

Teaching Writing to Students with Physical Disabilities: A Qualitative Investigation

Kashif Iqbal¹, Tahira Zafarullah², Ayesha Zia³

¹Ph.D Scholar, Lecturer, Govt. Training College for Teachers of Blind Lahore

²M.phil. University of Management and Technology Lahore

³Govt. Training College for Teachers of Blind Lahore

*Corresponding author email address: Tahirazafarullah555n@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Writing is the major skill in education for students with physical disabilities. Students with physical disabilities are also supposed to have mastery in writing skill to accomplish their academic goals. This study was based on a qualitative approach to analyze errors made by students with physical disabilities in writing, problems experienced by their teachers. The population of the study were all students with physical disabilities from school level, their teachers in Lahore city. Data of 31 respondents including teachers (N= 15) and students with physical disabilities (N=16) from grade 4, 5 and 6 were taken as a sample by using the purposive sampling technique. The instruments of the study were an interview protocol for teachers and syllabus based test for students with physical disabilities. Data was collected through interviews and syllabus based test. Qualitative data including interviews response and document analysis was analyzed through coding & thematic analysis by following up a validated writing rubric. The findings of the study revealed that there are many errors that students with physical disabilities make while writing. It was also founded that teachers experience many problems while teaching writing to students with physical disabilities. Additionally, strategies used by teachers while teaching writing were also the part of the findings. Teacher's training and conceptual learning of writing skill for students with physical disabilities were strongly recommended for better teaching and learning process

KEYWORDS

Students with Physical Disabilities, Teaching, Teacher's Problems, writing Rubric, teaching writing

JOURNAL INFO

HISTORY: Received: March 17, 2022

Accepted: May 10, 2022

Published: May 18, 2022

INTRODUCTION

Education is based on plans, with the matter of careful thinking. The acceptable fact is the acme position of formal education in which the interaction of student and the teacher takes place to make a developed personality. (Mishra et. Al., (2020).

The primary skill is writing in communication. Writing skill has been attained by more than 85% of the world's population (Swedlow, 1999). This versatile skill is utilized by writers for the learning of creative ideas, to convince, keeping information record, generating the imagination, expression of emotions, other's entertainment, development of psychological satisfaction, sharing of experiences, and exploration of contexts of situations with events (Graham, 2018a). Writing of the materials is compiled which students read (Bangert et al., (2004).

Writing requires adequate practice and guidelines because this is the complex skill which is not developed at its own. Every school has its basic goal to teach this skill in a style to their students either they are normal or physically disabled. Failure in improving writing include improper guidelines of writing skill to students with physical disabilities. Students are not provided with appropriate instructions of writing in their schools (Graham, 2019). Writing is the means of communication with our social relation and interaction at home especially with text, email, and tweet (Freedman et al., 2016).

Therefore, this research will highlight the problems in writing which are made by students with physical disabilities at school level. Additionally, this will also depict problems faced by teachers in teaching writing to physically handicapped students. It will include the efforts made by their teachers in teaching writing to students with physical disabilities.

Statement of the problem:

Teachers of students with physical disabilities teach writing to their students with their physical challenge. Students with physical disabilities make errors while writing. In addition, teachers of students with physical disabilities experience various problem while teaching writing to students with physical disabilities. Moreover, efforts of teachers with regard to teaching writing is also important. Therefore, the statement of the problem is regarding teaching of writing to students with physical disabilities.

Objective of the Study

The objectives of the research were to:

1. Highlight the errors in writing made by students with physical disabilities.
2. Identify the efforts of teachers regarding teaching writing to students with physical disabilities.
3. Explore the problems faced by teachers while teaching to students with physical disabilities.

Research Questions

Following were the research questions for this study:

1. What are the errors made by students with physical disabilities in writing?
2. What are the strategies used by teachers of students with physical disabilities in writing?
3. What sort of problems experienced by teachers in teaching writing to students with physical disabilities?

Significance of the Study

This research focuses on finding the errors made by students with physical disabilities in writing and the problems experienced by their teachers while teaching writing. This research is much beneficial for the teachers of students with physical disabilities to work better on the writing of students with physical disabilities. This study is also very useful for those who want to join special education department as a teacher of students with physical disabilities. Additionally, this study will help the parents of physically handicapped children at their homes to include and modify healthy activities of writing to prevent from all those writing errors which have been mentioned earlier in this research. Moreover, teachers of physical disabled children will overcome on the problems which they face while writing to students with physical disabilities in their classes.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to Punjab special education schools only.

Delimitations of Study

The study is de-limited to the teachers of physically handicapped students and their physically handicapped students from grade 4 to 7.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Physical activities are influenced largely or partially by any kind of physical impairment. Movement, posture including manipulation of objects, walking, gripping, standing, sitting, eating, communicating, any kind of reflex movement and even perception may all be issues for students with physical limitations. Daily challenges are encountered commonly by people with physical disabilities which may be restricted accessibility to health services, higher risk of emotional & behavioral problems, hurdles in mobility to community (Lebrasseur, 2021).

Due to movement limitations, many kids with physical impairments struggle to write fluently. Due to motor, strength, or endurance limitations, students with physical impairments may have trouble with the physical mechanics of writing. The success of the student in school or work or even in their personal life is always dependent on their mandatory learning of writing (Graham, 2019).

The skill of effective writing is based on knowledge, comprehension, application & synthesis of fresh information which are the part of cognitive domain (Defazio et. Al., 2010).

Several forms of motor impairments can significantly influence the functional use of the arms, hands, and fingers in people with cerebral palsy, making precise and efficient typing difficult, if not impossible. Because a means for initiating and maintaining personal relations are provided by writing at home (Freedman et. Al., 2016).

Additionally writing difficulty restricts occupational, academic and individual achievements (Graham, 2006). However, home is the place where kids traditionally learn to write (Tolchinsky, 2016).

Degenerative disorders, such as muscular dystrophy and spinal muscular atrophy cause students' arm, hand and finger muscle power to deteriorate, limiting their ability to sustain and complete writing tasks. Writing fluency can be harmed by any of these motor and strength difficulties, whether they occur alone or in combination. Early years of life are those life stages which are best known for acquiring writing skill (Chung, et. al., 2020).

The speed and accuracy with which text is created are part of the mechanics of writing. The sequential processes a person takes to generate a written product are referred to as stages of the writing process. Previous researches contained an indicator which depicts that enough time is not devoted by the majority of teachers to teach writing (Graham et. Al., 2016). Considerable amount of instructional time is required in writing which is a challenging and complex task (Graham, 2018a).

According to Gilbert & Graham, (2010), studies of observation are structured for describing the teaching of writing in school. Two common findings of previous studies scrutinized teaching of writing in modern classrooms. One of the finding revealed that firm writing program is provided to students by few educators while these instructions are exemplified in a number of classrooms (Wilcox, Jeffrey, & Gardner-Bixler, 2016). The other findings opposed this reality because according to this finding, in many classrooms, instructions for writing and writing are insufficient. Both of these findings can be applied in various grades, around the globe and universal in nature.

Furthermore, learn to write is a kind of complex problem which is not only the school's responsibility (Harris, 2018), because numerous aspects of writing are acquired outside of school in various writing environment or situations (Graham, 2018b). There is a dire need to develop such directions which could be useful in school and out of school. It includes systematic approach for writing, understanding of writing or writing skill, learning to write and to promote the instructions for writing. However, numerous and various writing activities are assigned by teachers during a complete academic year but such writing activities are able to engage the students only once or twice in one academic year (Koko, 2016). Insufficient writing instruction contains another indicator of writing which focuses on proper usage of the procedures of teaching. It is when various distinctive writing instruction are applied by a distinctive teacher (McCarthy & Ro, 2011) and made many different instructional adaptations over the course of the school year (Mo, Troia, 2017).

Writing is done mostly outside the school through various digital resources (Freedman et al., 2016). Additionally, in the typical classrooms, writing digital tools or even contemporary writing instructions are also notably absent (Coker et al., 2016).

As a final point, in the context of individual's studies, classrooms writing instructional practices are also involved by the particular issues. It includes teachers who were primary audience for writing of the students (Applebee & Langer, 2011). Little collaboration is involved for writing among the students (De Smedt et al., 2016). There is excessiveness of time in test preparation for high stakes writing (Applebee & Langer, 2011). There is inadequacy of resources of classroom teaching for writing (Dockrell et al., 2016).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This part of study deals with methodology and sample design instrument used to collect and processing of data.

Research Design

This is exploratory research which is qualitative in nature. According to Asperse and Corte (2019), qualitative research as an iterative process in which improved understanding to the scientific community is achieved by making new significant distinctions resulting from getting closer to the phenomenon studied.

Population

The populations of the study were the teachers of students with physical disabilities and students with physical disabilities from the schools of Lahore city.

Sample

The Sample of the study included teachers of students with physical disabilities (N = 15) and students with physical disabilities (N=16). The age range of teachers was 20 years to 35 years. 5 male and 10 female were included for interview. Additionally, Students with physical disabilities (N=16) were from grade 4, 5 and 6 for their syllabus related achievement test based on validated writing rubric. Purposive sampling technique was used to collect data for this research.

Procedure of the study

After the selection of the problem for this research, the researchers reviewed the literature, set out the objectives, significance and questions of the research. The researchers developed an open-ended questionnaire for semi structured interview. The sample of teachers (N=15) were chosen by purposive sampling technique.

The sample of the students with physical disabilities (N=16) were selected by using purposive sampling technique. During the data collection, the researcher devoted few times for introducing the research and its purpose to the respondents especially teachers of physically handicapped students. The researcher took his responsibility to tell the respondent about the importance of this research and they were assured that finding from this research will be used for academic purpose only. Respondents were also urged to present information in good faith about themselves and factors related to teaching writing to students with physical disabilities. After data collection, content analysis was done by using codes and themes. The data was analyzed with coding and thematic analysis with two various parts. At the end, finding, discussions, conclusion and recommendations were added.

Instrument for data collection

There were two instruments used for this research. A semi-structured interview questions were developed to collect data by following the interview protocol. These questions were open ended. Validity of the semi structured interview questions was confirmed by expert opinion (N=02). Each respondent had to provide general information about themselves such as age, qualification, and gender in the first part of questionnaire. A large pool of question was generated by keeping in mind the research questions (R.Q). After obtaining the expert opinion, only 09 questions were finalized to collect relevant data by following the appropriate interview protocol.

The other instrument of the research was the achievement test of the students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5, and 6. These tests were also validated after the expert opinion. The achievement tests were held for the purpose of document analysis to find the errors made by students with physical disabilities in their writing as per research objective number one.

Data collection procedure

Before starting the data collection process, permission to conduct interview from the teachers were obtained. The researcher had to read and interpret the questionnaire in familiar language to the respondent and conduct the interviews. Different probing questions were also asked according to need. Responses were recorded and then they were transcribed and written by the researcher in chapter 4.

Furthermore, achievement test was taken by students with physical disabilities after taking permission from their teachers. The content of the tests was taken from their syllabus (grade 4, 5 and 6) respectively. The test was planned on the base of writing rubric. Whose validity was confirmed by the expert opinion (N=02).

Data analysis

The data was analyzed by using the content analysis. Content was categorized further into codes and themes. The open-ended questions on the questionnaire were coded for the purpose of deriving answers for research questions (R.Q).

Furthermore, document analysis for the test was done accordingly for coding & thematic analysis. This document analysis was made from the achievement tests taken from the students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5, and 6.

CODING AND THEMATIC ANALYSIS

This part of the study deals with coding and thematic analysis of interview protocol and document analysis respectively. It contains two parts which include coding and thematic analysis of teacher interviews and document analysis from achievement tests of students with physical disabilities.

Part (1)

According to Moses& Mohamad, (2019), the challenges for teachers to teach writing skill to their students are the consequences of the challenges experienced by their students while learning writing. These challenges include student's diversity, difficulty in motivating the students, limitations of times, material deficiency.

Part (2)

Coding and thematic analysis of students with physical disabilities (Grades 4,5 and6) This part of the chapter 5 contains 05 major writing rubrics which are organization, expression, convention, legibility, main idea and focus. The five major writing rubrics also have their sub-domains of writing matrix. These writing rubrics have been assessed through a class tests developed from the subject English of class 4, 5, and 6.

Rubric 1: Organization

Category 1: Establishes a strong beginning, Middle and End

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 7 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 established strong beginning, middle and end during writing, while 9 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in establishing strong beginning middle and end in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of establishing strong beginning middle and end in writing.

Category 2: Demonstrates Orderly Flow of Ideas

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 10 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 demonstrate an orderly flow of ideas during writing, while 6 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in demonstrating an orderly flow of ideas. It shows that minimum students with physical disabilities have the problem of demonstrating orderly flow of ideas in writing.

Category 3: Attempts Adequate Introduction and Ending

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 attempt adequate introduction and ending during writing, while 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in attempting adequate introduction and ending. It shows that equal students with physical disabilities have the problem of attempting adequate introduction and Ending in writing.

Category 4: Evidence of Logical Sequencing

12 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 follow logical sequencing, while 4 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in evidence of logical sequencing in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have evidence of logical sequencing in writing.

Category 5: Attempt for Sequencing

11 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 attempted for sequencing during writing, while 5 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in attempting the sequencing in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problems to attempt sequencing in writing.

Category 6: Little or no Organization

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 5 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have little or no organization during writing, while 11 or 16 students with physical disabilities have little or no organization in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have little or no organization in writing.

Category 7: Relies on Single Idea

5 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 rely on single idea during writing, while 11 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in relying on single idea in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have no problem of relying on single idea in writing.

Rubric 2: Expression

Category 1: Uses Effective Language

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 3 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 use effective language, while 13 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in using effective language. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of using effective language in writing.

Category 2: Uses High-Level vocabulary

3 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 use high-level vocabulary during writing, while 13 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in using high-level vocabulary in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of using high-level vocabulary.

Category 3: Use of sentence Variety

8 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 use sentence variety, while 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in using sentence variety in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of using sentence variety in writing.

Category 4: Diverse Word Choice

The 5 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have diverse word choice during writing, while 11 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in diverse word choice in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of diverse word choice in writing.

Category 5: Use of Descriptive Words

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 4 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 use descriptive words during writing, while 12 of 16 students with Physical disabilities were lacking in using descriptive words in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of using descriptive words in writing.

Category 6: Sentence Variety

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 6 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have sentence variety during writing, while 10 of 16 students with physical disabilities were deficient in sentence variety. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem in sentence variety in writing.

Category 7: Limited Word Choice

7 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have limited word choice, while 9 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in limited word choice in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of limited word choice in writing.

Category 8: Basic Sentence Structure

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 5 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have basic sentence structure, while 11 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in basic sentence structure. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of basic sentence structure in writing.

Rubric 3: Convention

Category 1: Grammar

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 10 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were good in grammar during writing, while 6 of 16 students with physical disabilities were deficient in grammar while writing. It shows that fewer students with physical disabilities have the problem of grammar in writing.

Category 2: Noun

13 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were having understanding about noun during writing, while 3 of 16 students with physical disabilities were having problem to recognize noun while writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities were good in recognizing noun.

Category 3: Pronoun

8 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were lacking in understanding in Pronoun during writing, while 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities were good in understanding pronoun in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of understanding pronoun in writing.

Category 4: Structure of Sentence

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were having the problem in structure of sentence during writing, while 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in understanding structure of sentence in writing. It shows that equal number of students with physical disabilities have the problem of understanding the structure of sentence in writing.

Category 5: Spelling

13 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were having the Spelling problem during writing, while 3 of 16 students with physical disabilities were deficient in spelling. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of spelling in writing.

Category 6: Capitalization

13 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were having the problem of capitalization, while 3 of 16 students with physical disabilities were good enough in capitalization. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of capitalization in writing.

Category 7: Punctuation

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 14 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 were having the problem of punctuation during their writing, while 2 of 16 students with physical disabilities were good enough in putting and using Punctuation. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of using punctuation in writing.

Rubric 4: Legibility:**Category 1: Space Between words and Sentences**

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 14 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 follow proper space between words and sentence, 2 of 16 students with physical disabilities are lacking in proper spacing between words and sentence. It shows that students with physical disabilities have no problem of spacing between words and sentence.

Category 2: Proper Letter Formation

14 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have proper letter formation, while 2 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in proper letter formation. It shows that fewer students with physical disabilities have the problem of proper letter formation.

Category 3: Slanted Lines

4 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 have slanted lines, while 12 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in Slanted Lines in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of slanted lines in writing.

Rubric 5: Main Idea and Focus**Category 1: Skillfully Combines Story Elements around Main Idea**

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 4 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 skillfully combines story elements around main idea during writing, while 12 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in skillfully combines story elements around main idea in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of skillfully combine's story elements around main idea in writing.

Category 2: Focusing Topic

The test analysis followed by standardized writing rubric depicted that 9 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4, 5 and 6 focus on topic was profoundly clear during writing, while 7 of 16 students with physical disabilities were deficient to focus on topic in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities were good in understanding topic.

Category 3: Combines Story Elements around Main Idea

8 of 16 students with physical disabilities from grade 4,5 and 6 combines story elements around main idea during writing, while 8 of 16 students with physical disabilities were lacking in combining story elements Around main idea in writing. It shows that maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of combining story elements around main idea in writing.

Findings

The findings of the study have been extracted from the coding and thematic analysis. The first part findings is related to the teacher's problem which they experience while teaching writing to students with physical disability. It also includes the strategies delineated by the teachers while teaching writing to students with physical disability. These findings of part 1 indicate the ways of working on writing skill to diminish writing errors in students with physical disabilities. The findings of the study are given below:

1. Children with physical disabilities have poor muscle coordination which affects their writing.
2. Children with physical disabilities write with slanted lines while writing.
3. Children with physical disabilities have composition problem while writing.
4. Children with physical disabilities have slow writing.
5. Students with physical disabilities have learning issue.
6. Students with physical disabilities have oblique line problems.
7. Students with physical disabilities have clarity issue.

8. Students with physical disabilities have shaky grasp on pencil.
9. There is deficiency of teachers training with regard to teaching writing to students with physical disabilities. Teachers are not properly trained and not equipped with proper tools.
10. Students with physical disabilities have the problem of postures which becomes hurdles in their writing.

Finding From Part (2) of Students with Physical Disabilities

The findings from part 2 have been extracted from the writing rubric implemented in the test taken from the students with physical disabilities of class 4, 5 and 6.

11. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problems of establishing strong beginning middle and end.
12. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problems of demonstrates and orderly flow of ideas in writing.
13. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problems of Attempts and adequate introduction and Ending in writing.
14. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problems of Evidence of Logical sequencing in writing.
15. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of relying on Single Idea in writing.
16. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problems of Diverse word Choice in writing.
17. Students with physical disabilities have the problems of using Descriptive Word in writing.
18. Students with physical disabilities are lacking in the concept of Sentence Structure in writing.
19. Students with physical disabilities have the issues of discrimination of Noun.
20. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the problem of Capitalization in writing.
21. Students with physical disabilities are good in giving spacing between words and sentences while writing.
22. Students with physical disabilities have the problem of Proper Letter Formation.
23. Students with physical disabilities have the problem of Skillfully Combines Story Elements around Main Idea in writing.
24. Maximum students with physical disabilities are good in understanding and focusing on Topic.
25. Maximum students with physical disabilities have the issue in Grade level Appropriate Convention recorded as a hard copy.

Discussion

There are various problems which students with physical disabilities face while writing. These errors in writing with regard to finding of the study include problems of slanted lines, composition, pencil grip, slow writing, shivering in hands, spelling mistakes. There is difficulty in teaching writing due to various challenges faced by students while learning writing (Moses, Mohamad, 2019).

Grammar is another problem for students with physical disabilities while writing. Some of the weaker students with physical disability are not good in English grammar. 'Those students are considered weak who make constantly mistakes in their writing especially with the concept of grammar. This is lacking among these students who are unable to correct their writing while proof reading (Windsor, 2021).

The strategies used by teachers in class for students with physical disabilities while writing are also important to discuss here. There are many strategies used in classroom for teaching writing. The purpose of such strategies to facilitate the students with physical disability to improve and enhance their writing skill. It includes sitting plan, using various resources, provision of various devices and etc. Poor academic performance of the student has various drawback including major one is fragile foundation in writing. Writing helps in developing academic performance and it ensures the emotional and social development (Moses, Mohamad, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Students with physical disabilities make writing errors which are grammar, punctuation, spelling mistakes, unstable pencil grip, slow writing and slanted lines. These problems are tackled by teachers through guidance with firm grip of teacher's hand on the hand of the students with physical disability. Practicing of various activities to enhance writing skill of the students with physical disabilities are also complied. However, teachers are required to learn through standardized and suitable training of teaching writing to students with physical disabilities.

It is concluded here that various writing errors are made by students with physical disabilities. Similarly, there are many problems experience by their teachers as well. However, teachers use various strategies to overcome such errors and problems.

Recommendations

The recommendations for this study have been given below;

1. Teachers should be well trained so they could be able to teach writing skills to students with physical disabilities.
2. Students with physical disabilities should be taught the basic concepts of grammars that they could overcome of the problems of composition grammar.

3. Students with physical disabilities must be provided with adequate learning environment. So that they could easily learn writing skills.
4. Administration should facilitate the teachers in provision of adequate resources of teaching to students with physical disabilities.
5. Students with physical disabilities should be taught with proper writing rubric in their schools.

REFERENCES

- Albert Efendi Pohan, (2017). STUDENTS' ERRORS ON WRITING (An Analysis Studies at Junior High School)
- Applebee, A., & Langer, J. (2011). A snapshot of writing instruction in middle schools and high schools. *English Journal*, 100, 14–27.
- Audrey Lebrasseur et. Al, 2021, Impact of COVID-19 on people with physical disabilities: A rapid review, *Disabil Health J.* 2021 Jan; 14(1): 101014. doi: 10.1016/j.dhjo.2020.101014 PMID: PMC7603994
- August 2017 · JURNAL DIMENSI 6(2). DOI:10.33373/dms.v6i2.1056
- Bangert-Drowns, R., Hurley, M., & Wilkinson, B. (2004). The effects of school-based writing to-learn interventions on academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 29–58.
- Coker, D., Farley-Ripley, E., Jackson, A., Wen, H., MacArthur, C., & Jennings, A. (2016). Writing instruction in first grade: An observational study. *Reading & Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 29, 793–832.
- De Smedt, F., van Keer, H., & Merchie, E. (2016). Student, teacher, and class-level correlates of Flemish late elementary school children's writing performance. *Reading & Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 29, 833–868.
- Dockrell, J., Marshall, C., & Wyse, D. (2016). Teachers' reported practices for teaching writing in England. *Reading & Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 29, 409–434.
- Freedman, S. W., Hull, G. A., Higgs, J. M., & Booten, K. P. (2016). Teaching writing in a digital and global age: Toward access, learning, and development for all. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 1389–1450). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Gilbert, J., & Graham, S. (2010). Teaching writing to elementary students in Grades 4 to 6: A national survey. *Elementary School Journal*, 110, 494–518.
- Graham, S. (2006). Writing. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 457–478). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Graham, S. (2018a). A revised writer(s)-within-community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53, 258–279.
- Graham, S. (2018a). A revised writer(s)-within-community model of writing. *Educational Psychologist*, 53, 258–279.
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., & Chambers, A. (2016). Evidence-based practice and writing instruction. In C. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (Vol. 2, pp. 211–226). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Harris, K. R. (2018). Educational psychology: A future retrospective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 110, 163–173.
- Joseph Defazio et. All., 2010, Academic literacy: The importance and impact of writing across the curriculum – a case study *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, Vol. 10, No. 2, June 2010, pp. 34–47.
- Koko, K. (2016). Writing in mathematics: A survey of K–12 teachers' reported frequency in the classroom. *School Science & Mathematics*, 116, 276–285.
- Lokanath Mishra, Tushar Gupta, Abha Shree, (2020). Online teaching-learning in higher education during lockdown period of COVID-19 pandemic *International Journal of Educational Research Open*, Volume 1, 2020, 100012
- McCarthy, S., & Ro, Y. (2011). Approaches to writing instruction. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 6, 273–295.
- Mo, Y., & Troia, G. (2017). Similarities and differences in constructs represented by U.S. middle school writing tests and the 2007 national assessment of educational progress writing assessment. *Assessing Writing*, 33, 48–67.
- Peter J. Chung, Dilip R. Patel, Iman Nizami, (2020), Disorder of written expression and dysgraphia: definition, diagnosis, and management, *Journal Transl Pediatr* 9(Suppl 1); 2020 Feb PMID: 7082241, *Translational Pediatrics Transl Pediatr*. 2020 Feb; 9(Suppl 1): S46–S54. doi: 10.21037/tp.2019.11.01 PMID: PMC7082241
- Rachel Nyanamoney Moses, Maslawati Mohamad, (2019). Challenges Faced by Students and Teachers on Writing Skills in ESL Contexts: A Literature Review. *Creative Education* > Vol.10 No.13, December 2019, DOI: 10.4236/ce.2019.1013260 PDF HTML XML 19,540
- Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, v29 n5 p903-928 May 2016 ISSN: ISSN-0922-4777
- Ryan John WINDSOR, (2021). The effectiveness of an online grammar study scheme for Chinese undergraduate students *Journal Smart Learning Environments*. Volume: 8, Published - 10 Mar 2021 J10.1186/s40561-021-00147-w
- Steve Graham, (2018b), A Revised Writer(s)-Within-Community Model of Writing, *Educational Psychologist*, Volume 53, 2018 - Issue 4: Conceptualizing Writing, Pages 258-279 | Published online: 04 Oct 2018 doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2018.1481406 CrossMark Logo
- Steve Graham, (2019). Changing How Writing Is Taught Review of Research in Education March 2019, Vol. 43, pp. 277–303 DOI: 10.3102/0091732X18821125

- Steve Graham, 2019, Chapter 10 Changing How Writing Is Taught, *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 43, pp. 277–303
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X18821125> DOI: 10.3102/0091732X18821125
- Steve Graham, Rui A. Alves, (2021). Research and teaching writing. *Reading and Writing* volume 34, pages1613–1621 (2021)
- Tolchinsky, L. (2016). From text to language and back again: The emergence of written language. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (2nd ed., pp. 144–159). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Wilcox, Kristen Campbell; Jeffery, Jill V.; Gardner-Bixler, Andrea, (2016), *Writing to the Common Core: Teachers' Responses to Changes in Standards and Assessments for Writing in Elementary Schools*.