



Teacher's Perspective on challenges and strategies in Teaching English Writing to Students with Learning Disabilities

Dr. Khaled Safar Alotaibi 

4442@qu.edu.sa

Abstract

The study at hand looks at teachers' opinions on the difficulties they meet when instructing English writing to students with learning Disabilities and examines the strategies they believe to be the most effective. Using a qualitative exploratory method, the data was gathered through semi-structured interviews with the sample of educators in the Qassim area. Recurring themes in the data were discovered through thematic analysis. Teachers said that traditional, rigid methods are inadequate, while adaptive implementations of evidence-based practices—such as task decomposition, visual scaffolding, and gamified repetition—are seen as extremely successful. The current study presently shows that teachers attribute writing challenges primarily to deficits in phonemic awareness, working memory, and visual perception, rather than simply a lack of drive. Task decomposition (chunking), visual scaffolding, routine-based repetition, collaborative learning, and technological support that are some of the successful tactics that have been documented. This study recommended that reforms at the policy level, such as longer evaluation times and specific teacher training in neuro-educational methods, considering these results of the study.

Key words: Writing Instruction, Formative Assessment, Multi-Sensory Instruction, Scaffolding, Task Decomposition.

* Assistant Professor of Special Education, Department of Special Education- College of Education- Qassim University- Saudi Arabia.

Cite this article as: Alotaibi, K. S. (2026). Teacher's Perspective on challenges and strategies in Teaching English Writing to Students with Learning Disabilities, *Journal of Arts*, 14(1), 901-918. <https://doi.org/10.35696/jwx0jz29>

© This material is published under the license of Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0), which allows the user to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format. It also allows adapting, transforming or adding to the material for any purpose, even commercially, as long as such modifications are highlighted and the material is credited to its author.



وجهة نظر المعلمين حول التحديات والاستراتيجيات في تدريس الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية للطلاب ذوي صعوبات التعلم

د. خالد سفر العتيبي*

4442@qu.edu.sa

الملخص:

تبحث هذه الدراسة في آراء المعلمين حول الصعوبات التي يواجهونها عند تدريس مهارة الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية للطلاب ذوي صعوبات التعلم، كما تستقصي الاستراتيجيات التي يرونها الأكثر فاعلية. واعتمدت الدراسة منهجاً نوعياً استكشافياً، حيث جمعت البيانات من خلال مقابلات شبه منظّمة مع عيّنة من المعلمين من منطقة القصيم. وكشف التحليل الموضوعي للبيانات عن مجموعة من الأنماط المتكررة. وأفاد المعلمون بأن الأساليب التقليدية الجامدة غير كافية، في حين تُعدّ التطبيقات التكيفية للممارسات المبنية على الأدلة، مثل تجزئة المهام، والدعامات البصرية، والتكرار القائم على التلعيب شديدة الفاعلية. وتشير نتائج الدراسة إلى أن المعلمين يعززون صعوبات الكتابة أساساً إلى قصور في الوعي الصوتي، والذاكرة العاملة، والإدراك البصري، وليس مجرد ضعف الدافعية. كما تبيّن أن من أكثر الاستراتيجيات نجاحاً: تجزئة المهام (التقسيم المرحلي)، والدعم البصري، والتكرار القائم على الروتين، والتعلم التعاوني، والدعم التقني. وتوصي الدراسة، في ضوء هذه النتائج، بإجراء إصلاحات على مستوى السياسات التعليمية، مثل إتاحة وقت أطول للتقويم، وتوفير تدريب متخصص للمعلمين في الأساليب العصبية-التربوية.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تعليمات الكتابة، التقييم التكويني، التعليمات من خلال الحواس المتعددة، السقالات التعليمية، تحليل المهام.

* أستاذ التربية الخاصة المساعد، قسم التربية الخاصة، كلية التربية، جامعة القصيم، المملكة العربية السعودية.

للاقتباس: العتيبي، خ. (2026). وجهة نظر المعلمين حول التحديات والاستراتيجيات في تدريس الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية للطلاب

ذوي صعوبات التعلم، مجلة الآداب، 14 (1)، 901-918 <https://doi.org/10.35696/jwx0jz29>

© نُشر هذا البحث وفقاً لشرط الرخصة Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0)، التي تسمح بنسخ البحث وتوزيعه ونقله بأي شكل من الأشكال، كما تسمح بتكييف البحث أو تحويله أو إضافته إليه لأي غرض كان، بما في ذلك الأغراض التجارية، شريطة نسبة العمل إلى صاحبه مع بيان أي تعديلات أجريت عليه.



Introduction

The problem for students with learning disabilities is that they struggle with academic skills, especially in reading, writing, or mathematics, even if they have an average or above-average IQ and fair educational opportunities. These challenges frequently manifest as persistent issues in vocabulary, grammar, sentence structure, and idea development in writing (Mustafa et al., 2022; Bulqiyah et al., 2021). The focus of this research is on these categories of students who have been officially diagnosed with learning impairments in regular English classes.

Students with these disabilities require differentiated, evidence-based teaching methods, such as formative evaluation, genre-based instruction, scaffolding, and varied feedback. Meanwhile, there is evidence of a significant gap between what teachers claim to do in the classroom and what they do (Yu et al., 2020; Cheng et al., 2025; Alharbi, 2022). This may lead to a confluence of contextual constraints, such as exam-oriented instructional models, rigid curricula, and other factors (Shan et al., 2023; Fonkamo et al., 2022; Mleiki, 2025; Al-Moushaki, 2024).

The teachers with a significant influence on their teaching style, shaped by institutional norms, professional socialization, and their own previous learning experiences (Moodie, 2016). For example, a teacher who learned to write in a very grammar-focused, prescriptive manner may unintentionally imitate that approach, even if they are intellectually in favor of process-oriented or student-centered teaching strategies.

According to Mustafa, Arbab, and El Sayed (2022), Omani university students' most significant challenges were their limited vocabulary, poor grammar, and struggle with paraphrasing and summarizing. Similarly, Vein et al., (2021) observed that Indonesian college students continue to struggle with sentence coherence, structure, and the logical flow of their ideas, all of which indicate issues in macro-writing.

Effective variables such as low self-efficacy, anxiety, and negative attitudes toward writing tasks heighten these difficulties (Bai et al., 2020; Graham et al., 2023). The cognitive burden of ensuring linguistic accuracy while also managing structure often leads to disengagement among LD students, particularly when they receive feedback. This process can be overwhelming or unachievable (Supiani et al., 2023).

The teaching techniques, methods, and strategies that instructors use to help students improve their capacity to create written texts that are linguistically acceptable, coherent, and purposeful. This includes specific instructions on linguistic precision, genre norms, the writing process (planning, writing, editing), and audience awareness (Liu, & Chen, 2022; Zhang & Zhang, 2021A), despite the widely accepted importance of writing as a crucial academic and communication skill. Teaching students with learning disabilities how to write in English presents academic challenges. They may struggle with vocabulary, grammar, and syntax, as well as higher-level cognitive skills such as idea development, audience awareness, logical sequencing, text organization, and sentence structure (Mustafa et al., 2022; Bulqiyah et al., 2021). These difficulties are



compounded by other factors, such as negative perceptions of poor self-efficacy and feedback (Supiani et al., 2023).

Literature often highlights the discrepancy between instructors' beliefs about how to teach writing effectively and how they teach. Although many teachers advocate process-oriented, genre-based, and student-centered methodologies (Liu & Chen, 2022; Nazari & Oghyanous, 2023), their actual classroom practices frequently revert to techniques that prioritize product-oriented grammar problems due to contextual factors.

Employing complexity theory, Yu et al., (2020) demonstrated how strict curricula, which challenged inexperienced teachers, also challenged Macau teachers. In contrast, Cheng et al., (2025) discovered that teachers placed a higher priority on grammatical correctness, even when they appreciated holistic feedback. This shows a frequent mismatch between their values and behavior.

Teachers' previous learning experiences exacerbate the impact of this gap. Moodie (2016) describes the "anti-apprenticeship of observation" to show how negative experiences as language learners can cause teachers to either steer clear of or replicate specific techniques—underscoring the deep historical roots of pedagogical choices based on ineffective methods.

Although feedback is widely acknowledged as essential to the development of writing skills, its application to students with learning disabilities remains challenging. Supiani et al., (2023) showed that students usually disengage from indirect forms when minor errors happen, such as article mistakes, but they prefer them. Larger problems, like idea development, stem from a lack of linguistic or metacognitive skills to analyze and address them effectively.

Cheng and Liu (2022) support this conclusion in demonstrating that learners with low competence have difficulty in intellectual and behavioral interactions with worldwide feedback, regardless of its quality. Also, they express doubt about how they provide feedback. Lee and Mao (2024) introduced the concept of "writing teacher feedback literacy." They found that although instructors' values align with contemporary research, they are unsure of their capacity to use practical feedback approaches, particularly for students with different learning styles.

The mediating function of self-regulated learning has been highlighted in several recent studies. According to Bai et al., (2020) and Zhu et al., (2024), instructor input has an indirect impact on writing through the application of techniques, implying that promoting students' metacognitive abilities is just as vital as the input itself.

The institutional environment is the most crucial element influencing teachers' responses. According to Shan et al., (2023), curriculum configuration compels teachers to divide their attention during assessment, frequently neglecting rhetorical and genre understanding. Likewise, in Chinese universities, educators' function under a "mixed conception" of assessment that strikes a balance between formative and factual



ideas, according to Guo and Xu (2021). As a result, they are restricted in their use of student-centered strategies, such as self- or peer assessment, which are underutilized despite their potential (Apridayani et al., 2024; Zhao, 2018).

Teachers' capacity to differentiate instruction is further limited by large class sizes and limited time for planning specific training in special educational needs (Fonkamo & Zeru, 2022; Burns, 2014). Yu et al., (2023) emphasize the need for systemic rather than individual remedies, noting that a teacher's self-efficacy in teaching writing is strongly correlated with their perception of system support.

This study makes a significant contribution to the expanding field of research on the cognitive processes of teachers of second-language writing (Yu et al., 2020; Zheng et al., 2022). While most of the literature focuses on student outcomes or generic pedagogical approaches, this research explores the intricate relationship between teachers' implicit beliefs and their actual classroom conduct. Using Activity Theory, for example (Engeström, 2014), is a solid theoretical framework for understanding how contextual factors, such as institutional rules, impact classroom behavior management. The curriculum limits of the student body both influence teachers and decision-making. This goes beyond simple descriptions of teacher behavior to offer a more comprehensive, systemic view of teaching as a dynamic, contextually driven activity .

Furthermore, the study addresses the idea of anti-apprenticeship of observation well (Moodie, 2016), which suggests that past negative learning experiences may influence a teacher's current teaching choices. By examining these early occurrences, the research may advance theories of teacher development and illuminate the genesis of pedagogical philosophy .

The findings will provide practical, context-specific guidance to teachers who have trouble implementing evidence-based methods such as formative assessment (Liu, 2024), genre-based instruction (Liu, 2024), or effective feedback (Supiani et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2024; Chen, 2022; Zhang & Zhang, 2021B). The study will identify the specific struggles that instructors face, such as time constraints, lack of training, and student disengagement. It will document the unique and adaptable solutions they create on their own. These real-world examples will serve as valuable professional development tools by demonstrating how to teach effectively in difficult situations, going beyond theoretical guidelines .

For instance, the study will emphasize the discrepancy between stated and actual beliefs (Cheng et al., 2025), which will help teachers reflect on their own strategies. Teachers will gain a better understanding of whether they value collaborative writing (Ruth, 2024) but struggle to find time for it, and the study will provide recommendations to adapt the strategy to their unique circumstances .

The implications of this study for the teacher training programs are substantial. Most contemporary training programs focus on effective instructional methods but do not equip teachers with the tools they need to handle the unpredictable nature of the classroom (Lee, 2010; Cheung, 2011). The research will provide



concrete data on the knowledge gaps (Yu et al., 2023) and real-world obstacles (Fonkamo et al., 2022) that both new and experienced teacher owner's encounter. Teachers will face challenges, allowing colleges to develop professional development programs that are more relevant and effective .

The study also emphasizes the importance of going beyond practical skills to focus on teacher self-efficacy (Yu et al., 2023) and feedback literacy (Lee et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2023). By demonstrating how teachers can acquire confidence and develop a professional identity as writing teachers, the study may assist programs that help teachers. Encourage competence and resilience practice ideally .

The data will provide strong support for legislative reforms at the institutional level. The research will demonstrate how curriculum design (Shan et al., 2023) and assessment culture (Guo et al., 2021; Yan et al., 2021) might be significant barriers to effective writing instruction. For instance, if teachers assert that high-stakes examinations force them to prioritize grammar over content, this gives lawmakers a clear mandate to reconsider evaluation methods.

Gaps of the Current Study

There is little emphasis on teachers of students who have been diagnosed with learning disabilities. Also, most of them have survey-based or short-term observational approaches. In addition, there is a lake focusing on teaching writing to LD students (Al-Khatib, 2017; Agili, Prabhashini, 2021). The current study will address the research gaps identified in previous studies.

Objectives

The objectives of the research project are to determine then examine the following:

- specifying the perceived challenges and obstacles that teachers experience in their everyday practice when teaching writing to this student group.
- Identifying the teachers' instructional strategies while they teach English writing to students with learning disabilities

Research Question

Based on the above, this study aims to answer the following two research questions:

- How does EFL teachers in Qassim region Qassim of Saudi Arabia perceive the obstacles they face when teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities?
- How does the teacher in Qassim region Qassim of Saudi Arabia perceive the most prominent methods of overcoming these obstacles when teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities?

To have a thorough, contextual understanding of teachers' attitudes, ideas, and methods when teaching writing to students with learning challenges, this study employed a qualitative methodology. The reason this approach is chosen is that it enables the study of real-world events from the participants' own perspectives (Yu et al., 2020; Supiani et al., 2023).



Research Methodology

The study used. It is essential to have this extended period to record the changes in teacher attitudes and behaviors, document how they react to challenges over time, and monitor the influence of contextual elements that might not be evident in short-term research (Yu et al., 2022).

This study employed a qualitative exploratory design to examine EFL teachers' perceptions of the challenges involved in teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities and the instructional strategies they use to address these challenges. This approach is appropriate given the study's focus on teachers' professional experiences, interpretations, and contextualized practices.

The study is analytically positioned as a qualitative cross-sectional design. Although data collection was conducted over the course of one academic semester (approximately four to five months), the data were not analyzed to identify changes over time. Instead, the extended data collection period served to enhance the credibility of the findings through prolonged engagement, allowing for richer data generation, rapport building, and triangulation across data sources.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and document analysis, and were treated as a single, integrated dataset. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis, following systematic procedures of data familiarization, coding, theme development, review, and refinement. The resulting themes were organized in direct alignment with the study's research questions, capturing teachers perceived challenges and the strategies they reported employing to support students with learning disabilities. The study employed a cross-sectional design. It is essential to have this extended period in the field to gain a comprehensive understanding of teacher attitudes and behaviors within their specific environment, and to monitor the influence of contextual elements that might not be evident in short-term research (Yu et al., 2022).

The research involved continuous observation, and triangulation of data sources. The researcher will establish rapport of the classroom by acting as a participant observer (Lee, 2010; Zhang & Zhang, 2021). Normsrent study utilized by Activity Theory (Engeström, 2014), which offers a systematic perspective on how institutional instruments, norms, and community interactions influence how the sample of teachers react to pupils with learning disabilities.

Participants

The study employed a targeted sample of 5 teachers with its limited and concentrated sample size. This approach is well-suited for qualitative studies, which enable in-depth data analysis (Brodsky et al., 2016).

This research included five English language teachers (two men and three women) from both public and private schools in the Qassim area of Saudi Arabia. Their teaching experience varied from three to eighteen years (average = 9.4 years). All of them had a bachelor's degree in English, or a similar subject, and two of



them had further postgraduate training in inclusive or special education. Two are taught in private schools with class sizes ranging from 12 to 20 pupils, while three are taught in public schools with class sizes ranging from 25 to 35 students. As verified by school records or parental documentation, each participant confirmed regular instruction of students formally diagnosed with specific learning disabilities (e.g., dyslexia, dysgraphia). Although they all said they used informal differentiation techniques, none had gotten official in-service training particularly geared toward teaching English writing to pupils with learning disabilities.

Selection criteria:

- The teacher must have experience instructing pupils who have been officially recognized as having learning challenges (for example, dyslexia, or other specific learning disorders). who, despite having sufficient intellect and education, struggles with writing.
- The teacher must instruct English as a foreign language.
- To guarantee a variety of instructional experience (beginner vs. expert) and educational settings (public vs. private schools, different class sizes).
- Recruitment Through teacher associations, school administrators, or professional networks, teachers. Information consent required before any data collection takes place, and participation voluntary.

Strategies for Gathering Data

The techniques are intended to record implicit components of the teacher's experience. A triangulated data collection method used to guarantee validity. (Brodsky et al., 2016).

Participation Observation:

Over the course of the semester, the researcher observed at least two writing classes taught by each participating instructor each week.

The following focus of the observations:

- The interactions between students and their teachers during feedback sessions.
- The way that teachers these support students.
- The use of time in classroom management.
- The classroom's social and physical environment observation.
- Field notes after each observation well.

Semi-structured interviews:

The teachers interviewed three times, at the beginning, middle, and conclusion of the semester.

The interview covered:

- Teachers' individual views on writing, learning challenges, and their position as educators.
- The ways that they see the major problems of them.



- The reason is they select their suitable strategies for them.
- Their face curriculum, assessment, and institutional assistance.
- Their sense of self-efficacy and professional identity as writing instructors.
- Any modifications to their practices or way of thinking during the research.
- The interviews were audio-recorded (with permission) and transcribed verbatim for analysis (Karatsareas 2022).

Analysis of documents:

To support interviews and observations with context, relevant documents gathered. Among them are:

- lesson and Syllabi plan.
- The teacher's written examples of student work that have been anonymized.
- Grading standards rubrics.
- curriculum materials pertaining to special education and writing instruction.
- The reflective journals of teachers.
- Instructors will be encouraged to keep a short weekly journal that reflects on their teaching experiences, successes, challenges, and any new knowledge they may have acquired (Lee, Yuan 2021).

Analysis of Data

Thematic analysis is a methodology well-suited for finding, evaluating, and reporting patterns (themes) in qualitative data, used to analyze the data. The procedure initiative and include these steps:

- **Familiarization:** Reading every manuscript, field note, and document repeatedly to become completely absorbed in the information.
- **First Coding:** Creating first codes throughout the whole dataset.
- **Finding Themes:** Compiling codes into possible themes.
- **Reviewing Themes:** Improving and defining themes.
- **Choosing and Defining Themes:** Creating precise definitions and names for each theme.
- **Making the Report:** Choosing interesting excerpts.

Data compared constantly, both within and between cases, to increase rigor and make sure that any developing themes are supported by the data. The vast amount of qualitative data will be coded and managed it. (Neuendorf 2018; Terry et al., 2017)

Qualitative Research Quality Criteria

- **Credibility:** Obtained through extended interaction throughout the course of an entire academic semester (about 4–5 months), triangulation of data sources, and member verification (sharing initial results with participants to receive feedback).



- **Transferability:** Readers may evaluate the applicability of the results to other contexts thanks to thorough explanations of the setting, actors, and methods.
- **Dependability:** Maintaining a transparent audit trail of choices made throughout the course of data gathering and analysis.
- **Confirmability:** The researcher reflexive, noting their own biases and assumptions throughout the investigation (Brodsky 2016; Terry et al., 2017).

Ethics Considerations

- Obtaining the approval of ethical community at Qasem University
- Providing the informed agreement of the participant.
- Protecting anonymity and confidentiality.
- The ability of the participant to leave the study at any point without facing any notice.
- begin (Terry et al., 2017).

Results

The data were analyzed using thematic analysis (Neuendorf et al., 2018; Terry et al., 2017). The qualitative data from the semi-structured interviews was coded and categorized into important themes. These subjects provide a comprehensive summary of teachers' perspectives on the issues and the remedies. The results are organized according to the two main research questions, supported by verbatim excerpts and the corresponding codes identified in the coding matrix as follows:

- How does the teacher perceive the obstacles they face when teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities?
- How does the teacher perceive the most prominent methods of overcoming these obstacles when teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities?

The following are the details:

Q1: How does the teacher in Qassim region Qassim of Saudi Arabia perceive the obstacles they face when teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities?

Table 1 shows the analysis of the coding matrix that reveals that teachers perceive obstacles. The difficulties are categorized into three primary dimensions as follows:

A. The Deficit of Phonemic Awareness:

The data indicates that the most critical barrier occurs before the student even attempts to write. Teachers identified a disconnection between the auditory input and the written output. The code " Means: Phonemic Awareness Deficit " emerged strongly from the data.

The Evidence: One participant said: "the problems of Auditory or comprehension... the inability to link the letter to the sound."



The Interpretation: Teachers perceive that students cannot "encode" language because they struggle to process the internal sound structure of words. If a student cannot map a sound to a symbol, writing becomes an impossible task (Evans et al., 2010; Habibi, Kaur 2015).

Table 1:

(The Coding Matrix Table) The teachers' viewpoint diagram of obstacles and strategies

Original Arabic Excerpt	Translated Excerpt	Initial Arabic Code	Initial English Code
النص بالعربي يعني: يمكن مشاكل سمعيه او استعابيه... عدم القدرة على ربط الحرف بالصوت...	Means: "Auditory or comprehension problems... inability to link the letter to the sound."	ضعف الوعي الصوتي أو الفونيمي	Means: The Deficit in Phonemic Awareness
"النص بالعربي يعني: تتلخص في الضعف الإملائي... الطالب لديه عسر كتابه حقيقه او ضعيف الذاكره...."	Means: "Spelling weakness... the student has true dysgraphia or is weak in memory."	القصور في الذاكرة والإملاء	Means: Memory and Dysgraphia (The obstacles)
"النص بالعربي: يستغرق الطلاب الذين يعانون من صعوبات التعلم وقتاً أطول لإكمال المهام الأساسية بشكل متكرر..."	Means: The students with learning disabilities take a longer time" to complete basic tasks often'	الضغط في الوقت او الزمن المقرر	Means: Pressure in Systemic Temporal
"النص بالعربي يعني: تقسيم المهارات الكتابيه الى اجزاء بسيطة..."	Means: "Dividing writing skills into simple parts."	اي التجزئة (التفكيك) للمهام الصعبة	Means: The task decomposition (Chunking)
"النص بالعربي يعني: استخدم صور تساعد في تحسين ذاكرة الطالب"	Means: "Using pictures to help improve the student's memory."	اي التديم البصري	Means: The Visual Scaffolding process
"النص بالعربي يعني: التكرار وعمل اختبارات قصيره متكرره... لا بد من وجود دفتر للكتابه اليوميه..."	Means: "Repetition and giving short, repeated tests... there must be a daily writing notebook."	بمعنى التكرار والروتين اليومي	Means: The repetition and routine process
"النص بالعربي يعني: تعليم الاقران او التعليم التعاوني..."	Means: "Peer learning or collaborative learning."	ويعني التعلم التعاوني	Means: ollaborative Learning
"النص بالعربي يعني: الطلاب ذوي صعوبات التعلم ياخذون وقت اطول..."	Mean: "Students with learning disabilities take a longer time."	وهي الحاجة لوقت إضافي	Means: Extended Time Needs
"نستخدم ادوات الذكاء الاصطناعي لدعمهم..."	Means: "We use AI tools to support them."	وتعني الدعم التكنولوجي	Means: echnological Support
"الصبر وعدم استعجال بالعربي يعني: لنص... النتائج"	Means: "Patience and not rushing the results."	الصبر التربوي	Means: Pedagogical Patience



B. The Memory and Dysgraphia (The obstacles):

Teachers highlighted that the physical act of writing and the cognitive act of spelling are severely compromised by weak memory. The code "**Memory & Spelling Deficits**" reflects this dual challenge.

The Evidence: One participant said: "**Spelling weakness... the student has true dysgraphia or is weak in memory.**"

The Interpretation: This suggests that teachers view the students' working memory as insufficient to hold vocabulary or grammatical rules long enough to write them down, leading to frustration and fragmented output.

C. Pressure in Systemic Temporal:

Beyond the cognitive issues, teachers identified a systemic obstacle related to time management. The code "**Extended Time Needs**" points to the clash between the curriculum pace and the student's processing speed.

The Evidence: One participant said: **The Teachers** noted that "**Students with learning disabilities take a longer time**" to complete basic tasks.

The Interpretation: This implies that the standard classroom duration is an obstacle, as it does not give these students the necessary processing time they require to succeed every time.

Q2: How does the teacher in Qassim region Qassim of Saudi Arabia perceive the most prominent methods of overcoming these obstacles when teaching English writing to students with learning disabilities?

Table 1 shows that in response to the identified obstacles, the coding matrix reveals that teachers have adopted a "**Pedagogy of Adaptation.**" They perceive effective methods as those that simplify content, visualize concepts, and enforce routine. The findings highlight four key strategies:

A. The task decomposition (Chunking):

The "**Memory Deficits**" identified in Q1, means that teachers utilize the strategy of breaking down complex tasks. The code "**Task Decomposition process**" appears as a primary remedial method.

The Evidence: One participant said: **Teachers** reported the necessity of "**Dividing writing skills into simple parts process.**"

The Interpretation: means that teaching whole paragraphs is so difficult. So, teachers perceive that effectiveness based on micro-teaching—mastering one small part before moving to the next—to reduce the student's cognitive process (Cheung 2011; Copland et al., 2014)

B. The visual scaffolding process:

To address the "**Phonemic Awareness Deficit,**" **teachers rely heavily on visual aids.** The code "**Visual Scaffolding**" signifies a shift from auditory instruction to visual mediation.



The Evidence: One participant said: "the using pictures to help improve the student's memory."

The Interpretation: The Teachers perceive images as a "cognitive attach." Since the students struggle to remember abstract words, connecting the word to an existing picture helps bridge the gap in their memory from time to time (Li & Zhang, 2022).

C. The repetition and routine process:

The current data suggests that teachers view consistency as the antidote to forgetting. The code "Repetition & Routine" illustrates a reliance on behavioral reinforcement process.

The Evidence: Effective methods include "The repetition and giving short, repeated tests... there must be a daily writing notebook."

Interpretation: The Teachers believe that "over-learning process" through daily drilling and routine is essential to transfer writing skills from the volatile short-term memory to long-term memory process (Bui et al., 2023; Apridayani et al., 2024)

D. Collaborative and Technological Support:

Lastly, the teachers perceive the environment as a tool for success. The codes "the Collaborative Learning process" and "Technological Support process" show a modern approach to intervention.

The Evidence: One participant said: Strategies include "Peer learning or collaborative learning" and the use of "AI tools to support them."

The Interpretation: the teachers use peer interaction to lower anxiety and technology (AI) to provide immediate, non-judgmental feedback, thereby creating a supportive ecosystem around the struggling learner every time.

The data from the table 1 coding shows a clear correlation between the diagnosis and the treatment. Teachers name the problem as a cognitive disconnect (Phonemic/Memory issues) and then recommend a treatment that is based on structural simplification (Chunking), sensory reinforcement (Visuals), and consistent practice (Routine). The current suggests that teachers are making conscious efforts to change their teaching strategies to cater to the individual neurological needs of their students in every time.

Discussion

In this section, your findings are interpreted thoroughly, linked to the literature you presented (for example, Khasawneh, 2021; Graham, 2023; Lee, 2014), and the importance of the Codes (such as Phonemic Awareness process and Task Decomposition) is explained in a broader educational context .

The goal of this study was to examine the challenges teachers face when teaching writing to students with learning disabilities (LD) and the remedial techniques they use to overcome them. The coding matrix was used to analyze the qualitative data, yielding a wealth of insights and showing that educators view writing challenges as a complex interplay among cognitive flaws, mechanical barriers, and systemic stresses rather



than a simple lack of skill. These results are examined in further detail in the sections that follow, placing them in the context of the current body of literature review

The Cognitive-Linguistic Nexus: Deconstructing the Barriers notice

The results of the first study question indicate that teachers have a complex and diagnostic understanding of why students struggle with writing. Instead of blaming student negligence, teachers are correctly identifying the Phonemic Awareness Deficits process and Memory Deficits as the main obstacles, thereby highlighting a break in the cognitive processing of language .

This aligns with Khasawneh's (2021) argument that students with learning disabilities often struggle to grasp the differences in structure and sound in English, which causes a disconnect between their language abilities and real-world performance. Khasawneh's assertion that the problem mainly stems from auditory and processing issues is supported by teachers' observations that students experience a break in the connection between sounds and letters .

The findings of Bulqiyah et al., (2021) are also supported by the identification of symptoms resembling dysgraphia (poor handwriting, visual confusion of letters). They found that, for many students, the physical act of writing itself consumes the cognitive resources needed for more complex tasks, such as organization.

The Pedagogical Shift: From Transmission to Scaffolding observation

According to the study, there is a paradigm shift in teaching methods, as indicated by the second research question. A very Adaptive and Scaffolded Model is replacing the conventional Transmission Model of instruction. The frequent focus on task decomposition (chunking) and visual scaffolding is a practical application of cognitive load theory. Teachers instinctively understand that to address the memory deficits highlighted in Table 1, they need to break information into small units and connect abstract ideas to concrete images every time .

According to Graham, Collins, and Ciullo (2022), general education teachers often need to develop specialized beliefs and practices when working with LD students, and this conclusion supports their assertion. This was demonstrated by the teachers in this study through repetition and routine. They view drilling as a crucial method for transferring knowledge from short-term working memory to long-term muscle memory, rather than as a sign of a lack of creativity.

The Impact of Technology and Emotions observation

One of the most important findings of this research is its focus on the affective dimension. Teachers see fear of failure and anxiety as paralyzing forces for LD students. By skillfully integrating technological assistance (AI) with collaborative learning, the students' affective filter is lowered, establishing a secure environment for making mistakes. As stated in the research, technology encourages student autonomy by providing an



impartial feedback process. This implies that educators are becoming learning designers who manage the learning environment to meet students' emotional needs perfectly (Bai et al., 2020).

The Systemic Limits vs. Teacher Cognition observation

The conflict between teachers' systemic realities must ultimately be discussed. The current data indicate that Systemic Time Constraints frequently make teachers feel restricted, even though Lee et al., (2010) confirmed the crucial role of teacher education in influencing professional identity. Teachers stated that their most effective strategies are patience and a longer time, but these are frequently incompatible with the speed of the regular school curriculum.

This is consistent with Gilliland (2015), who observed that teachers are sometimes compelled by accountability pressures to prioritize curriculum coverage over the thorough, gradual scaffolding that diverse learners need. The teachers in this research seem to be struggling with a complex pedagogical gap as they attempt to reconcile the demands of the system with the specific requirements of their students.

Conclusion

The current study shows that the Teacher saw the difficulty of teaching writing to students with learning disabilities as a complex cognitive problem (phonemic/memory) rather than a behavioral one. The study concluded that the most successful strategies are those that provide routine, visualization, and structure (chunking). Also, the study emphasizes that effective inclusion depends significantly on the teacher's ability to serve as a versatile facilitator who can break down complex activities for students in ways that complement their cognitive profiles.

Limitations

This study has limitations as follows:

- The result cannot be applied to every environment where English is taught as a foreign language.
- Relying on self-reporting (through interviews) may result in bias.
- The Teacher responses may be affected by the researcher's presence of the Hawthorne effect (Sedgwick & Greenwood, 2015).

References

- Agili, E. & Prabhashini C. (2021). A study on classroom discourse in enhancing metacognition to develop writing skill in Saudi EFL students. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 12*(3), 450-463.
- Alharbi, K. N. (2022). Female Saudi ESL Learners' Attitudes Toward Communication in Mixed Gender Classes in the USA. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies, 1*(13), 7-30. <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v1i13.838>
- Al-Khatib, H. (2017). The five tier model for teaching English academic writing in EFL contexts. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ), 8*(2), 74-86.
- Al-Moushaki, M. A. H. (2024). Attitudes of Yemeni EFL Students at Tamar University towards Desuggestopedia Method. *Journal of Arts, 12*(3), 677-693. <https://doi.org/10.35696/arts.v12i3.2116>



- Apridayani, A. Han, W. & Sakkanayok, K. (2024). Enhancing English writing competence in higher education: A comparative study of teacher-only assessment versus teacher and student self-assessment approaches. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9(1), 1-20.
- Bai, B. Shen, B. & Mei, H. (2020). Hong Kong primary students' self-regulated writing strategy use: Influences of gender, writing proficiency, and grade level. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 65, Article, 100839.
- Brodsky, A. Buckingham, S. Scheibler, J. & Mannarini, T. (2016). Introduction to qualitative approaches. In F. A. [Editor Initials] Last Name & S. B. [Editor Initials] Last Name (Eds.), *Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods* (pp. 13–22). Springer.
- Bui, H. Nguyen, L. & Nguyen, T. (2023). An investigation into EFL pre-service teachers' academic writing strategies. *Heliyon*, 9(3), 1-12.
- Cheng, X. & Liu, Y. (2022). Student engagement with teacher written feedback: Insights from low-proficiency and high-proficiency L2 learners. *System*, 109, Article, 102880.
- Cheng, X. Zhang, L. & Yan, Q. (2025). Exploring teacher written feedback in EFL writing classrooms: Beliefs and practices in interaction. *Language Teaching Research*, 29(1), 385-415.
- Cheung, Y. L. (2011). Teacher training for effective writing instruction: Recent trends and future directions. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, Article, 531-534.
- Copland, F. Garton, S. & Burns, A. (2014). Challenges in teaching English to young learners: Global perspectives and local realities. *Tesol quarterly*, 48(4), 738-762.
- Engeström, Y. (2014). Activity theory and learning at work. In *Tätigkeit-Aneignung-Bildung: Positionierungen zwischen Virtualität und Gegenständlichkeit* (pp. 67-96). Wiesbaden: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.
- Evans, N. Hartshorn, K. McCollum, R. M. & Wolfersberger, M. (2010). Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 445-463.
- Fonkamo, D., & Zeru, A. (2022). Exploring the impediments on the application of reflective teaching in EFL paragraph writing classes. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), Article, 2109648.
- Graham, S. Collins, A. & Ciullo, S. (2023). Special and general education teachers' beliefs about writing and writing instruction. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 56(3), 163-179.
- Guo, Q. & Xu, Y. (2021). Formative assessment use in university EFL writing instruction: a survey report from China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 41(2), 221-237.
- Guo, Q. (2025). Exploring teacher assessment conceptions in University EFL writing instruction. *SAGE Open*, 15(1), Article, 21582440251324746.
- Habibi, H. & Kaur, M. (2015). The effect of reading on improving the writing of EFL students. *Available at SSRN*, Article, 5291630.
- Karatsareas, P. (2022). Semi-structured interviews. In P. Karatsareas (Ed.), *Research methods in language attitudes* (pp. 99–113). Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, I. & Mao, Z. (2024). Writing teacher feedback literacy: Surveying second language teachers' knowledge, values, and abilities. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 63, Article, 101094.



- Lee, I. & Yuan, R. (2021). Understanding L2 writing teacher expertise. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 52, Article, 100755.
- Lee, I. (2010). Writing teacher education and teacher learning: Testimonies of four EFL teachers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 19(3), 143-157.
- Lee, I. (2014). Revisiting teacher feedback in EFL writing from sociocultural perspectives. *Tesol Quarterly*, 48(1), 201-213.
- Li, D., & Zhang, L. (2022). Exploring teacher scaffolding in a CLIL-framed EFL intensive reading class: A classroom discourse analysis approach. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(3), 333-360.
- Liu, C. & Chen, M. (2022). A genre-based approach in the secondary school English writing class: Voices from student-teachers in the teaching practicum. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 992360.
- Liu, X. (2024). Formative writing assessment: An EFL teacher's beliefs and practices. *Changing English*, 31(2), 200-210.
- Mleiki, A. K. (2025). Exploring Saudi EFL Learners' Perspectives on Digital Writing Tools for Mitigating Emotional Challenges in Foreign Language Writing. *Arts for Linguistic & Literary Studies*, 7(1), 577-590. <https://doi.org/10.53286/arts.v7i1.2373>
- Moodie, I. (2016). The anti-apprenticeship of observation: How negative prior language learning experience influences English language teachers' beliefs and practices. *System*, 60, 29-41.
- Mustafa, A. Arbab, A. & El Sayed, A. (2022). Difficulties in academic writing in English as a second/foreign language from the perspective of undergraduate students in higher education institutions in Oman. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(3), 41-53.
- Nazari, M. & Alizadeh Oghyanous, P. (2023). Contributions of a genre-based teacher education course to second language writing teachers' cognitions. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 17(2), 265-277.
- Neuendorf, K. (2018). Content analysis and thematic analysis. In *Advanced research methods for applied psychology* (pp. 211-223). Routledge.
- Ruth, E. (2024). EFL teacher beliefs about collaborative writing at Swedish primary school. *Education Inquiry*, 1-19.
- Sedgwick, P. & Greenwood, N. (2015). Understanding the Hawthorne effect. *Bmj*, 351.
- Shan, Z. Yang, H. & Xu, H. (2023). The mediating role of curriculum configuration on teacher's L2 writing assessment literacy and practices in embedded French writing. *Assessing Writing*, 57, 100742.
- Terry, G. Hayfield, N. Clarke, V. & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research in psychology*, 2(17-37), 25.
- Wang, Y. Derakhshan, A. Pan, Z. & Ghiasvand, F. (2023). Chinese EFL teachers' writing assessment feedback literacy: A scale development and validation study. *Assessing Writing*, 56, 100726.
- Yan, Q. Zhang, L. & Cheng, X. (2021). Implementing classroom-based assessment for young EFL learners in the Chinese context: a case study. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 30(6), 541-552.
- Yu, S. Xu, H. Jiang, L. & Chan, I. (2020). Understanding Macau novice secondary teachers' beliefs and practices of EFL writing instruction: A complexity theory perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100728.



- Yu, S. Yuan, K. Zhou, N. & Wang, C. (2023). The development and validation of a scale for measuring EFL secondary teachers' self-efficacy for English writing and writing instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 13621688231174701.
- Yu, S., Jiang, L., Liu, C., & Zhou, N. (2022). Profiles of Chinese secondary students' L2 writing motivation and engagement. *Educational Psychology*, 42(8), 972-990.
- Zhang, T. & Zhang, L. (2021B). Taking stock of a genre-based pedagogy: Sustaining the development of EFL students' knowledge of the elements in argumentation and writing improvement. *Sustainability*, 13(21), 11616.
- Zhao, H. (2018). Exploring tertiary English as a Foreign Language writing tutors' perceptions of the appropriateness of peer assessment for writing. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(7), 1133-1145.
- Zheng, X. & Zhang, L. (2021A). Sustaining university English as a foreign language learners' writing performance through provision of comprehensive written corrective feedback. *Sustainability*, 13(15), Article, 8192.
- Zheng, Y. Yu, S. Liu, C. & Jiang, L. (2022). Mapping research on second language writing teachers: A review on teacher cognition, practices, and expertise. *System*, 109, 102870.
- Zhu, J. Yang, Y. & Yan, Z. (2024). Relationships between teacher feedback and English writing proficiency in Chinese students: The mediating effect of writing self-regulated learning strategies. *System*, 123, 103338.

