

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**A METHODOLOGICAL MODEL FOR DEVELOPING SPEAKING AND WRITING
SKILLS THROUGH TRANSFORMATIVE LEARNING****Dilrabo Yulchiyeva***English language teacher, PhD researcher**Nizami National Pedagogical University**E-mail address: dilraboyulchieva2803@gmail.com**Tashkent. Uzbekistan***ABOUT ARTICLE**

Key words: transformative learning, productive skills, speaking skills, writing skills, methodological model, critical reflection, disorienting dilemma, rational discourse, reflective writing, frame of reference, learner autonomy, English as a foreign language, CEFR.

Received: 20.09.26**Accepted:** 21.09.26**Published:** 22.09.26

Abstract: The article is devoted to the development of a methodological model for teaching speaking and writing skills of English language learners on the basis of transformative learning theory. It is argued that traditional approaches to productive skills often reduce speaking and writing to the reproduction of ready-made patterns, as a result of which learners are able to produce accurate but reproductive texts and experience difficulty in expressing their own position. Transformative learning, developed by J. Mezirow and elaborated by P. Cranton, E.W. Taylor and S.D. Brookfield, offers a different perspective: learning is understood as a change in the learner's frames of reference achieved through a disorienting dilemma, critical reflection and rational discourse. The article shows that these key processes are, by their very nature, realised through speaking and writing, which makes productive skills both the means and the result of transformative learning. On the basis of theoretical analysis and didactic modelling, a four-component model is proposed, comprising target, content, procedural and evaluative components. The procedural component is organised as a five-stage cycle: trigger, critical reflection, rational discourse, reflective writing and action. For each stage, types of speaking and writing tasks, the teacher's functions and

indicators of results are defined. A system of assessment criteria is proposed that combines CEFR-based descriptors of linguistic quality with indicators of reflective depth. The model is intended for senior school and university learners at B1–C1 levels and is grounded in the normative documents of the Republic of Uzbekistan on foreign-language education.

Introduction. Speaking and writing are traditionally referred to as productive skills, since in both the learner does not receive but creates language. In the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, production and interaction are treated as the activities through which the user of a language acts in the world: expresses opinions, argues, negotiates meaning and constructs texts for real addressees [3]. At the level of declared objectives, therefore, productive skills are oriented towards the learner's own voice. In classroom practice, however, the situation is often different. Speaking lessons frequently consist of the rehearsal of dialogues and the answering of textbook questions, while writing is reduced to the reproduction of model essays and fixed templates. As a result, learners may produce texts that are grammatically acceptable but reproductive: they reflect the textbook rather than the learner, and they break down as soon as a real, unfamiliar problem requires the learner to take and defend a position.

This contradiction is particularly visible in the context of the Republic of Uzbekistan, where Presidential Resolution PQ-5117 of 19 May 2021 set the task of raising foreign-language education to a qualitatively new level and orienting it towards the practical use of the language [1]. International examinations and national certification, which learners increasingly take, require exactly the abilities that reproductive practice does not form: to respond to an unexpected question, to evaluate competing arguments and to construct an extended text expressing one's own reasoned view. The problem, therefore, is not the lack of practice as such but the nature of the practice: productive skills develop fully only when the learner has something of his or her own to say.

One of the theoretical frameworks capable of addressing this problem is transformative learning theory. Developed by J. Mezirow in the field of adult education, it describes learning as a process in which a person critically examines and revises the assumptions – frames of reference – through which he or she interprets experience [15; 16]. The central processes of transformative learning are a disorienting dilemma that challenges existing assumptions, critical reflection on these assumptions and rational discourse in which alternative views are tested in dialogue with others [17]. It is essential for methodology that each of these processes

is realised through language: reflection is articulated in speech and writing, and discourse is, by definition, a form of oral or written interaction. Productive skills thus appear not as an external addition to transformative learning but as its natural medium.

Literature review. Transformative learning theory has passed through several stages of development, which are traced by A. Kitchenham [11]. In his early work Mezirow described ten phases of perspective transformation, beginning with a disorienting dilemma and ending with the reintegration of a new perspective into one's life [15]. Later he defined transformative learning more broadly as the process of making frames of reference more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective and emotionally able to change [16; 17]. P. Cranton adapted the theory for educators and emphasised that the teacher's task is to create conditions for transformation rather than to impose it, which requires a safe learning environment and learner autonomy [4]. E.W. Taylor, in a critical review of empirical research, showed that relationships, dialogue and experiential activities are among the most consistently reported conditions of transformative learning [21]. S.D. Brookfield described critical reflection as the identification and checking of the assumptions underlying one's actions and proposed practical techniques for developing it [2].

Transformative learning theory has important roots and parallels. P. Freire's concept of conscientisation, according to which education should develop learners' critical awareness through dialogue rather than through the "banking" transfer of knowledge [7], influenced Mezirow directly. D.A. Kolb's cycle of experiential learning – concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualisation and active experimentation [12] – and D.A. Schön's concept of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action [19] provide a procedural basis for organising reflective activity. L.S. Vygotsky's idea that higher mental functions emerge first in social interaction and are then internalised [22] explains why dialogue precedes and supports individual reflection.

In second language acquisition research, productive skills have been described both as processes and as mechanisms of learning. W.J.M. Levelt's model of speech production distinguishes conceptualisation, formulation and articulation [13], while L. Flower and J.R. Hayes described writing as a recursive process of planning, translating and reviewing [6]. Both models show that the first stage of production is the generation of content – the stage that reproductive practice skips. M. Swain's output hypothesis attributed three functions to learner output: noticing gaps in one's language, testing hypotheses and metalinguistic reflection [20]. The last function is especially significant, since it shows that producing language is itself a reflective act. C.C.M. Goh and A. Burns proposed a holistic approach to teaching speaking that

integrates language, discourse, strategies and metacognition [8], and K. Hyland described writing as a socially situated activity in which the writer constructs a stance towards the reader [10]. N. Mercer's concept of exploratory talk – talk in which partners engage critically but constructively with each other's ideas [14] – is close to Mezirow's rational discourse and provides concrete guidance for organising it in the classroom. Task-based language teaching, as described by R. Ellis and by J.C. Richards and T.S. Rodgers, supplies the task formats through which such activity can be organised [5; 18].

Thus, transformative learning theory and the theory of productive skills have developed largely independently, although they share a common core: reflection and dialogue. A methodological model that would connect the phases of transformative learning with the stages of speech and text production, define corresponding task types and propose criteria for assessing both linguistic and reflective outcomes has not yet been sufficiently developed.

The aim of the article is to develop and substantiate a methodological model for developing speaking and writing skills of English language learners through transformative learning. The objectives are: to establish the correspondence between the processes of transformative learning and the processes of speaking and writing; to define the components of the model; to design the stages of the procedural component and the task types for each stage; to propose assessment criteria; and to determine the conditions and limitations of the model's implementation.

Materials and methods. The material of the study consists of the works on transformative learning theory [2; 4; 11; 15; 16; 17; 21], the psycholinguistic and methodological literature on speaking and writing [6; 8; 9; 10; 13; 20], the CEFR Companion Volume [3] and the normative documents of the Republic of Uzbekistan on foreign-language education [1]. The target group for which the model was designed comprises senior school students and university students learning English at B1–C1 levels, i.e. learners who already possess the linguistic resources necessary for extended production and whose main difficulty lies in generating and structuring their own content.

The following methods were used in the study, the sequence and purpose of which are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Methods of the study and their purpose

Method	Purpose in the study	Result
Theoretical analysis and synthesis	To generalise the provisions of transformative learning theory and of the theory of productive skills	Key processes of both theories identified

Method	Purpose in the study	Result
Comparative analysis	To correlate Mezirow's phases with the stages of speech and text production	Table of correspondences (Table 2)
Systems approach	To consider the development of productive skills as an integral system of interrelated components	Component structure of the model
Didactic modelling	To construct the structural-functional model and its procedural cycle	Five-stage procedural cycle (Tables 3–4)
Design of assessment instruments	To develop criteria combining linguistic quality and reflective depth	Assessment criteria (Table 5)
Pedagogical observation	To check the practicability of the task types in class and refine their wording	Refined task formulations and teacher guidelines

Source: compiled by the author.

The model was built on four methodological principles derived from the analysed literature. The principle of problematicity requires that every cycle begin with a genuine dilemma rather than a topic, since only a problem that challenges existing assumptions creates the need to speak or write [7; 15]. The principle of dialogicity requires that individual reflection be preceded and supported by interaction [14; 22]. The principle of the unity of content and form requires that linguistic work be subordinated to the learner's meaning: language support is offered at the moment when the learner needs it to express a thought [5; 20]. The principle of reflexivity requires that learners reflect not only on the problem but also on their own language and thinking [2; 19].

Results and discussion. 1. Correspondence between transformative learning and productive skills.

The first result of the study is the establishment of correspondence between the phases of transformative learning and the processes of speaking and writing. Mezirow's ten phases were grouped into five enlarged stages suitable for a classroom cycle, and each stage was correlated with the corresponding stage of speech production (Levelt) and text production (Flower and Hayes). The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Correspondence between the phases of transformative learning and the processes of speaking and writing

Phases of transformative learning (Mezirow)	Enlarged classroom stage	Speaking process	Writing process
Disorienting dilemma	Trigger	Initial reaction; conceptualisation of the problem	Free writing; noting first impressions
Self-examination; critical assessment of assumptions	Critical reflection	Articulating one's assumptions aloud; questioning	Planning: generating and organising ideas
Recognition that others share the experience; exploration of new roles	Rational discourse	Discussion, argumentation, negotiation of meaning	Collaborative planning; peer commentary
Planning a course of action; acquiring knowledge and skills	Reflective writing	Rehearsal of arguments; oral summary	Translating ideas into text; reviewing and revising
Trying new roles; building competence; reintegration	Action	Presentation, debate, public statement	Publication of the text for a real addressee

Source: compiled by the author on the basis of [6; 13; 15].

The correspondence shows that the phases of transformative learning cover precisely the stage of content generation, which both Levelt's and Flower and Hayes's models place at the beginning of production and which reproductive practice usually omits. In a traditional lesson the content of speaking or writing is given – by a model dialogue, a set of questions or a sample essay – and the learner's task is limited to formulation. In a transformative cycle the learner first confronts a problem, examines his or her own position and tests it in discussion, so that by the time of formulation the learner has something of his or her own to say. This is the main methodological advantage of the approach: it restores the conceptual stage of production.

2. The structure of the model.

On the basis of the systems approach, the model was designed as a set of four interrelated components. Their content is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Components of the methodological model

Component	Content	Methodological function
Target	Development of speaking and writing skills at B1–C1 levels together with critical reflection and the ability to express and defend a reasoned position	Defines the dual outcome: linguistic and reflective

Component	Content	Methodological function
Content	Dilemma-based topics relevant to learners (education, technology, values, society, career); authentic texts; functional language for opinion, argument, concession and hedging	Provides problems that challenge assumptions and the language needed to discuss them
Procedural	Five-stage cycle: trigger – critical reflection – rational discourse – reflective writing – action	Organises the sequence of speaking and writing tasks
Evaluative	Criteria combining CEFR descriptors with indicators of reflective depth; self-, peer- and teacher assessment; portfolio	Measures both linguistic quality and the change in perspective

Source: compiled by the author.

The components are connected by feedback: the results of the evaluative component inform the selection of new dilemmas and language support in the content component, and the model therefore works as a cycle rather than as a linear sequence. An important feature of the content component is that topics are formulated as dilemmas rather than as themes. For example, instead of the theme «Technology in education» learners are offered the dilemma «Should students be allowed to use artificial intelligence to write their essays?». The theme invites description; the dilemma requires a position.

3. The procedural component: the five-stage cycle.

The procedural component is the core of the model. Each of its five stages has its own objective, its own types of speaking and writing tasks and its own function for the teacher. They are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Stages of the procedural cycle, task types and the teacher's functions

Stage	Objective	Speaking and writing tasks	Teacher's function
1. Trigger	To create a disorienting dilemma that challenges learners' assumptions	Case, provocative statement, short video or text; «first reaction» talk in pairs; 5-minute free writing	Selects the dilemma; creates a safe atmosphere; does not reveal his or her own position
2. Critical reflection	To make learners' assumptions explicit and examine them	«Assumption hunting» questions (Why do I think so? Where did this belief come from?); reflective journal entry; think-aloud	Asks Socratic questions; offers language for expressing opinion and doubt

Stage	Objective	Speaking and writing tasks	Teacher's function
3. Rational discourse	To test positions in dialogue and consider alternative views	Structured discussion, role play, «opinion continuum», fishbowl, peer commentary on written drafts	Moderates; ensures equal participation; models exploratory talk; notes language gaps
4. Reflective writing	To formulate a reasoned position in an extended text	Argumentative essay, reflective essay, letter to a real addressee; drafting and peer review	Provides focused feedback on content first, then on language
5. Action	To apply the new perspective in a real or simulated communicative act	Presentation, debate, podcast, blog post, public letter; final reflection «How has my view changed?»	Organises an authentic audience; conducts the final reflection

Source: compiled by the author.

The sequence of stages follows the principle of moving from oral to written and from private to public. Speaking dominates the first three stages because it allows rapid exchange and testing of ideas, while writing dominates the fourth stage because it requires and enables a more deliberate, structured articulation of thought. At the fifth stage both skills are integrated in a public product. At the same time, the two skills are not separated: free writing at the first stage and the reflective journal at the second prepare speaking, and discussion at the third stage prepares writing. This interweaving corresponds to Swain's view that output of any kind stimulates metalinguistic reflection [20] and to Hyland's understanding of writing as a social activity [10].

Let us consider how the cycle works on the dilemma mentioned above. At the trigger stage, learners read two short opposing statements – one by a teacher who considers the use of artificial intelligence for essays to be cheating, and one by a student who considers it a legitimate tool – and discuss in pairs which statement is closer to their own view. They then write for five minutes without stopping about their first reaction. At the critical reflection stage, learners answer questions such as «What do I believe an essay is for?», «What do I believe counts as my own work?» and «Where does this belief come from?». Many learners discover at this point that their initial position rests on an unexamined assumption about the purpose of writing. At the rational discourse stage, learners take part in an «opinion continuum»: they stand along a line between «completely acceptable» and «completely unacceptable», explain their position and may move if a partner's argument convinces them. The teacher introduces language for concession and hedging (I see your point, but...; It could be argued that...) at the

moment when learners need it. At the reflective writing stage, learners write an argumentative essay in which they must present and answer at least one counter-argument, and the draft is reviewed by a peer. At the action stage, groups prepare a short set of recommendations on the use of artificial intelligence for their own class and present it, and each learner writes a final reflection on whether and how his or her view has changed.

The example shows that language work is not abandoned in the transformative cycle but embedded in it. Functional language, vocabulary and grammatical structures are introduced when learners need them to express a thought, and feedback on language follows feedback on content. This order corresponds to the principle of the unity of content and form and to the task-based understanding that attention to form is most effective when it arises from communicative need [5].

4. The evaluative component: assessment criteria.

Since the model has a dual outcome, the evaluative component must measure both the linguistic quality of speaking and writing and the depth of reflection. Criteria for the first are based on CEFR descriptors for spoken and written production and interaction [3]; criteria for the second are based on the indicators of critical reflection described by Mezirow, Cranton and Brookfield [2; 4; 17]. The system of criteria is presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Criteria for assessing productive skills in the transformative cycle

Group of criteria	Criterion	Indicators
Linguistic quality	Range and accuracy	Variety of vocabulary and structures; control of grammar appropriate to the level
	Coherence and cohesion	Logical organisation; use of linking devices; paragraphing (writing) or discourse markers (speaking)
	Fluency and interaction	Ability to sustain speech; turn-taking; responding to and building on others' contributions
Reflective depth	Explicitness of assumptions	The learner identifies the assumptions underlying his or her position
	Consideration of alternatives	The learner presents and fairly evaluates opposing views
	Argumentation	The position is supported by reasons and examples rather than by assertion
	Change of perspective	The learner describes how and why his or her view has been confirmed, refined or changed

Source: compiled by the author on the basis of [2; 3; 17].

Each criterion can be assessed on a four-level scale (not demonstrated – emerging – developing – consistent). It is important that the criterion «change of perspective» does not require the learner to change his or her view: a reasoned confirmation of the original position after serious consideration of alternatives is also evidence of transformation in Mezirow's sense, since the frame of reference becomes more open and better justified [16]. Assessment is carried out by the learner (self-assessment against the criteria), by peers (at the stage of rational discourse and peer review) and by the teacher. The portfolio of texts and reflections accumulated over several cycles makes the dynamics of both linguistic and reflective development visible.

5. The changing role of the teacher and conditions of implementation.

The model changes the role of the teacher. In the traditional organisation of productive skills, the teacher provides a model, controls its reproduction and corrects errors. In the transformative cycle, the teacher becomes a designer of dilemmas, a moderator of discourse and a provider of timely language support. Cranton emphasises that the teacher cannot «make» learners transform, but can create conditions in which transformation becomes possible [4]. Taylor's review identifies these conditions as trusting relationships, dialogue and experiential activity [21]. For the classroom, this means that learners must feel safe to express views that differ from those of the teacher and of the majority, and that disagreement must be treated as a resource rather than as a disciplinary problem.

Three conditions of implementation follow from the analysis. First, the choice of dilemmas must take into account learners' age, cultural context and values; the dilemma should challenge assumptions without humiliating or pressuring learners. Second, the model requires more time per topic than a traditional lesson, so it is advisable to plan one full cycle over two to four lessons and to combine it with shorter skill-focused activities. Third, teachers need preparation in techniques of Socratic questioning, moderating discussion and giving content-oriented feedback, which can be provided through in-service training.

The limitations of the model should also be noted. First, the study is theoretical and methodological: the model has been substantiated and its task types checked for practicability through pedagogical observation, but its effectiveness has not yet been measured experimentally. Second, the model is intended for learners at B1 level and above; at lower levels the linguistic demands of rational discourse may prevent learners from expressing their thoughts, and the cycle would require substantial simplification or partial use of the mother tongue at the reflective stages. Third, the assessment of reflective depth contains an element of

subjectivity, which can be reduced by using detailed descriptors and moderation among teachers.

Conclusion. The study has shown that transformative learning theory and the theory of productive skills share a common core – reflection and dialogue – and that the key processes of transformative learning are realised through speaking and writing. Productive skills are therefore both the means and the result of transformative learning.

On this basis, a methodological model has been developed that comprises target, content, procedural and evaluative components. Its procedural component is organised as a five-stage cycle – trigger, critical reflection, rational discourse, reflective writing and action – which moves from oral to written and from private to public production. The model restores the conceptual stage of speech and text production that reproductive practice omits and ensures that learners speak and write about what they genuinely think.

The evaluative component combines CEFR-based criteria of linguistic quality with criteria of reflective depth, which makes it possible to assess both the development of productive skills and the change in the learner's perspective. The effectiveness of the model depends on the teacher's role as a designer of dilemmas and a moderator of discourse and on a safe, dialogic learning environment.

Further research should be directed at the experimental verification of the model in senior schools and higher education institutions of Uzbekistan, at the comparison of its results in groups of different proficiency levels and at the adaptation of the model for blended and online learning environments.

References:

- [1]. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining 2021-yil 19-maydagi «O'zbekiston Respublikasida xorijiy tillarni o'rganishni ommalashtirish faoliyatini sifat jihatidan yangi bosqichga olib chiqish chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida»gi PQ-5117-son qarori. – <https://lex.uz>
- [2]. Brookfield S.D. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995. – 296 p.
- [3]. Council of Europe. *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume*. – Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. – 278 p.
- [4]. Cranton P. *Understanding and Promoting Transformative Learning: A Guide for Educators of Adults*. 2nd ed. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2006. – 238 p.
- [5]. Ellis R. *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. – 387 p.

- [6]. Flower L., Hayes J.R. A cognitive process theory of writing // *College Composition and Communication*. – 1981. – Vol. 32, No. 4. – P. 365–387.
- [7]. Freire P. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. – New York: Herder and Herder, 1970. – 186 p.
- [8]. Goh C.C.M., Burns A. *Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012. – 314 p.
- [9]. Harmer J. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. 5th ed. – Harlow: Pearson Education, 2015. – 446 p.
- [10]. Hyland K. *Second Language Writing*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 308 p.
- [11]. Kitchenham A. The evolution of John Mezirow's transformative learning theory // *Journal of Transformative Education*. – 2008. – Vol. 6, No. 2. – P. 104–123.
- [12]. Kolb D.A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. – Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984. – 256 p.
- [13]. Levelt W.J.M. *Speaking: From Intention to Articulation*. – Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989. – 566 p.
- [14]. Mercer N. *Words and Minds: How We Use Language to Think Together*. – London: Routledge, 2000. – 206 p.
- [15]. Mezirow J. *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991. – 247 p.
- [16]. Mezirow J. Transformative learning: Theory to practice // *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*. – 1997. – No. 74. – P. 5–12.
- [17]. Mezirow J. and Associates. *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000. – 381 p.
- [18]. Richards J.C., Rodgers T.S. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. 3rd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. – 410 p.
- [19]. Schön D.A. *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. – New York: Basic Books, 1983. – 374 p.
- [20]. Swain M. Three functions of output in second language learning // Cook G., Seidlhofer B. (eds.) *Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics*. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995. – P. 125–144.
- [21]. Taylor E.W. An update of transformative learning theory: A critical review of the empirical research (1999–2005) // *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. – 2007. – Vol. 26, No. 2. – P. 173–191.

[22]. Vygotsky L.S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978. – 159 p.