

Exploring the Role of Speaking Activities in Enhancing Undergraduate Students' Writing Skills

Yousef Houssni Zrekat

Faculty of Language Studies, Arab Open University, Saudi Arabia

Email: y.zrekat@arabou.edu.sa

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9479-6318>

Abstract

This study aims to explore the effect of improving the speaking of Arab undergraduates on their writing skills. A total of 50 first-year EFL university students at Arab Open University in Saudi Arabia were selected as the study participants; they were divided into three groups based on their level of English proficiency. Two research instruments were used to gather the needed data namely open-ended questions regarding their attitudes and experiences towards writing and students' recorded interactions transcripts. A thematic analysis approach was used to analyze the data. The findings revealed that students developed a better understanding of the writing process when writing and speaking are integrated and that various strategies can facilitate the writing process. With the said integration, the students were able to view the writing process from a broader perspective instead of focusing merely on the individual elements of grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Additionally, through group work structure, the students were able to develop interpersonal skills which facilitated their ability to listen, speak, organize, and provide constructive feedback. However, certain noteworthy issues with oral discussions should be addressed by the instructor such as ensuring the quality of the discussion, the length of time involved, and the recurrent usage of the mother tongue. Finally, a discussion of the pedagogical implications and suggestions for future studies conclude the study.

Keywords: English; skills; writing; speaking; language.

Introduction

Writing skills can be developed with systematic instructions and a considerable amount of practice. On the part of the learner, Yulia and Amirudin (2021) suggest that the writer goes through “a two-way interaction between continuously developing knowledge and continuously developing text”. This indicates that the writing process requires the writer to go back and forth through several writing phases before producing the end manuscript (Hedge, 1988).

Research attention has been growing on the teaching of writing in ESL settings (Hartshorn & Evans, 2015; Rahnuma, 2023). This is because the ability to write is an integral component in achieving communicative competence for any second language learner. Within this context, Ahmad et al. (2019) indicate that since 1970 the communicative competence in second-language learning was the ultimate goal, whereas writing skill has remained particularly crucial in academic settings where the performance of students is often evaluated

using written tasks like projects, tests, quizzes, and assignments. Writing skills are also significant for individuals pursuing studies in English-speaking countries, and those participating in academic conferences that require published works (Shamsi & Osam, 2022). Moreover, employees need good and professional writing skills when writing reports and formal letters (Neumann et al., 2021). On this basis, writing skills hold pivotal importance in the academic and professional contexts. This, in turn, raises the urge to delve deeply into the possible ways to enhance the EFL students' writing skills.

Typically, writing is taught in formal instructional settings, where students move progressively from the easiest levels to the more difficult ones thus learning several integrated skills. To be able to write paragraphs, students must first learn how to write sentences. Hence, they need to be exposed to the necessary writing tools (Solijon, 2022).

Due to the importance of writing skills, various language skills make up the foundation of the communicative language teaching (CLT) approach, which stresses meaningful learner interaction as a means of acquiring the target language naturally (Richards, 2005; Yadgarovna, 2022). On this basis, it is anticipated that applying the CLT approach could enhance the EFL student's proficiency in writing and speaking skills. It could also make English language teaching process more interactive, interesting, and meaningful (Azizah, 2022)

Guided by the CLT approach, the coordination of writing along with other English language skills has been confirmed to be efficacious by research. Some studies recommend the integration of reading and writing while teaching due to their impact on each other (Hameed, 2021). Another recommendation is to use speech to facilitate writing, specifically reading aloud which is done repetitively by the writer until his composition sounds good (Kraft, 2023). However, written information does not carry contextual clues the way spoken information does. Verbal and non-verbal cues facilitate the clarity of oral communication (Wahyuni, 2018). Nevertheless, written information generally is more complicated and requires the writer to provide context for clarity, whereas non-verbal and verbal cues provide the immediate contextual clues that spoken information provides (Wahyuni, 2018). As such, Wu et al. (2017) highlight the significance of oral communication in classroom learning.

According to the literature, there are four key phases in the relationship between speech and writing for first language acquisition, specifically for the teaching of writing. These phases are comprehensively identified by Kroll and Lempers (1981). The authors explain that The first phase is preparation i.e. the learning of basic skills namely handwriting and spelling; the second phase is consolidation i.e. the learning of writing while speaking which drives self-expression; the third phase is differentiation i.e. the ability to discern the features of speech and writing, and finally, the fourth phase which is integration i.e. the learning of the systematic control of oral and written language to produce quality writing which focuses on the audience and the writing objective.

The authors further assert the strong link between L1 and L2 writing proficiency and speaking proficiency. Meanwhile, Shao et al. (2020) suggest that interactions in meaningful tasks enable second-language learners to grasp the target language better and thus help with their language progress.

Some ESL or EFL students are better at speaking whilst others are better at writing. In the context of this current study, the presumption aligns with Ali et al. (2019) who suggest that the students are better English speakers than writers because their cultural background places greater emphasis on oral skills than on written skills. On the other hand, this brings to the researcher's attention that their ability to speak in English can empower their writing ability. This idea is reiterated by Golparvar and Khafi (2021) arguing that L2 writing instructions should incorporate a balanced emphasis on spoken and written language so that the students can utilize their strengths to facilitate their weaknesses.

It is essential to research interactive approaches that can enhance undergraduate students' writing skills, enabling them to meet the demands of both academia and the job market. Therefore, this research study aims to examine the effect of improving the speaking of Arab undergraduates on their writing skills.

Literature Review

The teaching of academic writing in various contexts can be carried out using multiple approaches. As explained by Teng and Zhang (2020), these approaches depend on fundamental philosophy, the initial point of the pupils, the goal and genre of writing, and oftentimes just on individual preferences.

Historically, the writing instruction for L2 learning has undergone various phases. In 1980, most of the teaching instruction for L2 writing was developed based on students' L1 writing approach although the two are strategically, rhetorically, and linguistically distinct. Qader and Yalcin Arslan (2019) highlight that most EFL studies do not focus much on writing skills because language learning communicative approaches prioritize oral communication more. In the late 1970s, writing was considered merely a facilitative skill in language learning as opposed to listening, speaking, and reading (Alkodimi et al., 2021). The authors further argue that there were three key approaches to the teaching of L2 writing. The first is the "product approach" dominant in the 1970s of which focus was on constructing grammatical sentences as a result of imitating the teacher-provided models. The second is the "process approach" dominant in the 1980s in which the focus was on guiding the students instead of controlling them in the process of writing by using the approaches of planning, reviewing, and drafting. According to Covarino (2019) and Iljazi (2021), teachers should allow their students to edit their work, and treating writing as a student-centered learning approach would benefit both teachers and learners as it facilitates writing improvement, learner motivation, and time-saving for grading. Meanwhile, Hassan et al. (2020) support the engagement of students in the cognitive processes involved in writing. They assert that the physical processes in the pre-, during-, and post-writing stages do not essentially drive the strategies and methods for fulfilling writing tasks. As such, the process approach and the product approach should be integrated to enable students to identify the purpose of a written text that takes place after completing the writing process. On this basis, the researcher believes that today, writing is treated as a communicative social act that integrates teacher-centered and student-centered approaches. In this integrated approach, writing combines social acts with linguistic and cognitive acts (Kaşlıoğlu & Ersin, 2018). Thus, informed by the comprehensive scholarly discussion

discussed above, we can notice that most researchers agree that social interaction in the L2 writing classroom can boost students' writing quality.

Collaborative Learning and Writing

Collaborative learning is one of the prominent approaches that can enhance the student's learning process. In this vein, research has shown that collaborative learning can effectively foster active learning, critical thinking, and student satisfaction as well as long-term classroom retention (Alsowat, 2016; Xu et al., 2023). To understand the efficacy of collaborative learning in improving EFL students' English language proficiency, we need to understand what collaborative learning means in the context of this study. Laal and Laal (2012) define collaborative learning as "*a situation in which two or more people learn or attempt to learn something together*". Azar et al. (2021) further elucidate that collaborative learning is an approach to group learning and can be an effective method to qualify the students for the 21st-century skills to solve problems, accomplish tasks, or create products in the learning process

One type of collaborative learning is collaborative writing, which essentially relies on a classroom community where the students evaluate each other's work under the guidance of their instructor. Laal and Laal (2012) believe that collaborative writing, as opposed to individual writing, allows for the production of better compositions. Harmer (2004) and Lopres et al. (2023) also highlight that such collaborative effort can drive better learning. At this point, Harmer (2004) elaborates that the writing process that is conducted collaboratively would lead to the generation of more and better ideas and solutions to writing. Due to the benefits of collaborative work in the teaching of writing, the researcher assumes that integrating writing with other language skills could potentially help improve writing skills too. Research has proven that collaborative writing is beneficial in both L1 and L2 settings. For instance, Zhang (2018) argues that collaborative writing allows students to receive prompt feedback and be involved in the various aspects of writing. It also enables learners to acquire shared knowledge and utilize writing and social skills that drive accountability. The author eventually explains that it aids learners in gaining more control over their writing.

Experiences and Attitudes Toward Writing

Several studies (Ankawi, 2023; Dhanapal & Agab, 2023) argue that Arab students struggle with writing tasks at various stages of their academic journey. Within Saudi context, Alkodimi et al. (2021) argue that the majority of English major undergraduates exhibit low writing proficiency with basic errors manifested in simple sentence constructions. Although the students are aware of various writing strategies, the majority of the students encounter challenges in applying these strategies effectively.

Studies on Writing

Despite being familiar with various writing strategies, they are typically weak when it comes to implementing them. Fageeh (2014) has conducted two reading tests to determine the impact of journal writing and reading comprehension in refining the writing performance of EFL students in Saudi universities and has found that the two have no significant impact on the

students' academic writing. Similarly, Teng et al. (2022) examined the effect of writing strategies in improving the writing performance of EFL students and found that students who used more writing strategies experienced less anxiety and thus produced better writing than their counterparts who used fewer writing strategies. Likewise, Aljafen (2013) has found that students feel anxious when writing due to negative past experiences, mainly their lack of English education in the past, low confidence, and fear of negative evaluations. Fandiño et al. (2019) have revealed that the lack of affective factors i.e. attitudes and motivation towards learning English is related to students' poor proficiency in writing in English. The authors have further asserted the significant relationship between writing proficiency from one side and English language proficiency from the other side. In this regard, Mahmoud (2014) has concluded that working in a team enhances Saudi students' writing abilities.

In an attempt to improve the EFL students' writing skills, Riza and Kawakib (2021) demonstrate that learning the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) helps improve speaking and writing skills; phonological consciousness of the written symbols helps students to better pronounce and spell words, and therefore write better. Teng and Zhang (2020) conclude that learners who independently use strategy-based instructions (SBIs) demonstrated improved organization, coherence, and mechanics in their writing.

Many international studies have investigated ways to improve writing ability in classrooms. Standish (2005) compared the impacts of collaborative reading and direct instruction on the writing skills and general writing attitudes of sixth-grade students. The students were grouped into three levels of engagement; the first group demonstrated a more positive attitude towards writing and thus produced better compositions. Meanwhile, Baker (2016) has proved that the peer review strategy enables students to write better as opposed to when they only received feedback. Khabiri and Marashi (2016) also reveal that graduate students produce better writing via collaborative work which improves their motivation to write.

Studies on Students' Attitudes to and Experiences with Writing

Alenezi (2022) indicates that teaching in Saudi Arabia is teacher-centered approach where the students' role in learning is passive; the methods that are used to teach writing skill in Saudi Arabia is traditional and impractical. Therefore, the majority of Saudi students encounter challenges in improving their writing skill. Accordingly, they have negative attitudes towards writing.

Studies on Meta-discussions around Drafts in Progress

might enhance the writing process and improve perceptions of a particular writing standard

The literature review above briefly describes the issues faced by students in writing and the strategies for overcoming those issues. Nonetheless, there exists a gap in utilizing meta-discussions around writing for improving EFL students' writing skills. Hence, this current study aims to explore this gap.

Research Questions

This study intends to seek answers to these questions:

1. What are students' attitudes and experiences towards English writing skills?
2. How can meta-discussions around writing develop students' writing skills?

Methodology

Participants

The study participants consisted of 50 first-year undergraduates studying various majors at the Arab Open University (AOU) in Saudi Arabia. They were divided into three groups according to their English proficiency levels which were determined based on their English placement test scores.

Data Collection and Analysis

To collect the data, two methods were used. First, a written survey containing open-ended questions was used to elicit an accurate description of the students' proficiency in written English. Such open-ended questions facilitated the collection of the data concerning students' habitual writing and their attitudes towards writing.

Second, the study employed an intervention-based approach. The study assigned tasks for the students to engage them in speaking and writing activities by carefully observing their performances and interactions throughout the process. To explore the impact of improving the speaking of Arab undergraduates on their writing skills, the researcher analyzed the collected data qualitatively using a thematic analysis approach. Data from the survey was manually analyzed, revealing consistent themes such as:

- Past writing experiences
- Feelings regarding failure to write
- Writing skills and strategies.

The second method involved transcriptions of 10 recorded lessons, during which the students' verbal interactions were analyzed in relation to their completion of writing tasks. This analysis focused on identifying the most frequently used writing strategies. The data was categorized according to emerging themes from the students' interactions—cognitive, linguistic, and social acts, as proposed by Shao et al. (2020).

To ensure validity and reliability, three experts in Applied Linguistics reviewed the collected data and checked the emerged themes. The researcher submitted the instruments to professors and linguists, who provided feedback on their accuracy and content. After receiving their approval, the final version was implemented. Such external review process is compatible with Creswell's (2014) recommendation for promoting the qualitative studies' validity.

Intervention Tasks and Procedures

The participants were instructed to consider writing as a process that consists of three stages, namely, pre-writing, during-writing, and post-writing. After assigning the writing topic, the students were asked to share and brainstorm their experiences on the topic. The students were asked to work individually for several minutes. After that, they were divided into groups. Each group consisted of (5) students. The researcher assigned a group leader for each group to guide the discussion and submit a report. The students in each group were instructed to work collaboratively to outline the paper.

After accomplishing their writing tasks, the students submitted their first draft to the teacher. The teacher provided students feedback and discussed them in the next class. After giving the students constructive feedback, the students were asked to complete the final draft at home. Throughout the intervention, the teacher actively monitored group discussions and offered guidance and support to the students.

Results and Discussion

This research examines just how discussing writing influences students' perceptions of their writing abilities. Classroom observations and open-ended questions were employed to gather data. The open-ended questions targeted students' attitudes and experiences toward writing in English. The findings were analyzed and compared with related literature to identify patterns and insights. Based on the analysis, the key findings are outlined as follows:

Findings of Research Question One (RQ1)

What are students' attitudes and experiences towards English writing skills?

The findings revealed important insights into students' attitudes toward English writing, highlighting several emergent themes:

Theme One: Past Writing Experience The majority of students reported limited prior experience with English writing before university. The writing was seen as a task driven by grammatical accuracy and spelling rather than a complex process involving multiple skills and strategies. This demonstrates a simple view of writing. To illustrate, the students associated the practice with producing correct sentences instead of engaging in creative expression or critical thought.

For example, one student shared:

“My experience about English writing in school was to write an academic writing where I have to write grammatical sentences with correct spelling.”

It can be implied from the above quote that writing for such students was mainly considered an academic requirement. Besides, the majority of students lacked the motivation to engage in writing tasks unless associated with examinations or grades.

Theme Two: Feelings Regarding Failure to Write

The participants demonstrated strong emotional responses to the obstacles they encountered in writing. They used words to describe their experiences, such as frustrated,” “worried,” and “sad”. This denotes that their challenges with writing are often reflected in negative emotions reinforced by their perceived English incompetence.

One student explained: *“When I try to arrange my thoughts, I have the competency, but I am not able to put it into words. It's frustrating.”*

This demonstrates how emotional barriers can inhibit students' writing progress. This is supported by Alkodimi et al. (2021) who found similar results.

Theme Three: Writing Strategies

Students who struggle with writing usually use informal strategies including consulting family members, classmates or even occasionally instructors or using Google Translate. Using these strategies commonly resulted in superficial improvements in their writing instead of improved knowledge or even learning about the writing process.

One student said:

“Google Translator helps me when I am not able to find the proper word, as I type the sentence in Arabic, and I get its equivalent in English.”

This demonstrates that students lack formal strategies and therefore warrant more structured writing instruction which emphasizes strategy and process instead of quick fixes.

Finding of Research Question Two (RQ2)

This sub-section discusses Research Question Two (RQ2): “How can speaking skills develop students' writing skills? The answers to this question were generated from the students' speaking group work.

The discussion on speaking is based on learning instances that consider the students' cognitive, linguistic, and social acts (Mart, 2019). The researcher believes that this method has yielded various notable findings which lead to a better understanding of the research problem. The findings are presented in Table 4.1.

First off, the results show that discussions around writing, especially during planning and brainstorming, might influence students' writing skills positively. The researcher observed that in students' verbal interactions and engagement with their peers while planning their ideas for the particular topic. Regardless of the fact that the data does not directly exhibit improvement in students' writing skills, such discussions enabled the students to collaborate

on ideas and organize their thoughts, which in turn, might enhance their writing as shown in Table (1) below:

Findings		Excerpts
1	The students' writing skills were improved by speaking in several ways.	<p><i>S1: Are we going to start with ideas before the methods?</i> <i>S2: well, let us decide it first, then we present three ideas and methods.</i> <i>S1: So, can we form the article more particularly?</i> <i>S2: How, hypertension along smokers. Smokers become drained fast, see smokers.</i> <i>S1: Yes, and they have serious problem.</i></p>
2	The students discussed more about the meaning than the grammatical and textual errors	<p><i>S1: Why the instructor [sic.] underlined this word?</i> <i>S2: Because it is not correct to write "but" in this place.</i> <i>S1: But the sentence is well-formed.</i> <i>S2: "But" is used to present different thing while [sic.]. the correct word to be used is "however" to include information and inform about unexpected idea.</i></p>
3	The students prefer to converse in their mother tongue i.e. Arabic.	<p><i>S1: Electronic maneuvers are necessary.</i> <i>S2: Sure, but how about the negative outcomes?</i> <i>S3: It can influence person wellness, and our thoughts, and result in addiction, and generate fire..... (told in Arabic).</i></p>
4	Group discussions in a relaxed setting also help improve the students' interaction skills as	<p><i>S1: You stated, "The electronic devices used might generate fire"; is that what you meant?</i> <i>S2: Yes, that is to say right.</i> <i>S1: How can I be able [incite.] to know, can you provide an example?</i> <i>S1: I can tell that you have to handle carefully while charging.</i> <i>S3: Also, if you handle bad battery.</i></p>

Table 1., Key Findings of Research Question Two (RQ2)

As shown in Table 1 the two students discussed the opening of their draft. The initial suggestion by S1 was partly disagreed by S2 who suggested that they provide a definition first. S1 then suggested narrowing the topic down, which S2 supported with an example. S2 continued by drawing on a personal experience which activated the discussion even further. With the provision of sufficient time to deliberate on relevant ideas, the students found better ways to present the given topic. This outcome is in line with the indication of Dobao (2014) who has stated that collaborative writing is substantially advantageous for students in the writing process.

Secondly, as illustrated in Table 1 the findings revealed that the students started to resolve

grammatical and word choice problems during the conversation. However, it was found that the students discussed more about the meaning than the grammatical and textual errors. This is unsurprising as the latter is more technical. Additionally, teachers typically do not provide extensive feedback about the students' ideas. They usually only leave comments such as "*not clear*" or "*rewrite the sentence*". This finding aligns with Cheung and Hennebry-Leung (2023) as they identify that ESL teachers often leave ambiguous comments on their students' work. With peer review, students can improve their writing and widen their perception of writing. The authors further demonstrate that working in groups can be time-consuming, as students may take a long time discussing and brainstorming ideas, teachers could ask their students to do the brainstorming at home and bring already developed ideas to be presented in class.

Thirdly, the transcripts, illustrated in Table 1 revealed that the students prefer to converse in their mother tongue i.e. Arabic. This is helpful when they need to define certain terms and to express themselves clearly. However, it is rather problematic when one thinks in Arabic and translates to English. The excerpt below is an example showing one of the students' over-usages of "and": This point is illustrated in a study conducted by Storch and Aldosari (2010) and Kolluru et al. (2020) that the coordinate conjunction of "and" is commonly used repeatedly to elongate sentences; in English however, such practice would end up sounding like rambling. This issue became highly apparent when some of the students wrote English sentences filled with "and."

Eventually, group discussions in a relaxed setting also help improve the students' interaction skills. The excerpt above shows that the students open plenty of room for feedback. Several forms of good feedback can be identified from the excerpt. For instance, when S1 asked a question, S2 replied with constructive feedback entailing two examples. On this basis, the researcher finds out that group discussions can develop the students' interpersonal skills i.e. listening, speaking, organizing, empathy, and provision of constructive feedback. This result aligns with the study of Dobao (2014) as he argues that interacting patterns are picked up by the participants in a group discussion. Ro'ufiyati and Mahbub (2023), Aljafen (2013), and Al Asmari (2013) similarly conclude that writing anxiety could be due to the students' fear of negative feedback along with unawareness of suitable strategies. Hence, we can conclude that in group work, students give each other positive feedback including suggestions for various writing strategies. There are two types of feedback as indicated by Teng et al. (2022). The first type is given for evaluation purposes as the student learns how good or bad he or she has achieved. While correction, little particular information is given on phases of the student's performance: by clarification or by elicitation of those from the learner.

One may argue that talking about writing encourages idea organization and collaboration along with boosting students' confidence. Both verbal interactions and group discussions during brainstorming and planning phases enable students to work collaboratively on writing, structure their thoughts, and increase their task readiness (Cheung & Hennebry-Leung, 2023). Although students might concentrate even more on meaning and content compared to grammatical accuracy, the cooperative environment in which peer discussions fosters students' writing along with students' confidence (Storch & Aldosari, 2010).

Discussion and Limitations

The study results provide valuable information concerning students' perspectives on how discussing

writing influences students' writing abilities. The analysis showed that speaking as well as group discussions have a positive impact on specific aspects of writing. However, the results revealed that neither of them led to significant improvements in writing skills. From students' perspectives, collaborative brainstorming and verbal interactions enabled them to develop content and organize ideas. This finding is similar to Dabao's (2014) results concerning the advantages of peer collaboration in improving students' writing.

Nevertheless, during these discussions, the participants were inclined to concentrate more on meaning instead of textual structure or grammatical accuracy. This implies that group discussions enhance both content development and idea generation. By contrast, grammatical competency and technical writing might be overlooked, demonstrating a limited development in writing skills. In addition, the use of students' self-reported questionnaires might increase the likelihood of bias since the students might either overlook areas that still require improvement or overstate their accomplishments. Even though the study revealed that speaking can improve writing skills, there is a need to approach the conclusions with caution. As a consequence, further studies are required to carry out more rigorous methods; including, formal writing assessments or longitudinal studies to accurately evaluate the level of improvement in students' writing skills.

This study has several limitations; the first one is manifested in the lack of objective measures, which assess if students' writing skills actually improved. To investigate true enhancement, future studies might replicate the study using statistical analysis to closely assess students' writing test scores or written tests. Moreover, future studies are advised to carry out a longitudinal design because it allows for a more thorough investigation of progress over time. In addition, longitudinal studies provide insights concerning the long-term impacts of combining speaking activities with writing instruction. The second limitation is the focus on students' impressions and attitudes towards their writing improvements and challenges from their perspectives. This limitation might not reflect measurable changes in their writing proficiency. It is strongly advised for future studies to interpret the findings cautiously since they rely more on subjective feedback than on objective performance data.

Conclusion and Implications

The purpose of this work is to investigate the relationship between students' perceptions concerning their capacity for the English writing language and the use of meta-discussions as a tool for nurturing their writing abilities. The findings reveal a complicated interaction between students' previous knowing and their emotional responses to writing. Moreover, the study found that collaborative dynamics enhanced through group discussions.

The study further demonstrates that the students commonly perceive writing as mechanics and skills, attributed to lack of experience and overemphasis on correct use of English with little or no levels of creativity. This constrained perception corresponds to the conventional patterns of teaching but poses important questions regarding the effectiveness of the given paradigms in terms of complexity and inclusiveness of writing as a communicative act.

Meta-discussions facilitated a shift from individual emergent attempt to emergent collaborative exploration wherein the students were able to coordinate the ideas, critique, and gain confidence in their writing. The patterns derived from these discussions point to how common discourse enhances the appreciation of content and the writing process, as well as how peer interaction may resolve aspects within the social/communicative and language domains in addition to the cognitive dimensions of learning. For instance, although clarity of language was mostly subjugated in the discussions, insistence on meaning and content construction helped students to enunciate and organize their ideas correctly.

The study results undermine the traditional paradigms of teachers' writing instruction by

illustrating the possibilities in embedding the speaking task. It raises concern over aspects such as the lack of response from other theories that take into consideration mechanical soundness instead of content appropriate and interaction pertinent. The findings above support the argument for shifting from teaching processes that occur in isolation to teaching practices that incorporate more integrative and dialogical approaches that are situated in a communicative context.

This study contributes to ongoing discussion regarding the effectiveness of active learning strategies in language education. It highlights the significance of elucidating data not as discrete observations but as interconnected elements, which highlights broader pedagogical implications. It is recommended for future studies to investigate the longitudinal effects of meta-discussions. Moreover, future studies should investigate the impact of such insights on informing more nuanced approaches to EFL instruction, which balance technical accuracy, collaboration, and creativity.

Acknowledgment

The author extends his appreciation to the Arab Open University for funding this work through AOU research fund No. (AOUKSA-524008).

Author's bio

Yousef Houssni Zrekat is Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics at Arab Open University, English language and literature department, in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Dr Zrekat is currently holding a position as the head of the Intensive English Unit. He has published several papers in the field of applied linguistics.

References

- Ahmad, T., Zainal, Z., & Rajab, A. (2019, 10/19). A Conceptual Review of the Role of Teaching and Learning of Second Language Through Literature and Communicative Approach. *Open Journal of Science and Technology*, 2, 6-10. <https://doi.org/10.31580/ojst.v2i2.913>
- Al Asmari, A. R. (2013). Saudi university undergraduates' language learning attitudes: A preparatory year perspective. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(11), 2288-2306.
- Shamsi, A. F., & Osam, U. V. (2022). Challenges and support in article publication: Perspectives of non-native English speaking doctoral students in a "Publish or No Degree" context. *Sage Open*, 12(2), 1-15.
- Neumann Jr, R. K., Margolis, E., & Stanchi, K. M. (2021). *Legal reasoning and legal writing*. Aspen Publishing.
- Alenezi, S. S. A. (2022). The Effects of Writing in a Class Blog on Saudi EFL Students' Attitudes towards Writing in English. *Arab World English Journal*, 329-341. OI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/covid2.22>.

- Ali, M. M. A., Yunus, M. M., Hashim, H., Hidayat, W., & Zaman, M. (2019). Experts' agreement towards student engagement constructs for a strategic development of a flipped learning framework for ESL context. *International Journal of Academic Research Business and Social Sciences*, 9(3), 1423-1431.
- Aljafen, B. S. (2013). *Writing anxiety among EFL Saudi students in science colleges and departments at a Saudi university*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Alkodimi, K., Mohammed Hassan Al-Ahdal, & Ahmed, A. (2021). Strategies of teaching writing at Saudi tertiary-level institutions: Reality and expectations. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Volume, 12*.
- Alsowat, H. (2016). An EFL flipped classroom teaching model: Effects on English language higher-order thinking skills, student engagement and satisfaction. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(9), 108-121.
- Ankawi, A. (2023). Saudi Arabian University Students' Perspectives on Issues and Solutions in Academic Writing Learning. *English Language Teaching*, 16(8), 1-1.
- Azar, A. S., Keat, O. B., & Arutus, J. S. (2021). Collaborative Learning in the Classroom: The Study of Malaysian University Student"Attitude. *Ilkogretim Online*, 20(4).
- Azizah, S. N. (2022). Projecting communicative language teaching (CLT) implementation in teaching spoken language at secondary school. *Journal of English Teaching, Applied Linguistics and Literatures (JETALL)*, 5(2), 179-198.
- Baker, K. M. (2016). Peer review as a strategy for improving students' writing process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 179-192.
- Cheung, A., & Hennebry-Leung, M. (2023). Exploring an ESL teachers' beliefs and practices of teaching literary texts: A case study in Hong Kong. *Language Teaching Research*, 27(1), 181-206.
- Covarino, G. (2019). *Literature in the foreign language classroom: students' and teachers' views on learner motivation, reading habits and skills, and the role of the teacher* [University of Birmingham].
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. SAGE Publications.
https://books.google.com.sa/books?id=4uB76IC_pOQC
- Dhanapal, C., & Agab, S. N. A. (2023). Writing Difficulties among Undergraduate Arab Students in English Language: A Case Study of King Khalid University. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 6(2), 167-169.
- Dobao, A. F. (2014). Attention to form in collaborative writing tasks: Comparing pair and small group interaction. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 70(2), 158-187.

- Fageeh, A. (2014). The Use of Journal Writing and Reading Comprehension Texts during Pre-Writing in Developing EFL Students' Academic Writing. *Studies in Literature and Language*, 9(3), 1.
- Fandiño, F. G. E., Muñoz, L. D., & Velandia, A. J. S. (2019). Motivation and E-Learning English as a foreign language: A qualitative study. *Heliyon*, 5(9).
- Golparvar, S. E., & Khafi, A. (2021). The role of L2 writing self-efficacy in integrated writing strategy use and performance. *Assessing Writing*, 47, 100504.
- [Record #136 is using a reference type undefined in this output style.]
- Hartshorn, K. J., & Evans, N. W. (2015). The Effects of Dynamic Written Corrective Feedback: A 30-Week Study. *Journal of response to writing*, 1(2).
- Hassan, A., Kazi, A. S., & Asmara Shafqat, Z. A. (2020). The impact of process writing on the language and attitude of Pakistani English learners. *Asian EFL Journal*, 27(4.3), 260-277.
- Iljazi, J. R. (2021). Effects of different approaches to writing on the improvement of students' writing performance. *Knowledge - International Journal*, 48(4), 653-658.
- Kaşlıoğlu, Ö., & Ersin, P. (2018). Pre-service teachers' beliefs about literature integration in English language teaching classrooms. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 14(3), 213-232.
- Khabiri, M., & Marashi, H. (2016). Collaborative Teaching: How Does It Work in a Graduate TEFL Class? *TESOL Journal*, 7(1), 179-202.
- Kolluru, K., Adlakha, V., Aggarwal, S., & Chakrabarti, S. (2020). Openie6: Iterative grid labeling and coordination analysis for open information extraction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.03147*.
- Kraft, S. (2023, 2023-March-23). Revisions in written composition: Introducing speech-to-text to children with reading and writing difficulties [Original Research]. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1133930>
- Kroll, B. M., & Lempers, J. D. (1981). Effect of mode of communication on the informational adequacy of children's explanations. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 138(1), 27-35.
- Laal, M., & Laal, M. (2012, 2012/01/01/). Collaborative learning: what is it? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 31, 491-495. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.092>
- Lopres, J. R., Lactam, J. Y., Sia, J. B., Jr, M. P., Jr, A. A. A., Labaria, J. J. C., Boloron, R. A., Ching, R. C., Alsaireh, M. Y., & Capulso, L. B. (2023). A Model of Collaborative

- Writing Technique to Enhance Students 'Writing Fluency. *World Journal of English Language*, 13(3), 227-227.
- Mahmoud, M. M. A. (2014). The effectiveness of using the cooperative language learning approach to enhance EFL writing skills among Saudi university students. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(3), 616.
- Mart, Ç. T. (2019). A comparison of form-focused, content-based and mixed approaches to literature-based instruction to develop learners' speaking skills. *Cogent Education*, 6(1), 1660526.
- Qader, R. O., & Yalcin Arslan, F. (2019). The Effect of Flipped Classroom Instruction in Writing: A Case Study with Iraqi EFL Learners. *Teaching English with Technology*, 19(1), 36-55.
- Rahnuma, N. (2023). Exploring ESL students' experiences of academic writing in higher education- a cultural historical activity theory perspective. *Education Inquiry*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2023.2222450>
- Richards, J. C. (2005). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre. <https://books.google.com.sa/books?id=n4rUMQEACAAJ>
- Riza, A., & Kawakib, A. N. (2021). Utilizing the phonetic transcription of IPA (International Phonetic Alphabet) to avoid EFL students miss-pronunciation. International Conference on Engineering, Technology and Social Science (ICONETOS 2020),
- Ro'ufiyati, D. F., & Mahbub, M. A. (2023). Students' essay writing anxiety: A narrative study of Indonesian tertiary EFL learners. *JEES (Journal of English Educators Society)*, 8(1).
- Shao, K., Pekrun, R., Marsh, H. W., & Loderer, K. (2020). Control-value appraisals, achievement emotions, and foreign language performance: A latent interaction analysis. *Learning and Instruction*, 69, 101356.
- Solijon, A. (2022). Improving students' paragraph writing skills through blended learning technologies at higher pedagogical education. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 4(10), 6-15. <https://doi.org/10.37547/tajssei/Volume04Issue10-02>
- Standish, L. G. (2005). *The effects of collaborative strategic reading and direct instruction in persuasion on sixth-grade students' persuasive writing and attitudes*. University of Maryland, College Park.
- Storch, N., & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(4), 355-375.
- Teng, L. S., & Zhang, L. J. (2020). Empowering learners in the second/foreign language classroom: Can self-regulated learning strategies-based writing instruction make a difference? *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 48, 100701.

- Teng, M. F., Wang, C., & Zhang, L. J. (2022). Assessing self-regulatory writing strategies and their predictive effects on young EFL learners' writing performance. *Assessing Writing*, 51, 100573.
- Wahyuni, A. (2018). The power of verbal and nonverbal communication in learning. 1st International Conference on Intellectuals' Global Responsibility (ICIGR 2017),
- Wu, W.-C. V., Hsieh, J. S. C., & Yang, J. C. (2017). Creating an online learning community in a flipped classroom to enhance EFL learners' oral proficiency. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society*, 20(2), 142-157.
- Xu, E., Wang, W., & Wang, Q. (2023, 2023/01/11). The effectiveness of collaborative problem solving in promoting students' critical thinking: A meta-analysis based on empirical literature. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 10(1), 16. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-01508-1>
- Yadgarovna, N. (2022, 11/21). Communicative Approach to Teaching a Foreign Language: Pendekatan Komunikatif dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Asing. *Indonesian Journal of Education Methods Development*, 20. <https://doi.org/10.21070/ijemd.v20i.624>
- Yulia, Y., & Amirudin, S. (2021, 2021/03/01). Technology to develop student writing skill: a portrait of english language teaching in remote area. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1833(1), 012035. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1833/1/012035>
- Zhang, M. (2018). Collaborative writing in the EFL classroom: The effects of L1 and L2 use. *System*, 76, 1-12.