to English Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Macmillan.

TOMLINSON, B. 2013. (Eds.). *Developing Materials for Language Teaching* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Bloomsbury.

TOMLINSON, C. A. 2014. The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). USA: Alexandria, VA.

ZAFAR, S., MEENAKSHI, K. 2012. A study on the role of personality in second language learning. In: *English Language and Literature Studies*, 2 (1), pp. 94 – 101.

Zhang, L. F. 2010. Do learning approaches and self-efficacy predict academic performance? The role of personality traits. In: *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20 (3), pp. 287 – 291.

Contact:
Mgr. Katarína Chválová, PhD.
Department of English Language and Intercultural Communication
Faculty of Applied Languages
University of Economics
Email: katarina.chvalova@euba.sk
Dolnozemská 1, 852 35 Bratislava
Slovakia
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9221-8821