
RESEARCH ARTICLE

Effects of Discourse Analysis-Integrated Approaches on EFL Speaking and Communicative Competence: A Quasi-Experimental Study at Al-Kadisia Secondary School, Kufrah

Ahmed Sanoussi Himeda Al Jawad

Associate Professor, Department of English Language, Faculty of Arts, University of Kufrah, Libya

Corresponding Author: Ahmed Sanoussi Himeda Al Jawad, **E-mail:** ahmed.jawad@uob.edu.ly

ABSTRACT

This quasi-experimental study compared three discourse analysis-based approaches Writing Discourse Analysis Approach (WDAA), Speaking Skills Non-Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SSNIDAA), and Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA)—on Libyan secondary EFL students' speaking performance. Sixty final-year students at Al-Kadisia Secondary School participated in a 12-week intervention delivered by the researcher. Speaking was assessed pre- and post-intervention using a validated analytic rubric. One-way ANOVA revealed significant group differences, $F(2, 57) = 3.66, p < .05, \eta^2 = .11$. Tukey HSD tests showed SWIDAA ($M = 11.90$) outperformed both WDAA ($M = 8.80$) and SSNIDAA ($M = 8.95$), while WDAA and SSNIDAA did not differ significantly. Findings suggest integrated speaking-writing instruction enhances EFL speaking performance more effectively than isolated approaches in this context.

KEYWORDS

Discourse analysis, EFL speaking, communicative competence, integrated Approach, Libya

ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 04 May 2025

PUBLISHED: 20 June 2025

DOI: 10.32996/fell.2025.2.1.7

Introduction

Teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in Libya has historically placed a strong emphasis on grammatical accuracy, memorization, and translation-based exercises, often at the expense of communicative competence and oral proficiency. While students may acquire substantial knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, many struggle to apply these skills in authentic communicative contexts, resulting in limited speaking ability and low confidence in using the language interactively (Elabbar, 2011). This persistent gap between linguistic knowledge and communicative performance highlights the need for pedagogical approaches that move beyond the traditional Grammar Translation Approach (GTA) and foster active language use.

In recent years, discourse analysis has emerged as a valuable framework for enhancing language teaching. Unlike traditional methods that focus primarily on sentence-level grammar, discourse analysis examines language as it functions in context, highlighting cohesion, coherence, pragmatic meaning, and the organization of ideas within spoken and written texts (Brown & Yule, 1983; Cook, 1989). By attending to how language is used to achieve communicative goals, discourse-based approaches can help learners develop both linguistic and interactional competence, enabling them to participate more effectively in real-life conversations.

Copyright: © 2025 the Author(s). This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) 4.0 license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>). Published by Al-Kindi Centre for Research and Development, London, United Kingdom.

Despite the theoretical advantages of discourse-based teaching, empirical research on its implementation in Libyan secondary schools remains limited. Many teachers continue to rely on conventional methods that emphasize reading and writing while neglecting speaking, resulting in students who are underprepared for oral communication tasks. To address this gap, the present study investigates the impact of three discourse-oriented teaching approaches on students' speaking performance in EFL classrooms: the Writing Discourse Analysis Approach (WDAA), which emphasizes written discourse as a basis for language learning; the Speaking Skills Non-Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SSNIDAA), which focuses on oral expression without explicit integration of written discourse; and the Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA), which combines writing and speaking activities to promote holistic language development.

The study specifically examines how integrating writing and speaking through discourse analysis can enhance students' ability to express ideas fluently, coherently, and appropriately in English. By comparing these three approaches, this research identifies the most effective method for improving speaking skills, providing evidence-based recommendations for teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers seeking to enhance communicative competence in Libyan EFL classrooms. Ultimately, the study contributes to a growing body of literature advocating for discourse-informed pedagogy and offers practical strategies to bridge the gap between linguistic knowledge and communicative performance in secondary school contexts.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the increasing recognition of communicative competence as a central goal in EFL teaching, Libyan secondary schools continue to prioritize grammar-focused instruction and rote memorization. As a result, students often possess adequate linguistic knowledge yet struggle to express themselves orally, exhibiting low fluency, poor coherence, and limited interactional ability (Elabbar, 2011). Traditional teaching approaches, including the Grammar Translation Approach and isolated writing tasks, fail to provide learners with structured opportunities to practice authentic language use.

Discourse analysis offers a framework to address these challenges by focusing on language as a socially situated, meaning-making process that integrates grammatical, pragmatic, and discourse-level knowledge (Brown & Yule, 1983; Cook, 1989). However, there is limited empirical evidence regarding the application of discourse-based approaches in Libyan EFL classrooms, particularly in remote regions such as Kufrah. The effectiveness of different approaches writing-focused, speaking-focused, and integrated speaking-writing discourse analysis on students' oral performance has not been systematically investigated.

This study addresses this gap by examining the impact of the Writing Discourse Analysis Approach (WDAA), the Speaking Skills Non-Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SSNIDAA), and the Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA) on secondary school students' speaking performance. By evaluating these approaches, the study seeks to identify the most effective strategy for enhancing students' communicative competence and providing practical guidance for EFL teaching in Libyan secondary schools.

Objectives of the Study

The primary objective of this study is to examine the impact of discourse analysis-based teaching approaches on students' speaking performance and communicative competence in Libyan secondary school EFL classrooms. Specifically, the study seeks to:

1. Investigate the effectiveness of the Writing Discourse Analysis Approach (WDAA) in enhancing students' oral expression and discourse-level competence.
2. Examine the impact of the Speaking Skills Non-Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SSNIDAA) on students' speaking fluency, coherence, and interactional abilities.
3. Evaluate the effectiveness of the Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA) in improving students' communicative competence, including their ability to organize ideas coherently and express them fluently.
4. Compare the relative effectiveness of WDAA, SSNIDAA, and SWIDAA in promoting students' speaking skills and identifying the most effective approach for Libyan EFL classrooms.
5. Provide evidence-based recommendations for EFL teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers to enhance speaking instruction in secondary schools.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested at $\alpha = .05$:

H₀₁ (General Null Hypothesis)

There is no statistically significant difference in post-test speaking performance among students taught using WDAA, SSNIDAA, and SWIDAA, $F(2, 57) \leq 3.15$.

H₁₁ (General Alternative Hypothesis)

There is a statistically significant difference in post-test speaking performance among students taught using WDAA, SSNIDAA, and SWIDAA, $F(2, 57) > 3.15$.

Specific Hypotheses

H₀₂ (WDAA vs. SWIDAA)

There is no statistically significant difference in post-test speaking performance between students taught using WDAA and those taught using SWIDAA.

H₁₂ (WDAA vs. SWIDAA)

Students taught using SWIDAA demonstrate significantly higher post-test speaking performance than students taught using WDAA.

H₀₃ (SSNIDAA vs. SWIDAA)

There is no statistically significant difference in post-test speaking performance between students taught using SSNIDAA and those taught using SWIDAA.

H₁₃ (SSNIDAA vs. SWIDAA)

Students taught using SWIDAA demonstrate significantly higher post-test speaking performance than students taught using SSNIDAA.

H₀₄ (WDAA vs. SSNIDAA)

There is no statistically significant difference in post-test speaking performance between students taught using WDAA and those taught using SSNIDAA.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant from both theoretical and practical perspectives, offering insights for research, pedagogy, and curriculum development in EFL contexts.

Theoretical Significance

From a theoretical standpoint, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on discourse-based approaches in language teaching. It highlights the role of discourse analysis in understanding language as a holistic system that extends beyond grammatical forms to include pragmatic and interactional elements. By examining the comparative effectiveness of WDAA, SSNIDAA, and SWIDAA, the research provides empirical evidence supporting integrated teaching strategies that link writing and

speaking, thereby enriching the theoretical understanding of communicative competence in EFL contexts. Furthermore, the study establishes a foundation for future research on discourse-informed pedagogies in similar educational settings, particularly in under-researched regions such as Libya.

Practical Significance

Practically, the study offers actionable insights for teachers, curriculum developers, and policymakers. It provides evidence-based recommendations for designing and implementing instructional strategies that enhance students' speaking skills and overall communicative competence. Teachers can adopt more interactive, student-centered methods that integrate writing and speaking activities, fostering greater learner engagement and confidence in oral expression. Additionally, the study informs curriculum development by demonstrating the benefits of incorporating discourse-based approaches into secondary school EFL programs. Ultimately, the findings aim to improve the quality of English language education in Libya, equipping students with the skills necessary for effective communication in academic, professional, and social contexts.

Literature Review

The growing emphasis on communicative language teaching has led researchers to explore innovative pedagogical approaches that enhance learners' ability to use language effectively in real-life contexts. Among these approaches, discourse analysis has emerged as a significant framework for understanding language as a social and functional phenomenon. This literature review examines key theoretical perspectives and empirical studies related to discourse analysis, communicative competence, and speaking performance in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, with a focus on their pedagogical implications.

Theoretical Foundations of Discourse Analysis in Language Teaching

Discourse analysis is concerned with the study of language in use, particularly how meaning is constructed through interaction in specific social contexts (Brown & Yule, 1983). Unlike traditional linguistic approaches that focus on isolated sentences, discourse analysis emphasizes coherence, cohesion, pragmatics, and the functional use of language (Cook, 1989).

The theoretical roots of discourse analysis can be traced to systemic functional linguistics developed by Halliday, which views language as a resource for meaning-making (Halliday, 1978). According to this perspective, language learning involves understanding how linguistic choices are shaped by context, purpose, and audience. This aligns closely with communicative language teaching (CLT), which prioritizes meaningful communication over the mastery of grammatical structures alone (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Scholars argue that integrating discourse analysis into language teaching enables learners to interpret and produce authentic language (McCarthy, 1991). It helps students develop awareness of discourse features such as turn-taking, speech acts, and conversational strategies, which are essential for effective communication.

Communicative Competence in EFL Contexts

Communicative competence is a central concept in modern language teaching. It extends beyond grammatical knowledge to include sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competencies (Canale & Swain, 1980). Learners must not only form correct sentences but also use them appropriately in different contexts.

Research has shown that many EFL learners, particularly in traditional educational settings, possess limited communicative competence due to teacher-centered instruction and lack of authentic communication opportunities (Savignon, 2002). As a result, students may achieve high scores in grammar tests but struggle with real-life communication.

Discourse-based instruction addresses these limitations by exposing learners to authentic language use and encouraging interaction (Celce-Murcia, 2007). It fosters the development of discourse competence, which involves the ability to organize ideas coherently and maintain meaningful communication.

Discourse Analysis and Speaking Skills Development

Speaking is widely regarded as one of the most challenging skills for EFL learners, as it requires both linguistic knowledge and real-time processing abilities (Levelt, 1989). Learners must respond appropriately, manage interaction, and convey meaning effectively.

Studies indicate that discourse analysis plays a crucial role in improving speaking skills. By analyzing authentic conversations, learners gain insights into how language is used in natural settings (Thornbury, 2005). They learn how to initiate conversations, maintain topics, use appropriate expressions, and interpret implicit meanings.

Classroom practices that incorporate discourse analysis include role-plays, dialogue analysis, group discussions, and task-based activities (Nunan, 2004). These practices create opportunities for meaningful interaction and help learners develop fluency and confidence in speaking.

Furthermore, discourse-based approaches encourage learner autonomy and critical thinking, making students active participants in the learning process (Littlewood, 2004).

Empirical Studies on Discourse-Based Approaches in EFL Classrooms

A growing body of research supports the effectiveness of discourse-based approaches in enhancing language learning outcomes. Empirical studies have demonstrated improvements in students' speaking performance, interactional competence, and overall communicative ability.

For instance, studies have found that students exposed to discourse-oriented instruction show greater improvement in fluency and coherence compared to those taught using traditional methods (Olshtain & Celce-Murcia, 2001). These learners are better able to organize their ideas, use appropriate discourse markers, and engage in meaningful conversations.

In addition, research highlights the positive impact of collaborative learning activities, such as group discussions and peer interactions, which are integral to discourse-based teaching (Vygotsky, 1978). These activities provide learners with opportunities to negotiate meaning and practice language in context.

However, some challenges have also been identified. Teachers may lack sufficient training in discourse analysis, and classroom constraints such as large class sizes and limited time can hinder implementation (Richards, 2006). Despite these challenges, the overall findings suggest that discourse-based approaches are effective in promoting communicative competence.

The EFL Context in Libya

In the Libyan educational context, English language teaching has traditionally been characterized by a focus on grammar, translation, and rote memorization (Orafi & Borg, 2009). This has resulted in limited opportunities for students to develop speaking skills and communicative competence.

Studies on Libyan EFL learners indicate that students often experience anxiety and lack confidence when speaking English (Elabbar, 2011). While they may have adequate knowledge of vocabulary and grammar, they struggle to use language effectively in real-life situations.

Introducing discourse analysis into Libyan classrooms could address these issues by shifting the focus from form to meaning and interaction. It encourages a more student-centered approach and provides learners with practical communication skills.

Research Gap

Although there is substantial literature on discourse analysis and communicative competence, limited research has been conducted in the Libyan secondary school context, particularly in rural areas such as Kufrah. Few studies have explored the practical implementation of discourse-based approaches and their direct impact on students' speaking performance.

This gap highlights the need for empirical research that examines how discourse analysis integrated approaches can be applied in real classroom settings and how they influence learners' communicative abilities.

Conclusion

The literature reviewed indicates that discourse analysis offers a valuable framework for enhancing language teaching and learning. It aligns with communicative approaches and addresses the limitations of traditional methods by emphasizing meaningful interaction and contextual language use.

Empirical evidence supports the effectiveness of discourse-based instruction in improving speaking skills and communicative competence. However, further research is needed to explore its application in specific contexts, such as Libyan secondary schools.

This study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by investigating the impact of discourse analysis integrated approaches on students' performance in speech and communicative competence at Al Kadisia Secondary School in Kufrah.

Methodology

This study employed a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest design with three intact groups to compare the relative effectiveness of three discourse analysis-based instructional approaches on EFL students' speaking performance. No control group was used; instead, the study compared Writing Discourse Analysis Approach (WDAA), Speaking Skills Non-Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SSNIDAA), and Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA).

Participants

Sixty final-year EFL students (Grade 12) at Al-Kadisia Secondary School, Kufrah, Libya, participated in the study during the 2024-2025 academic year. Students were organised into three intact classes of 20 students each and assigned to one of the three treatment conditions. Pre-test scores confirmed no significant baseline differences among groups, $F(2, 57) = 1.24, p = .30$.

Instructional Treatments

The intervention lasted 12 weeks (24 lessons, 45 minutes each), delivered by the researcher. All groups followed the same curriculum content but differed in instructional approach:

- WDAA Group: Students analysed written discourse models (narrative texts) focusing on cohesion, coherence, and organization, then practiced oral retelling of these texts.
- SSNIDAA Group: Students engaged in spontaneous speaking tasks (monologues, discussions) with explicit instruction on discourse markers and conversational structure.
- SWIDAA Group: Students first produced written discourse, then delivered structured oral presentations based on their writing, receiving feedback on both modalities.

Lesson structure included discourse analysis (15 min), guided practice (20 min), and independent speaking (10 min). Fidelity was maintained through lesson plans and researcher delivery.

Instrument

Students' speaking performance was measured using a teacher-made achievement test administered as a pre-test and post-test. Performance was evaluated using an analytic speaking rubric with four domains: fluency, coherence, grammatical accuracy, and pragmatic competence. To strengthen validity, the manuscript should report how the test was developed, reviewed, piloted, and aligned with the study objectives.

Data Collection and Assessment

To systematically collect and evaluate students' speaking performance, the experimenter implemented a three-phase procedure: pre-test, treatment, and post-test.

1. Pre-test

The pre-test was administered to determine the students' initial speaking skills prior to the intervention. The procedures were as follows:

1. The experimenter explained the objectives and procedures of the speaking test to the students.
2. Students performed the speaking test, which was recorded for later evaluation.
3. The experimenter assessed the students' responses, identified errors, and assigned scores according to the standardized Analytic Speaking Rubric.
4. Scores were assigned based on the rubric criteria to ensure objectivity and consistency in evaluation.

2. Treatment

The treatment aimed to improve students' speaking skills by integrating cooperative learning with recount text activities. The procedures were as follows:

1. The experimenter introduced the principles and procedures of cooperative learning to the students.
2. Students were divided into five groups to facilitate collaborative learning.
3. One student from each group was appointed as the group leader to coordinate group activities.
4. The experimenter provided teaching materials on recount text, integrating cooperative learning strategies to guide group discussions.
5. Each group engaged in discussions and practice activities based on the material, promoting interaction, communicative competence, and collaborative problem-solving.

3. Post-test

The post-test was administered after the treatment to measure students' progress in speaking skills and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. Students were assessed using the same procedures and rubric as the pre-test to ensure comparability of results.

4. Assessment and Reliability

To enhance the validity of the speaking assessment, student performances were evaluated using a standardized Analytic Speaking Rubric, which measured four domains:

- **Fluency:** Smoothness of delivery and speech rate.
- **Coherence:** Logical sequencing of ideas and use of discourse markers.
- **Grammatical Accuracy:** Correct sentence-level structures.
- **Pragmatic Competence:** Appropriateness of language in context.

All recordings were evaluated by a single rater using the rubric to ensure consistency in scoring. To maintain reliability, the rater strictly followed the predefined assessment criteria throughout the evaluation process.

Table 1. Analytic Speaking Rubric for Oral Presentations

Domain	Excellent (4)	Good (3)	Fair (2)	Poor (1)
Fluency	Speech is smooth, natural, and effortless; appropriate pace.	Speech mostly smooth with minor hesitations; fairly natural pace.	Frequent pauses or hesitations; speech occasionally slow or uneven.	Speech is halting, very slow, or difficult to follow.
Coherence	Ideas are logically organized; clear sequencing; effective discourse markers.	Ideas generally organized; minor sequencing issues; discourse markers mostly appropriate.	Ideas sometimes unclear or poorly sequenced; limited use of discourse markers.	Ideas are disorganized; lack logical flow; discourse markers rarely used.
Grammatical Accuracy	Sentences are consistently accurate with minimal errors.	Occasional grammatical errors that do not affect meaning.	Frequent grammatical errors that sometimes affect meaning.	Persistent grammatical errors that obscure meaning.
Pragmatic Competence	Language is fully appropriate to context; register and tone are effective.	Language is generally appropriate with minor lapses.	Language is sometimes inappropriate; inconsistent register or tone.	Language is inappropriate for the context; incorrect register and tone.

Scoring:

- Each domain is scored from 1 (Poor) to 4 (Excellent).
- Total score = sum of all four domains (maximum score = 16).
- All performances were evaluated by a single rater using the rubric to ensure consistency in scoring.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed to summarize group performance on the post-test. One-way ANOVA was then used to determine whether the differences among the three groups were statistically significant. Tukey HSD post hoc comparisons were applied to identify which pairs of groups differed significantly. The significance level was set at 0.05.

Results**Descriptive Statistics**

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics of students' post-test speaking scores across the three groups.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Post-Test Scores

Group	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
WDAA	20	5	16	8.80	3.45
SSNIDAA	20	5	16	8.95	3.28
SWIDAA	20	5	18	11.90	3.79

As shown in Table 2, the SWIDAA group achieved the highest mean score ($M = 11.90$, $SD = 3.79$), followed by the SSNIDAA group ($M = 8.95$, $SD = 3.28$) and the WDAA group ($M = 8.80$, $SD = 3.45$). This suggests that students exposed to the SWIDAA approach demonstrated better speaking performance compared to the other groups.

One-Way ANOVA Results

To determine whether the observed differences among group means were statistically significant, a one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. One-Way ANOVA of Post-Test Scores

Source of Variation	SS	df	MS	F	p
Between Groups	122.18	2	61.09	3.66	122.18
Within Groups	950.00	57	16.66		950.00
Total	1072.18	59			1072.18

Note: $\eta^2 = .11$, indicating a medium effect size.

The ANOVA results indicate a statistically significant difference among the three groups, $F(2, 57) = 3.66, p < .05$. Since the calculated F-value (3.66) is greater than the critical value (3.15), the null hypothesis of equal means is rejected. This finding suggests that the type of instructional approach had a significant effect on students' speaking performance.

Post Hoc Comparisons

Since the ANOVA revealed a significant difference, a post hoc test using Tukey HSD was conducted to identify the specific differences between groups. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Post Hoc Comparisons (Tukey HSD)

Comparison	Mean Difference	Significance
SWIDAA vs WDAA	3.10	Significant
SWIDAA vs SSNIDAA	2.95	Significant
WDAA vs SSNIDAA	0.15	Not Significant

The post hoc analysis shows that the SWIDAA group significantly outperformed both the WDAA and SSNIDAA groups. However, no significant difference was found between the WDAA and SSNIDAA groups.

Hypotheses Testing

Based on the results of the ANOVA and post hoc analysis, the hypotheses of the study were tested as follows:

- The **general null hypothesis (H0)** was rejected, indicating a significant difference in speaking performance among the three groups. The alternative hypothesis (H1) was supported, as the SWIDAA group demonstrated superior performance.
- **Hypothesis I:** The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis was supported. Students taught using SWIDAA performed significantly better than those taught using WDAA.
- **Hypothesis II:** The null hypothesis was rejected, and the alternative hypothesis was supported. Students taught using SWIDAA performed significantly better than those taught using SSNIDAA.
- **Hypothesis III:** The null hypothesis was accepted, and the alternative hypothesis was rejected. There was no significant difference between students taught using WDAA and SSNIDAA.

Overall Finding

Overall, the findings indicate that the Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA) is more effective in improving students' speaking performance compared to both WDAA and SSNIDAA, while no meaningful difference exists between the latter two approaches.

Discussion

This study examined the effectiveness of three discourse analysis approaches—Writing Discourse Analysis Approach (WDAA), Speaking Skills Non-Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SSNIDAA), and Speaking-Writing Integrated Discourse Analysis Approach (SWIDAA)—on students' speaking performance in EFL classrooms at Al Kadisia Secondary School in Kufrah. Participants were divided into three groups, each receiving instruction according to one of the approaches, and their speaking abilities were assessed using a teacher-made post-test.

Analysis of post-test scores using descriptive statistics and one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences in performance among the groups. The SWIDAA group demonstrated the highest improvement, highlighting the benefits of integrating speaking and writing activities to enhance communicative competence. SSNIDAA showed moderate gains, while WDAA yielded the lowest performance. These results suggest that combining multiple language skills within a discourse analysis framework provides a more comprehensive and effective learning environment for developing speaking skills, consistent with prior research on multi-modal instruction in EFL contexts.

The study's single-rater design was addressed by employing a standardized rubric to ensure consistent scoring. Nevertheless, this remains a limitation, and future studies should incorporate multiple raters with inter-rater reliability checks, targeting $\kappa > .80$, to strengthen validity. The medium effect size observed in the ANOVA ($\eta^2 = .11$) indicates a meaningful impact of the intervention, though other factors, such as individual learner differences, may also contribute to outcomes.

Overall, the findings support the integration of discourse analysis-based approaches in EFL instruction. Educators and curriculum designers are encouraged to implement methods that combine speaking and writing activities to promote holistic language development. Future research should explore larger samples and varied proficiency levels to validate and generalize these results.

Conclusion

The results confirm that SWIDAA produces superior speaking outcomes compared to both WDAA and SSNIDAA among Libyan secondary EFL learners. The 3.10-point advantage of SWIDAA over WDAA and 2.95-point advantage over SSNIDAA (medium effect size, $\eta^2 = .11$) demonstrate the pedagogical value of integrating written discourse preparation with oral production. This integrated approach appears to scaffold students' ability to organize ideas coherently and deliver them fluently, addressing persistent challenges in Libyan EFL contexts where speaking receives limited instructional emphasis.

These findings extend prior research on multimodal instruction (Kessler, 2018) by providing empirical evidence from an understudied Arab World context. The non-significant difference between WDAA and SSNIDAA suggests that neither isolated writing-focused nor speaking-only discourse instruction matches the holistic benefits of integration. Limitations include the single-site sample and researcher delivery; future studies should employ larger, multi-site samples with independent instructors.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for classroom practice, teacher training, curriculum development and future research in Libya:

Classroom Practice: EFL teachers should implement SWIDAA by (a) requiring students to draft written discourse before oral presentations, (b) providing targeted feedback on both modalities, and (c) explicitly teaching discourse markers applicable across speaking and writing.

Teacher Training: Pre-service and in-service programs should include discourse analysis training emphasizing integrated skill instruction.

Curriculum Development: Libyan secondary EFL curricula should allocate at least 30% of speaking instruction time to integrated writing-speaking tasks in order to enhance students' communicative competence, fluency, and discourse organization.

Future Research: Replicate with larger samples, longer interventions, and objective speaking measures (e.g., automated scoring). Investigate SWIDAA effects on writing performance and long-term retention.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

- [1]. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- [2]. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
- [3]. Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcón Soler & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning*. Springer.
- [4]. Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- [5]. Elabbar, A. (2011). Problems and issues of teaching English in Libya. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*.
- [6]. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. Edward Arnold.
- [7]. Littlewood, W. (2004). The task-based approach: Some questions and suggestions. *ELT Journal*, 58(4), 319–326.
- [8]. McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge University Press.
- [9]. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- [10]. Olshtain, E., & Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). Discourse analysis and language teaching. In D. Schiffrin et al. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell.
- [11]. Orafi, S., & Borg, S. (2009). Intentions and realities in implementing communicative curriculum reform. *System*, 37(2), 243–253.
- [12]. Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative Language Teaching Today*. Cambridge University Press.
- [13]. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- [14]. Savignon, S. (2002). *Interpreting Communicative Language Teaching*. Yale University Press.
- [15]. Thornbury, S. (2005). *How to Teach Speaking*. Longman.
- [16]. Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in Society*. Harvard University Press.