

EFFICACY OF PRE-WRITING ORAL DISCUSSION AS A METHOD FOR ENHANCING WRITING ABILITIES

Muhammad Rashid, Asim Mahboob Qureshi

Center for Foundation Studies, Middle East College, Oman

ORCID iDs: Muhammad Rashid
Asim Mahboob Qureshi

 N/A

 N/A

Abstract. *In the realm of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing, the scarcity of ideas often hampers original conceptual development. Teacher-led class discussions (TLCD) are widely acknowledged as an effective method for fostering learners' creativity. The teacher assumes the role of a facilitator, initiating and guiding discussions while maintaining a positive atmosphere among participants. The students' speaking proficiency, ensuing discourse, and the resulting emergence of critical thinking in writing are interconnected aspects. This experimental study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of employing such discussions as a precursor to writing tasks. Specifically, it seeks to address two main inquiries: 1) The influence of TLCD, utilizing a structured questioning approach, on enhancing learners' creativity in an EFL writing class, and 2) the varying levels of responsiveness among high, average, and low proficiency students concerning their writing outcomes in response to the questioning strategy utilized in teacher-led discussions. A cohort of 56 level 3 General Foundation Programme students at Middle East College was divided into control and experimental groups to investigate these questions. The experimental group engaged in weekly writing tasks following topic-based questions designed to facilitate conceptual learning. A mixed method approach was employed, encompassing surveys, interviews, and pre-and post-test written assessments exclusively to evaluate the strategy's effectiveness holistically. The findings reveal that high proficiency students derive significant benefits from integrating oral discussions and subsequent writing tasks, displaying notable improvements in their writing skills. In contrast, while the writing abilities of average and low proficiency students showed discernible enhancement, their progress was not statistically superior to the control group. These results highlight the potential of TLCD in stimulating creativity and enhancing EFL writing capabilities, particularly among proficient learners.*

Key words: *Teacher-lead class discussion (TLCD), Structured questioning approach (SQA), Socratic Seminar Model, Experimental group (EG), Control group (CG), Critical thinking (CT), High proficiency level students (HPS), Average proficiency level students (APS), Low proficiency level student (LPS), General Foundation Programme (GFP)*

Submitted December 5th, 2023, accepted for publication April 18th, 2024

Corresponding author: Muhammad Rashid, Center for Foundation Studies, Middle East College, Oman

E-mail: rashid@mec.edu.om

1. INTRODUCTION

Language acquisition and development in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts are intricate processes that demand a multifaceted approach to effective teaching. Proficiency in writing is not solely reliant on linguistic competence but also on fostering creativity and originality in conceptualization (Silva, 1993). EFL students often encounter the challenge of generating original and innovative content, primarily due to a lack of ideas, which hinders their writing efforts (Etemadzadeh et al., 2012). Acknowledging the crucial role of teacher-led discussions in nurturing learners' creativity (Richards & Lockhart, 1996), this research explores the intersection of teaching methods, critical thinking, and language advancement. The teacher's responsibility is akin to that of a referee, orchestrating and guiding discussions while cultivating a positive atmosphere for participation. Proficiency in speaking, ensuing dialogues, and subsequent growth in critical thinking are closely intertwined. Teacher-led discussions have been recognized as a successful approach in igniting students' creativity and encouraging them to explore diverse viewpoints and ideas. Building upon this notion, the present research examines the potential benefits of introducing TLCD as an initial phase for English as a Foreign Language (EFL) writing assignments, employing a strategic questioning method or Socratic seminar model.

While writing skills are often taught separately, integrating speaking techniques into EFL classrooms can provide a dynamic approach to enhancing students' writing capabilities. By acknowledging the interdependence of speaking and writing, educators can establish a comprehensive learning environment that promotes language development and empowers students to become more skilled and confident communicators (Nation & Macalister, 2020). Speaking and writing are intricately linked aspects of language acquisition. Both entail formulating ideas, structuring thoughts, and conveying messages effectively. Incorporating speaking exercises into ESL classrooms offers students a platform to articulate their ideas verbally before translating them into written form. This process aids learners in organizing their thoughts logically and facilitates the expansion of their vocabulary (Thornbury, 2005; Macalister & Nation, 2020).

Engaging students in roundtable discussions on a given topic encourages active participation and oral expression. These discussions expose learners to diverse perspectives and enable them to brainstorm ideas collectively. Subsequently, students can channel their insights into structured writing assignments, refining their ability to organize and convey complex ideas in written form (Nunan, 2003; Thornbury, 2012). Further, organizing debates and persuasive speech activities prompts students to defend their viewpoints persuasively. These exercises require students to articulate arguments clearly and logically, fostering critical thinking. Transferring these skills to writing helps students craft persuasive essays with well-structured arguments and coherent reasoning (Richards & Farrell, 2005; Macalister & Nation, 2020).

2. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Achieving a reasonable level of oral communication proficiency is imperative for the majority of learners to sustain discussions effectively. Discussions serve as a technique to lay a firm foundation for students' development of thinking abilities (Brookfield & Preskill, 2016). Consequently, speaking competence takes center stage in this scenario. Nevertheless, Omani EFL learners have perennially grappled with this skill, especially as

they approach graduation, owing to several reasons. Numerous studies (Brookfield & Preskill, 2016; Mercer & Littleton, 2007) have proposed employing diverse speaking approaches guided by the teacher before engaging in writing tasks on the same topic. This method nurtures critical thinking, creativity, and imagination.

Writing, akin to speaking, is widely acknowledged as the most challenging skill to both master and teach among EFL students and English language educators (Ferris, 2003; Hyland & Hyland, 2006). It holds a pivotal position among integrated language skills. Despite these recognized challenges, Arab EFL learners face a deeper issue beyond mere grammatical or structural deficiencies. The main issue arises from a lack of ideas when it comes to crafting academic essays. Regrettably, the written works of many students not only exhibit an absence of ideas but also lack originality and coherent reasoning, fundamental elements for crafting well-formed pieces. Hosni (2014) reported some reasons for this problem, highlighting that teachers often prioritize teaching grammatical rules and vocabulary over fostering speaking and practical writing skills. Also, Al-Brashdi (2002), Rababa (2005) and Al-Issa (2006), as cited by Naqvi et al. (2023), noted that in Gulf countries, such as Oman, a significant portion of school graduates and students in GFP programs face a deficiency in both English language proficiency and study skills. Moreover, Naqvi et al. (2023) also highlighted that the English textbooks presently employed within Omani classrooms fall short in fostering students' abilities for critical thinking.

While the well-known brainstorming technique aids learners to some extent in generating ideas before writing compositions, the concepts generated often comprise isolated words or fragments of incomprehensible sentences, indicating a student's unclear understanding of a topic and their lack of critical thinking or originality of thought.

Regrettably, there has not been sufficient research on the efficacy of TLCD in developing critical thinking and enhancing writing abilities among Arab EFL learners. Moreover, there is a scarcity of literature correlating such activities specifically to Arab EFL students. Therefore, this study aims to evaluate the viability and effectiveness of teacher-led discussions employing a targeted or structured questioning approach in Omani EFL learners' writing classes at the advanced tertiary level. The objective is to assess the improvement in critical thinking and its ongoing impact on their writing abilities.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

The aim of this literature review is to explore the critical role of class discussions in enhancing critical thinking (CT) skills among EFL students, elucidating how these discussions contribute to the refinement of language proficiency, fluency in expression, and logical excellence in both verbal and written communication. Despite the acknowledged importance of CT, particularly in EFL contexts, there exists a notable gap in the literature regarding the explicit connection between class discussions, CT development, and their enduring positive influence on productive skills like speaking and writing. Drawing from a range of scholarly perspectives, this review investigates the impact of various pedagogical approaches, such as Socratic questioning strategies, communicative language education strategies, and the interrelation between speaking and writing abilities, in fostering CT and enhancing language production skills. Additionally, this review aims to underscore the significance of addressing deficiencies in speaking skills among Omani EFL learners, which significantly affect their academic writing capabilities and social interactions within the classroom.

According to Etemadzadeh et al. (2012), incorporating Socratic questioning strategies in the classroom is crucial for creating engaged and independent learners. Moreover, Stojković and Zerkin (2023) assert that employing the Socratic method in an ESP setting triggers the activation of students' content and linguistic knowledge, stimulates them to devise fresh solutions in both domains, and engages their cognitive capabilities. Alkhoudary (2015) proposed that engaging students with questions in a classroom setting enhances the clarity of learners' thoughts. Furthermore, Richards and Rodger (2001), argue that the communicative language education strategy, which stresses meaningful interaction among learners as a technique to acquire the target language in a more natural way, is based on the integration of several language abilities. In complete agreement with Richards and Rodger, According to Elbow (2012), although speaking and writing differ in several aspects, speech can significantly aid writing in various ways.

Etemadzadeh et al. (2012) also noted that lack of ideas is regarded as one reason why learners are reluctant to engage in productive skills like writing. Students' low participation is mostly because of a blank mind rather than poor linguistic skills. They emphasize that employing questioning techniques or the Socratic Model assists students in enhancing their critical thinking skills. This, in turn, encourages them to become more active language producers, particularly in writing, as exceptional thinking is recognized as a precursor to proficient writing.

Speaking is the main source of language acquisition. However, according to Omani school instructors, speaking is not evaluated in examinations, thus they do not see the need to concentrate on it. Al-Hosni (2014) cites the instance of young EFL Omani learners at the school level to admit that speaking is less stressed by both teachers and pupils since it is not assessed. This is in line with Al Lawati's (2002) research results, which show that students pay close attention to writing, reading, and listening tasks that are exam items. He further reports that teachers and students agree that speaking tasks in textbooks receive the least attention because speaking is completely disregarded in exams.

Richards and Rodger (2001) contend that the communicative language teaching approach hinges on integrating diverse language skills, emphasizing meaningful learner interaction to facilitate a more natural acquisition of the target language. Echoing the sentiments of Richards and Rodger, Elbow (2012) asserts that despite the differences between writing and speech, speech can aid writing in various ways. According to Alkhoudary (2015), as writing is an intellectual skill, teaching thinking abilities may be connected to teaching writing rather than being taught separately. In the current era, writing is increasingly recognized as a communicative social activity that blends teacher-centered and student-centered approaches in teaching academic writing. This perspective on writing extends beyond linguistic and cognitive aspects to encompass a social dimension (Santose, 2010). Numerous researchers highlight the significance of social interaction in L2 (second language) writing classrooms, acknowledging it as a factor that can enhance students' writing quality (Weissberg, 2006).

Throughout this review, the literature underscores the critical need to address deficiencies in speaking skills among Omani EFL learners. The oversight of speaking skills in educational assessments, as highlighted by Omani school instructors and research findings, has resulted in a diminished emphasis on speaking within the classroom environment. This neglect of speaking skills, despite its foundational role in language acquisition and its synergy with academic writing, has been highlighted as a

significant concern, affecting students' social interactions and hindering their development in other language domains.

In addition, the synthesis of studies underscores the importance of integrating CT skills into EFL curricula, especially within writing-related lessons. Addressing learners' "blank mind syndrome" through questioning techniques that stimulate critical thinking has been identified as a means to enhance students' active participation and proficiency in productive skills, such as writing. Moreover, the connection between thinking abilities and writing skills advocates for a more interconnected approach to teaching these aspects rather than treating them in isolation.

4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How successfully do teacher-led class discussions foster critical thinking?
2. How important are language proficiency, lexical knowledge, and speaking skills for class discussion?
3. Does the structured questioning method improve writing skills?

5. METHODOLOGY

This experimental study consisted of 56 Omani General Foundation Programme (GFP) Level 3 students at Middle East College, Oman, evenly split between males and females chosen randomly. Each participant shared the same linguistic and cultural background. All students were native speakers of Arabic and studied English as a compulsory subject but not as their medium of instruction during school years. The 56 students, categorized into three skill levels—high, average, and low—were subsequently divided into two identical sets: the CG (Control Group) and EG (Experimental Group), ensuring an equal distribution of boys and girls within each group. They were taken from Level 3 which is the final level of GFP at MEC.

The experimental and controlled groups underwent both pre and post-tests (see Table 1 and Table 2) to assess their writing proficiency. Following the post-test, the experimental group (comprising 28 students) additionally took part in an online survey (refer to Table 3) conducted using google forms. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews with 12 students, representing varying levels of proficiency (good, average, and weak) from the experimental group were conducted to gather their perspectives on TLCD.

To assess and compare the performance of the two groups, pre-tests were conducted in week 3 and post-tests in week 14 in the fall semester of Academic Year 2021-2022. The study was confined to a 14-week session due to limitations and focused on a specified syllabus covering compare & contrast, argumentative, and opinion essays to align with the objectives of the curriculum. In the pre-test, both groups were tasked with an argumentative essay to gauge their writing skills. In the post-test, an argumentative essay was included to assess and compare their progress. Rubrics recommended by the module coordinator were utilized for essay grading, with slight modifications made for research purposes. The rubric, allocating a total of 100 marks, was divided into: structure (20 marks), grammar (20 marks), spelling (10 marks), critical thinking (15 marks), cohesion and coherence (10 marks), subject matter (15 marks), and lexical range (10 marks).

The in-depth analysis primarily focused on critical thinking, cohesion and coherence, content, and lexical range components. The mean and standard deviation of the overall 100 marks were also considered in the comprehensive analysis to maintain alignment with the research objectives.

However, during the experiment, alongside the methods used for both groups, the EG students received instructions through a unique approach called the Structured Questioning Approach (SQA) or Socratic Seminar Model (Christopher Phillips, 2011). This strategy was implemented before the students were assigned their weekly essay writing tasks, aiming to stimulate topic-based discussions in class and enhance critical thinking skills. The purpose of employing teacher-led discussions using the Socratic Seminar model questions was carefully planned to align with the core writing topics. These questions were thoughtfully organized to encourage discussions and explore potential solutions among the students. The intention was to foster a deeper understanding of the topics and stimulate critical thinking by prompting active engagement and exploration of various perspectives during the discussions.

Meanwhile, the CG also had weekly essay writing tasks but did not undergo the SQA method. Both groups received detailed feedback on their weekly writing assignments. After 13 weeks, a post-test of similar difficulty and structure to the pre-test was administered to compare the progress of the two groups. The objective was to analyze and identify any differences in their performance. Although the mean scores of the groups were compared, the actual assessment focused on specific criteria: “critical thinking”, “content”, “cohesion and coherence”, and “lexical range”.

6. RESULTS (EXPERIMENTAL STUDY)

Mean and Standard Deviation (SD) were employed to analyze the data derived from both the pre-test and post-test of CG and EG. The mean scores for CG and EG on the pre-test were 48.98 and 49.184, respectively. It was more than 0.05 level alpha when there was a difference of 0.557 between the two means. As a result, there was no discernible statistical difference between the two means. Prior to the treatment phase, both groups exhibited a similar level of proficiency in English language (Table 1). The groups' respective mean scores on the post-test were 52.112 and 56.806 respectively. Results from CG's pre- and post-testing revealed a moderate difference between the two means. The experimental group, however, had superior outcomes in the post-test, and their mean score increased from 49.184 to 56.806. (Table 1). The overall and segmental analysis of the two groups in the post-test, taking into account “critical thinking”, “content”, “cohesion and coherence”, and “lexical range”, presents a clear picture of the findings. The detailed analysis of the pre-test and the post-test does not, however, include the achievement of the groups in “structure”, “grammar”, and “spellings”, as they were not supposed to be analyzed in the study (Table 2).

Table 1 Overall achievement of both the groups in pre-test and Post-test

| Pre-test and Post-test by CG and EG | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------|----|--------|--------|
| Segment | Group | n | Mean | SD |
| Pre-Test | CG | 28 | 48.98 | 8.789 |
| | EG | 28 | 49.184 | 10.788 |
| Post -Test | CG | 28 | 52.112 | 10.678 |
| | EG | 28 | 56.806 | 13.403 |

Table 2 Detailed achievement of both the groups in pre-test and post-test

| Pre-test by two groups (CG and EG) in details | | | | | Post-test by two groups (CG and EG) in details | | | | |
|--|-------|----|-------|--------|---|-------|----|-------|--------|
| Segment | Group | n | Mean | SD | Segment | Group | N | Mean | SD |
| Critical thinking | CG | 28 | 7.492 | 1.4855 | Critical thinking | CG | 28 | 7.567 | 1.4256 |
| | EG | 28 | 6.935 | 1.8992 | | EG | 28 | 7.789 | 2.9118 |
| Content | CG | 28 | 7.407 | 1.9308 | Content | CG | 28 | 8.235 | 1.7277 |
| | EG | 28 | 7.677 | 2.0142 | | EG | 28 | 8.795 | 2.3987 |
| Cohesion | CG | 28 | 4.666 | 1.1554 | Cohesion | CG | 28 | 4.897 | 1.1433 |
| | EG | 28 | 5.018 | 0.984 | | EG | 28 | 5.832 | 1.6256 |
| Lexical range | CG | 28 | 4.925 | 0.9025 | Lexical Range | CG | 28 | 5.357 | 1.4346 |
| | EG | 28 | 4.962 | 0.9788 | | EG | 28 | 5.987 | 1.7136 |

6.1. Result (Interview And Survey Study)

As the interview served as a continuation of the survey, the data collected from both the interview and the survey intertwined thematically. Consequently, the survey analysis was followed by the interview analysis. The emerging themes from the research topics addressed in this study encompassed:

- Students' perceptions regarding the feasibility and effectiveness of TLCD to enhance critical thinking in writing
- Identification of the primary reasons why learners with low and average proficiency feel disadvantaged during question-and-answer sessions, based on student perceptions

The most prominent viewpoint among high-rated individuals regarding TLCD was articulated as follows:

"We believe that TLCD is beneficial for individuals skilled in verbal communication, yet less helpful for students learning at lower or medium proficiency levels. How can this approach support students in writing if they struggle to articulate their thoughts clearly, comprehend, or benefit from others' ideas?"

When questioned about the usefulness of TLCD, all four low proficiency students (LPS) agreed that TLCD could have been advantageous if they had the opportunity to participate actively. They referred to their limited vocabulary and grammar skills, which significantly affected their ability to express opinions effectively. They also indicated shortcomings in both these areas.

The survey received responses from 28 EG students. The following results provide an in-depth exploration of the primary factors contributing to a notable proportion of students encountering challenges during TLCD. It is evident from items Nos. 1 and 2 that many students cited their lack of speaking competence and a limited lexical range as key

challenges during TLCD. Additionally, some students who identified grammar as an issue also believed that all three factors listed in item 1 (including grammar) were at play. Moreover, item 2 in Table 3 demonstrates a significant correlation between limited lexical and speaking skills as the main causes.

Table 3 Students' perceptions of the main factors of the disadvantage experienced by low-proficiency and average proficiency learners during TLCD

| No. | Items | A | b | C | d |
|-----|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1 | I face the following problem/problems during TLCD. a) I cannot speak well b) My grammar is weak c) I do not have the vocabulary to speak d) All the three reasons | 20% | 20% | 30% | 30% |
| 2 | I think TLCD a) Helps me because I have more ideas b) Helps me to some extent d) Does not help me as I cannot speak well e) Does not help me as my vocabulary is weak | 20% | 35% | 20% | 25% |

When asked about encountering challenges during TLCD in the interview, all four high proficiency students (HPS) unanimously expressed that they did not face significant difficulties except for occasional fluency issues arising from their limited vocabulary range. One HPS participant remarked, "In class discussions, my major hurdle is occasionally lacking the necessary vocabulary to express my ideas clearly and fluently. I wonder how learners with lower or average proficiency would cope with this situation. Many students, despite the conversation being in English and on challenging topics, tend to initially think in Arabic before searching for the right English words. Even when they find the correct words, they struggle to use them effectively." One of them mentioned, "We believe our primary issue is the lack of speaking practice."

Sharing their perspectives, all average proficiency level students (APS) highlighted their lack of confidence and occasional demotivation, primarily stemming from their challenges in grammar, limited vocabulary, and inadequate speaking skills. They perceived TLCD as requiring a strong command of language and lexical range, which they felt they lacked. They conveyed their incapacity to participate in TLCD fully and naturally because of their limited speaking abilities, emphasizing that depending on thinking in Arabic impeded their involvement in discussions.

7. DISCUSSION

The pre-test results for both the control group (CG) and experimental group (EG) suggest an equivalent level of English proficiency. However, the comprehensive analysis of the post-test results indicates variations in their performance. Our research questions, derived from teaching experience and prior studies on EFL Arab learners, guided the focus on four key components: logical touch, cohesion and coherence, lexical range, and forms for evaluating improvements in thinking skills among EG.

Although the post-test results for high and average proficiency EG learners demonstrated improvement, the majority of low proficiency struggled due to inadequate oral communication skills, limited lexical range, and insufficient abilities to sustain discussions. Various researchers have highlighted several contributing factors to the poor writing skills among Arab learners. Sivaraman, Al Balushi, and Rao (2014), Ahmed (2018), attributes these deficiencies to limited exposure to authentic English language contexts, a lack of writing practice, and inadequate instructional strategies that fail to address their specific linguistic needs. Al-Lawati (1995), cited by Alhosni (2014), emphasized that Omani EFL students encounter speaking difficulties predominantly within the linguistic domain, including vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and discourse, as they have not attained proficiency in fundamental language skills. Referencing observations by Al-Mahrouqi (2014) on Sultan Qaboos University students, it is highlighted that students might struggle to persuade others if they lack adequate language proficiency or subject matter knowledge. In our research, high proficiency students actively participated in discussions but were discouraged by the inability of low and average proficiency students to engage meaningfully, resorting to communication techniques like code-switching, message abandonment, and topic avoidance. Al Alawi (2016) observed that low proficiency learners tend to utilize avoidance tactics more frequently due to their lack of linguistic competence.

Our findings align with seasoned EFL researchers, indicating a sizable portion of Arab EFL learners lack oral and linguistic proficiency. Consequently, our research raises questions about claims that improvement in critical thinking abilities translates to enhanced writing skills for EFL Arab tertiary level learners:

- How can these students engage in critical discourse when they struggle to articulate basic facts in both written and spoken forms?
- What insights do their writings offer when based on oral competence, lexical variety, and active participation, qualities believed to be weak among EFL Arab learners?

Essays from our EG low proficiency students, built on prior discussions, showed limited improvement in ideas, except for high proficiency students and to a lesser extent, average proficiency students, who significantly outperformed CG average proficiency students in the post-test. Notably, improvements were observed in the areas we focused on, whereas essay structure, grammar, and spelling did not show significant changes among CG high proficiency students.

However, the remaining EG students' writings lacked effective structure, coherence, lexical range, and critical thinking compared to highly proficient and average ability students.

8. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, our study underscores the benefits of TLCD in enhancing the writing skills of high proficiency and average proficiency students within an EFL framework. However, it reveals challenges faced by low proficiency students, primarily stemming from inadequate oral communication skills, limited lexical range, and difficulties sustaining active participation in discussions. Previous research, notably studies on Arab EFL learners, has consistently highlighted the struggles in coherent expression due to insufficient language skills for effective communication. Our findings echo these observations, particularly noting the impact

of linguistic deficiencies on critical discourse and writing abilities. While high and average proficiency students exhibited improvements in their writing linked to discussion engagement, low proficiency students faced obstacles hindering significant progress. The low proficiency group struggled to articulate ideas coherently, lacked lexical variety, and displayed limited critical thinking in their writings, raising questions about the direct translation of enhanced critical thinking abilities into improved writing skills for EFL Arab learners. Moving forward, addressing the foundational language skills and fostering inclusive discussion techniques tailored to diverse proficiency levels could be pivotal in maximizing the benefits of TLCD for all EFL students.

9. LIMITATIONS

The study's limited sample size of 56 level 3 EFL Omani learners might not fully represent the broader population. Focusing exclusively on one specific group limits the generalizability of findings to other proficiency levels or contexts, potentially impacting the applicability of the results. Another limitation is that the study primarily concentrates on short-term effects, engaging participants in weekly tasks post-discussions. This short duration might not capture the sustained or long-term improvements in writing skills resulting from these discussions, thus limiting a comprehensive understanding of their lasting impact. Moreover, maintaining strict differentiation between the control and experimental groups, beyond the discussed intervention, could be challenging. Factors like teaching styles, classroom dynamics, or additional resources might inadvertently influence results, impacting the study's integrity and the accuracy of findings.

10. RECOMMENDATIONS

The authors would like to make the following recommendations for the effective use of TLCD to enhance students' productive language skills:

1. Real-life Language Exposure: Encourage real-world language interactions for Arab EFL students inside and outside the classroom to improve oral communication and expand vocabulary essential for discussions and writing tasks.
2. Teacher Training and Support: Provide comprehensive training for EFL instructors to lead effective discussions that stimulate critical thinking and encourage original idea generation. Support teachers in fostering inclusive discussions accommodating students with varying language abilities.
3. Blend Oral and Writing Tasks: Merge oral exercises with writing assignments by using TLCD as a starting point for idea generation before structured writing tasks.
4. Guide students in translating spoken ideas into coherent written compositions, reinforcing the connection between spoken and written language.

Implementing these recommendations within TLCD will aid in developing students' communication skills, expanding vocabulary, fostering critical thinking, and bridging the gap between spoken and written expression in the EFL classroom.

REFERENCES

- Al Alawi, Rahma Awadh. "Communication strategies used by Omani EFL students". *Pyrex journal of English and literature* 2, no. 1 (2016): 1-11. <http://pyrexjournals.org/pjel/pdf/2016/january/rahma.pdf>
- Al-Husseini, Suleiman. "The visible and invisible role of English foundation programmes: A search for communication opportunities within EFL contexts". *Asian EFL Journal* 8, no. 4 (2006): 35-51.
- Al-Issa, A. S. "An ideological discussion of the impact of the NNETs' English language knowledge on ESL policy implementation 'a special reference to the Omani context'". *Asian EFL Journal* 7, no. 3 (2005): 98-112.
- AlKhouidary, Yahia Ashour Mohammed. "The effect of teaching critical thinking on Al-Buraimi university college students' writing skills: A case study". *International Journal of applied linguistics and English literature* 4, no. 6 (2015): 212-219.
- Al-Lawatiyah, Masooma Talib. "A diagnostic study of the difficulties encountered by Omani secondary school students in their oral production of English". PhD diss., Sultan Qaboos University, 1995.
- Al-Lawati, Nahlah. "Washback effect of secondary certificate English examination on teaching and learning processes." PhD diss., Sultan Qaboos University, 2002.
- Al Mahrooqi, Rahma. "English Communication Skills: How Are They Taught at Schools and Universities in Oman?" *English Language Teaching* 5, no. 4 (2012):124-130. <http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFile/15943/10706>
- Al Hosni, Samira. "Speaking difficulties encountered by young EFL learners." *International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL)* 2, no.6(2014): 22-30. <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.682.9417&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Brookfield, Stephen D., and Stephen Preskill. *The discussion book: 50 great ways to get people talking*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- Cotton, K. "Classroom questioning. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory: School improvement research series (SIRS)." (2006).
- Cox, S., and A. Griffith. "Outstanding teaching." *Osiris Educational* (2007).
- Cottrell, Stella. *Critical thinking skills: Developing effective analysis and argument*. Vol. 282. Basingstoke: palgrave macmillan, 2011.
- Elder, L., and Richard Paul. "A miniature guide to the art of asking questions." (2002).
- Elbow, Peter. *Vernacular eloquence: What speech can bring to writing*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Etemadzadeh, Atika, Samira Seifi, and Hamid Roohbakhsh Far. "The role of questioning technique in developing thinking skills: The ongoing effect on writing skill." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 70 (2013): 1024-1031.
- Evans, Norman W., Neil J. Anderson, and William G. Eggington, eds. *ESL readers and writers in higher education: Understanding challenges, providing support*. Routledge, 2015.
- Ferris, Dana R. *Response to student writing: Implications for second language students*. Routledge, 2003.
- Hyland, Ken, and Fiona Hyland. "Feedback on second language students' writing." *Language teaching* 39, no. 2 (2006): 83-101.
- Mercer, Neil, and Karen Littleton. *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking: A sociocultural approach*. Routledge, 2007.
- Macalister, John, and IS Paul Nation. *Language curriculum design*. Routledge, 2019.
- Naqvi, Samia, Mohammed Rashid, Asfiya Khan, Priya Mathew, Mohammed Al Shubaily, and Insiya Zehra. "Evaluation of Study Skills Integration into Omani Secondary School Curriculum." *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes* (2023): 473-484.
- Phillips, Christopher. *Six questions of Socrates: A modern-day journey of discovery through world philosophy*. WW Norton & Company, 2011.
- Richards, J., T. Rodgers, J. Richards, and T. Rodgers. "Whole language." *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2001): 108-114.
- Richards, Jack C., and Charles Lockhart. "Interaction in the second language classroom." *Readings in Methodology* 66 (1996).
- Santoso, Agus. "Scaffolding an EFL effective writing class in a hybrid learning community." Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. Queensland: Queensland University of Technology (2010).
- Silva, Tony. "Toward an understanding of the distinct nature of L2 writing: The ESL research and its implications." *TESOL quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1993): 657-677.
- Sivaraman, Ilango, Ahmed Al Balushi, and D. H. Rao. "Understanding Omani students'(university) English language problems." *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research (IJSBAR)* 13, no. 1 (2014): 28-35.
- Stapleton, Paul. "Critical thinking in Japanese L2 writing: Rethinking tired constructs." *ELT Journal* 56, no. 3 (2002): 250-257.
- Stojković, Nadežda, and Dmitriy G. Zerkin. "Pedagogy of Socratic Method of Teaching ESP." *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes* (2023): 555-565.
- Weissberg, Robert. "Connecting Speaking & Writing in Second Language Writing Instruction." *TESL-EJ* 11, no. 3 (2007).