Journal of Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics
Volume 2, Issue 2, 103-112
e-ISSN: 3110-8822
https://e-journal.gomit.id/index.php/jaiela/oai

KWL Technique to Develop Speaking Skills in Descriptive Activities: An Exploratory Study in a Basic Speaking Course

Defy Gustianing*
Aisyah University of Pringsewu, IINDONESIA

Septika Ariyanti
Aisyah University of Pringsewu INDONESIA

Article Info

Article history:
Received: October 3, 2026
Revised: November 14, 2026
Accepted: November 18, 2026

Keywords:
Basic Speaking;
Descriptive Speaking;
EFL;
KWL Technique;
Speaking Pedagogy.

Abstract

Background: Speaking instruction in EFL contexts requires learners to generate ideas, select appropriate vocabulary and grammar, sustain oral production, and interact with an audience. The Know–Want to Know–Learned (KWL) technique was originally developed as a prior-knowledge and reflection framework, but has also been adapted for speaking instruction.
Aims: This exploratory classroom study examines how KWL-supported descriptive speaking was implemented in a Basic Speaking course and identifies the speaking dimensions that appeared relatively strong or weak after the activity.
Methods: Seventeen undergraduate students completed a descriptive speaking task about a person they knew. Their performances were scored using an analytic rubric covering content and organization, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, delivery and confidence, and interaction/audience awareness. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize criterion-level and overall performance.
Result: The mean overall score was 61.54/100 (SD = 2.39), with individual scores ranging from 60.00 to 66.25. Content and organization was the strongest criterion (M = 3.50/4.00), whereas interaction/audience awareness was the weakest (M = 1.76/4.00). Pronunciation and fluency were also comparatively low (both M = 2.12/4.00). Only three students reached the minimum three-minute speaking duration specified in the task.
Conclusion: The findings suggest that KWL can provide a useful pre-speaking structure for organizing descriptive content, but a single KWL-supported activity does not by itself demonstrate improvement in overall speaking proficiency. The findings point to the need to extend KWL with explicit rehearsal, pronunciation work, fluency-building practice, and audience interaction. The study provides a classroom-based diagnostic foundation for a more rigorous longitudinal or quasi-experimental investigation.

To cite this article: Gustianing, D., & Ariyanti, S. (2026). KWL Technique to Develop Speaking Skills in Descriptive Activities: An Exploratory Study in a Basic Speaking Course. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence in English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, 2*(2), 103-112. https://doi.org/10.58723/jaiela.v2i2.257
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License ©2026 by author/s

INTRODUCTION

Speaking is not simply the production of grammatically acceptable sentences; it is a multidimensional communicative activity in which learners must formulate meaning, select linguistic resources, organize ideas, manage temporal pressure, and orient their speech to an interlocutor or audience (Fernández & Andersen, 2019; Pawlak, 2018). Contemporary work on second-language speaking assessment conceptualizes oral proficiency as multi-componential, encompassing linguistic resources as well as strategic and interactional competencies (Jong, 2022). This perspective is particularly relevant in Basic Speaking courses because students may demonstrate adequate knowledge of vocabulary or grammar while still experiencing difficulty sustaining fluent, comprehensible, and audience-oriented speech (Burns, 2019; Matyakhan, 2025).

In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings, the transition from language knowledge to spontaneous oral performance remains a substantial pedagogical challenge. Learners must retrieve vocabulary quickly, construct clauses in real time, monitor pronunciation, and maintain the

*** Corresponding author:**
Defy Gustianing. Aisyah University of Pringsewu. ✉ defygustianing@aisyahuniversity.ac.id

continuity of a message (Anhari et al., 2026; Kurnihayati et al., 2026). Research has demonstrated that vocabulary knowledge is meaningfully related to L2 speaking proficiency: vocabulary size contributes to overall speaking ability, while productive vocabulary knowledge is associated with fluency and coherence (Katushemererwe & Rugyema, 2025; Koizumi & In'nami, 2013). This evidence suggests that speaking instruction needs to support not only linguistic accuracy but also the cognitive processes through which learners generate and organize content for oral production.

Descriptive speaking tasks provide a useful context for addressing this challenge. Asking learners to describe a person, place, object, or experience requires them to retrieve prior knowledge, select relevant details, organize those details into a coherent sequence, and express them through appropriate lexical and grammatical choices. However, an open-ended prompt can create a substantial planning burden for beginning and intermediate learners (Li et al., 2024; Xu & Zhang, 2023). When students do not know how to initiate or structure their response, the result may be short turns, repetition, hesitation, or overreliance on memorized expressions. Speaking pedagogy therefore benefits from structured pre-speaking activities that help learners move from ideas to language and subsequently to oral performance (Burns, 2019; Lambert et al., 2020).

One potentially useful scaffold is the Know–Want to Know–Learned (KWL) technique. Originally proposed KWL as a framework for activating prior knowledge, identifying learning purposes, and consolidating new knowledge. Although its original application was associated with reading, the underlying cognitive sequence has a plausible application to speaking (Silva, 2020). In a speaking lesson, the K stage can activate knowledge about the topic; the W stage can help learners identify information they want to communicate or questions that may guide elaboration; and the L stage can consolidate and organize the material before or after oral production. In this adapted form, KWL can function as a bridge between content generation and spoken performance (Rozy, 2025; Sueri, 2023).

Existing empirical evidence provides an initial rationale for applying KWL to oral language learning. (Lumbangaol, 2021) reported improvement in English speaking performance across two classroom-action-research cycles after implementing KWL with vocational high-school students. Similarly, (Yunus et al., 2024) reported improvement in speaking performance and learner motivation following KWL-based instruction with eleventh-grade students. Evidence from another language also indicates that KWL can support speaking development; (Setiawati et al., 2021) reported higher speaking scores following KWL-based instruction in Japanese. These studies suggest promise, but they also reveal a limitation in the current evidence base: much of the research frames KWL in terms of overall score improvement and classroom cycles rather than examining which components of speaking are actually supported by the technique.

This distinction matters because speaking proficiency is multidimensional. A learner can organize content successfully while still experiencing difficulty with pronunciation, fluency, delivery, or interaction. Recent work on speaking assessment emphasizes the importance of treating oral performance as a multi-component construct and controlling potential sources of construct-irrelevant variation arising from tasks, raters, and interlocutors (Fan & Yan, 2020; Jong, 2022). Research on analytic speaking rubrics likewise shows that criterion-level scoring can provide useful diagnostic information, although reliability between raters must be considered carefully (Isaacs & Trofimovich, 2012; Limgomolvilas & Sukserm, 2025). Thus, a KWL study that reports only a total speaking score may overlook the instructional mechanisms through which the technique operates.

The present study responds to this gap by examining KWL-supported descriptive speaking through seven dimensions: content and organization, vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, delivery and confidence, and interaction/audience awareness. The design is intentionally exploratory because the available classroom records contain a single post-activity assessment rather than pretest and posttest data or a comparison group. The study therefore does not attempt to establish a causal effect of KWL. Instead, it asks what the students' speaking-performance profile looks like after a KWL-supported activity and what that profile suggests about the pedagogical affordances and limitations of KWL.

The study addresses three research questions: (1) What is the speaking-performance profile of undergraduate students after participating in a KWL-supported descriptive speaking activity? (2) Which dimensions of speaking performance appear relatively strong and weak? and (3) To what extent do students meet the task requirement for sustained oral production? The third question is

included because duration provides an observable indicator of whether learners can sustain an extended speaking turn, complementing rubric-based judgments of fluency and delivery.

The study is informed by a view of speaking pedagogy in which planning, rehearsal, performance, interaction, and reflection should be connected rather than treated as isolated stages (Muhammad et al., 2026). Argue for a holistic approach to teaching speaking, while task-based research emphasizes the importance of designing conditions that help learners balance complexity, accuracy, and fluency (Cherrez, 2021). From this perspective, KWL may be particularly valuable at the planning stage, but it should not be assumed to provide sufficient practice for the subsequent demands of oral delivery. The central proposition of this study is therefore not that KWL automatically produces speaking improvement, but that KWL may provide a useful cognitive scaffold whose effectiveness depends on how it is connected to subsequent speaking practice (Kim & Hwang, 2026; Rozy, 2025).

By examining the pattern across speaking dimensions, the study makes two contributions. First, it contributes classroom-level evidence about how KWL functions in an undergraduate Basic Speaking course, a context less represented in the available KWL-speaking literature than school-based classroom action research. Second, it translates the observed performance profile into a pedagogical refinement: if KWL successfully supports content organization but students continue to struggle with fluency, pronunciation, and audience interaction, then subsequent instruction should extend the KWL cycle with explicit rehearsal, repeated speaking, pronunciation practice, and interactional tasks. This diagnostic orientation provides a more cautious and theoretically grounded basis for future quasi-experimental research.

KWL is conceptualized in this study as a pre-speaking cognitive scaffold rather than a complete speaking method. The proposed instructional pathway is: (1) Know, activate topic knowledge and retrieve relevant lexical resources; (2) Want to Know, generate communicative questions and identify information that can enrich the description; (3) Learned, consolidate and sequence information; (4) Rehearse, practice target vocabulary, pronunciation, and sentence patterns; (5) Perform, deliver the description; (6) Interact, respond to audience questions; and (7) Reflect, identify remaining problems and revise the next performance. This extended cycle links the original KWL logic to established principles of speaking pedagogy and task-based performance.

METHOD

This study employed an exploratory descriptive classroom design. The design was selected because the available evidence consisted of students' speaking performances following a KWL-supported descriptive activity. No pre-intervention speaking scores, comparison group, or repeated treatment cycles were available in the supplied assessment records. Accordingly, the study does not estimate a causal effect of KWL. Instead, it documents the observed speaking-performance profile and identifies instructional needs that can inform subsequent intervention research.

The participants were 17 undergraduate students enrolled in a Basic Speaking course. The speaking activity focused on the topic "Description of People." The task required each student to choose a person they knew, such as a family member, friend, teacher, classmate, or public figure and produce an oral description. The task specification required students to include identity or relationship, physical appearance, personality, occupation or daily activities, hobbies or interests, and an explanation of why the person was important or interesting. Students were instructed to speak for 3–5 minutes. Individual student names were not used in the analysis reported in this manuscript.

The pedagogical sequence was organized around the three KWL stages. First, in the Know stage, students activated information they already knew about the person they intended to describe. This stage was intended to reduce the cognitive demand of generating content during speaking by making relevant ideas available before oral production. Second, in the Want to Know stage, students identified information they wanted or needed to include, helping them expand the description beyond a short list of physical characteristics. Third, in the Learned stage, students consolidated information and organized what they had developed before or during the speaking task. This adaptation retains the cognitive logic of KWL activation, inquiry, and consolidation while shifting the immediate product from reading comprehension toward spoken description. The task also included an opening requirement: students were expected to begin with an appropriate greeting or

introduction rather than moving directly to the description. This element was reflected in the delivery and interaction dimensions of the classroom rubric. Speaking performance was assessed using the supplied analytic rubric. The rubric contained seven criteria with different weights: content and organization (15%), vocabulary (15%), grammar (15%), pronunciation (20%), fluency (20%), delivery and confidence (10%), and interaction/audience awareness (5%). Each criterion was rated on a four-point scale. The supplied scoring formula was Weighted Score = (Score ÷ 4) × Weight, followed by summation across criteria to obtain the final score out of 100.

The rubric descriptors define content and organization in terms of clarity, completeness, organization, and relevant details; vocabulary in terms of variety, accuracy, and appropriateness; grammar in relation to descriptive structures such as be, have/has, adjectives, and simple present; pronunciation in terms of comprehensibility, stress, and intonation; fluency in terms of smoothness and hesitation; delivery and confidence in terms of presentation behavior; and interaction/audience awareness in terms of attention to the audience and communicative engagement. The rubric therefore provides a multidimensional representation of descriptive speaking performance. The available records do not provide evidence of independent expert validation, inter-rater reliability, or psychometric analysis of the rubric. This is treated as a methodological limitation rather than inferred away. The rubric was used as a classroom assessment instrument, and the analysis is therefore interpreted as classroom-based evidence rather than as a validated measurement scale.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the overall weighted score and for each rubric criterion. The analysis included the mean, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum. Criterion-level raw scores were retained on the 1–4 scale to preserve the rubric's original interpretation, while weighted scores were used for the overall 100-point result. The proportion of students meeting the specified minimum speaking duration of three minutes was also calculated. No inferential test of treatment effect was conducted because there was no pretest or comparison condition. The design is limited to one class, one descriptive speaking task, one assessment occasion, and the records available from the course. The results should therefore be interpreted as an exploratory classroom profile. The study cannot determine whether KWL caused an improvement, whether the observed scores would have been different without KWL, or whether the findings generalize to other courses, proficiency levels, or institutions.

The 17 students represented the complete set of available classroom assessment records for the activity; no additional sampling procedure was applied because the study analyzed an intact class. Student names were removed from the analytical dataset and only aggregated results are reported. The assessment was conducted as part of routine course activities. For journal publication, the authors should insert the institutional ethical/permission statement applicable to their setting (e.g., departmental approval, informed consent, or a waiver where permitted). Because the supplied records do not document independent rater calibration or inter-rater reliability, the present analysis does not report reliability coefficients that cannot be substantiated. Future implementation should use at least two trained raters and report inter-rater agreement or generalizability evidence.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Overall Speaking-Performance Profile

The 17 students obtained an overall mean score of 61.54 out of 100 (SD = 2.39), with scores ranging from 60.00 to 66.25. Based on the performance bands embedded in the classroom rubric, 15 students (88.2%) fell within the 56–65 "Fair" range, while two students (11.8%) reached the 66–75 "Good" range. No student reached the "Very Good" or "Excellent" bands. This distribution indicates that the KWL-supported task produced a relatively concentrated performance profile at the lower-to-middle level of the course rubric. The relatively narrow score range is noteworthy. A small standard deviation of 2.39 suggests that the students performed similarly overall, but it also means that the aggregate score alone provides limited information about individual strengths and weaknesses. For this reason, the criterion-level results are more informative for pedagogical interpretation.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the seven speaking-performance criteria (n = 17).

Criterion	Weight	Mean (1–4)	SD	Weighted Mean	Interpretive Observation
Content & Organization	15%	3.50	0.00	13.13	Strongest dimension
Vocabulary	15%	2.53	0.12	9.49	Generally adequate, limited variation
Grammar	15%	2.50	0.00	9.38	Consistent but moderate control
Pronunciation	20%	2.12	0.22	10.59	Needs focused support
Fluency	20%	2.12	0.22	10.59	Needs focused support
Delivery & Confidence	10%	2.47	0.12	6.18	Moderate
Interaction / Audience Awareness	5%	1.76	0.44	2.35	Weakest dimension

Criterion-Level Speaking Performance

At the criterion level, content and organization recorded the highest mean (M = 3.50/4.00; SD = 0.00). Vocabulary averaged 2.53 (SD = 0.12), and grammar averaged 2.50 (SD = 0.00). Pronunciation and fluency each averaged 2.12 (SD = 0.22), while delivery and confidence averaged 2.47 (SD = 0.12). Interaction/audience awareness had the lowest mean (M = 1.76/4.00; SD = 0.44). The weighted means for the seven criteria are presented in Table 1.

Speaking Duration

The task required a 3–5 minute performance, but the recorded durations ranged from 1 minute 5 seconds to 3 minutes 5 seconds. The mean duration was approximately 2 minutes 4 seconds, and the median was 2 minutes 5 seconds. Only three students (17.6%) reached at least three minutes. This finding provides additional evidence that students had difficulty sustaining extended oral production.

Discussion

Interpretive Note on Causal Claims

Before interpreting the descriptive results, an important methodological distinction must be made. The scores reported below represent performance after a KWL-supported activity; they do not represent measured gains from a baseline. Therefore, terms such as “improved,” “increased,” or “effect of KWL” are not used to characterize the present data. The appropriate interpretation is that the assessment provides evidence about the students' performance profile following the instructional activity. This distinction aligns the claims of the manuscript with the available design.

Content and Organization: The Main Strength

Content and organization was the strongest criterion, with a mean of 3.50/4.00 and no variation across the 17 students (SD = 0.00). This result is consistent with the pedagogical logic of KWL. The K stage requires learners to retrieve relevant knowledge, while the W stage prompts them to identify additional information they want to address. These stages can create a content-generation scaffold before the learner has to perform orally. The finding therefore supports the interpretation that KWL is particularly useful as a planning and idea-organization tool. The result also suggests an important distinction between content preparation and oral execution. Students were able to produce descriptions that the classroom assessor judged as relatively clear and organized, yet this strength did not translate into similarly high scores for pronunciation, fluency, or interaction. KWL may therefore be most productive when treated as a pre-speaking scaffold rather than as a complete speaking pedagogy.

Vocabulary and Grammar: Adequate but Not Yet Flexible

Vocabulary averaged 2.53/4.00, while grammar averaged 2.50/4.00. The vocabulary scores were slightly more variable because two students received a score of 3.00, whereas the remaining students received 2.50. The pattern suggests that learners had sufficient lexical and grammatical resources to construct a recognizable description, but they had not yet demonstrated a high level of range or control. For descriptive speaking, vocabulary is closely tied to the ability to elaborate. A

learner who knows only a small set of common adjectives may produce an accurate but repetitive description. Likewise, grammatical knowledge of be, have/has, adjectives, and the simple present may support basic description but does not automatically produce extended discourse. This finding supports the use of KWL as a content scaffold combined with explicit lexical expansion and sentence-pattern rehearsal.

Pronunciation and Fluency: The Main Oral-Production Challenge

Pronunciation and fluency both had a mean of 2.12/4.00, making them substantially weaker than content and organization. These dimensions concern the real-time delivery of the message rather than the availability of ideas. The contrast is pedagogically important: students appear able to organize what they want to say more successfully than they can deliver it smoothly and clearly. The result is consistent with broader work on speaking pedagogy, which treats oral production as more than the accumulation of linguistic knowledge. Speaking instruction needs opportunities for controlled practice, rehearsal, increasingly spontaneous production, feedback, and interaction (Campbell & Tigan, 2022). Conceptualize speaking pedagogy holistically, while (Fernández & Andersen, 2019) emphasizes the importance of meaningful speaking tasks and progressive opportunities to develop oral production. The present findings therefore suggest that the KWL sequence should be followed by a second pedagogical layer: students could rehearse the description from their KWL notes, practice target pronunciation of key words, repeat the task with reduced planning time, and progressively move from supported description to semi-spontaneous speaking. Such a sequence would preserve the cognitive benefits of KWL while directly addressing the oral-production dimensions that remained weak.

Interaction and Audience Awareness: The Weakest Dimension

Interaction and audience awareness produced the lowest mean score, 1.76/4.00, and the greatest relative variability (SD = 0.44). This result is not surprising if KWL is used mainly as an individual planning chart. KWL can organize what a speaker knows and wants to communicate, but it does not automatically create an interlocutor or require the speaker to respond to an audience. This distinction is important for Basic Speaking courses. Describing a person is often treated as an individual presentation task, yet effective speaking also involves orientation to listeners. Students may need to greet the audience, establish who the person is, maintain listener interest, invite or respond to questions, and use eye contact or other delivery behaviors. Speaking assessment frameworks emphasize that oral ability involves both linguistic production and interactional or contextual dimensions (Lam, 2018; May et al., 2019). The low interaction score consequently points to a modification of the activity rather than a rejection of KWL. After completing the KWL chart, students could work in pairs: one student describes the person while the partner asks two or three follow-up questions generated from the W column. The speaker then revises the description based on the questions. In this form, the W stage becomes a bridge from planning to authentic interaction.

Speaking Duration and Sustained Production

The duration data are especially useful because they complement the fluency score. A learner may successfully communicate a short description but still struggle to sustain a longer turn. In future instruction, the 3–5 minute target should be scaffolded rather than treated as an immediate endpoint. For example, students could first produce a one-minute description, then expand it to two minutes by adding personality and activities, and finally reach three minutes by adding examples, reasons, and audience questions.

Why Criterion-Level Assessment Matters

The criterion-level pattern also demonstrates why analytic assessment is valuable in speaking pedagogy. The overall mean of 61.54 can be interpreted only broadly, whereas the component scores reveal a specific pedagogical asymmetry: content and organization were comparatively strong, while pronunciation, fluency, and interaction were weaker. Recent research on oral-presentation assessment confirms that analytical rubrics can support more differentiated judgments, although the reliability of scores depends on the rubric, raters, and scoring conditions (Limgomolvilas & Sukserm, 2025). Research on peer assessment also indicates that structured assessment and qualitative feedback can be useful in college EFL speaking classrooms (Dang & Le, 2023). These findings support

using the rubric not merely as a grading instrument but as a feedback architecture for subsequent speaking cycles.

Comparison with Previous KWL Research

Previous studies provide evidence that KWL has been used successfully as a speaking-support strategy. A study involving English Education students at Potensi Utama University used classroom action research and reported higher performance across cycles after KWL-based speaking instruction. A more recent classroom action research study with eleventh-grade students similarly reported improved speaking performance and motivation following KWL implementation. The present study differs from those studies in an important methodological respect. It does not claim improvement because the available records contain no baseline or control condition. Instead, it identifies the performance profile after a KWL-supported activity. This difference strengthens the interpretive caution of the study while also identifying a concrete next step: a future study should collect pretest and posttest speaking performances, ideally with a comparison group or repeated measures, and should analyze whether changes occur in particular dimensions such as fluency, pronunciation, and interaction.

Pedagogical Model Emerging from the Findings

This model extends the original KWL logic into a speaking-specific pedagogical cycle while preserving the central role of prior knowledge, purposeful inquiry, and reflection. The proposed extension is particularly relevant because the strongest observed dimension was content organization, while the weakest dimensions were interaction, pronunciation, and fluency. In other words, the data suggest that the "planning" side of the activity was more successful than the "performance" side. A speaking pedagogy built around KWL should therefore not stop after the L stage.

From Cognitive Scaffolding to Communicative Practice

The findings suggest that KWL should be embedded in a broader communicative sequence. The K and W stages may lower the cognitive burden of deciding what to say, but speaking proficiency also depends on opportunities to actually speak, interact, receive feedback, and repeat the task. Recent EFL research has linked interactive speaking practice with gains in fluency and willingness to communicate, while classroom-based assessment has been associated with speaking performance and engagement (Kafabih et al., 2026; Liao, 2025). Accordingly, the most defensible pedagogical interpretation is that KWL can serve as an entry point into speaking rather than a substitute for speaking practice itself.



Figure 1. A step-by-step framework for continuous improvement in speaking skills, ranging from activating prior knowledge to final reflection

Implications

To implement this instructional approach effectively, teachers should utilize KWL strictly as a pre-speaking planning scaffold rather than a standalone speaking method, converting the "W" column into audience questions to foster genuine interaction alongside presentation. Before the main speaking task, students should engage in a brief pronunciation rehearsal targeting high-frequency descriptive vocabulary, followed by repeated speaking cycles that gradually transition from full KWL support to progressively reduced notes. Furthermore, speaking duration should be scaffolded incrementally starting from approximately one minute and expanding toward three or more minutes rather than demanding extended speech immediately while analytic rubric feedback is applied selectively to target one or two specific dimensions per cycle, particularly fluency, pronunciation, and interaction.

Research Contribution

The findings justify a more rigorous follow-up study. A quasi-experimental pretest–posttest design could compare a KWL-supported speaking class with a conventional speaking class. A stronger design could include two or more speaking tasks administered at different points in the intervention. Effect sizes should be reported alongside significance tests, and inter-rater reliability should be established when more than one assessor is available. A mixed-methods design could additionally examine students' perceptions of how KWL helped them generate ideas, organize speech, and manage anxiety or hesitation.

The main contribution is a multidimensional classroom account of KWL-supported descriptive speaking at the undergraduate Basic Speaking level. Rather than reducing speaking achievement to a single score, the study identifies a clear pattern: students demonstrated relatively strong content organization but weaker oral delivery and interaction. This pattern offers a practical basis for redesigning KWL from a content-planning technique into a more complete speaking pedagogy.

Limitations

Several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the sample was small and drawn from a single Basic Speaking class. Second, the assessment represents one speaking task and one assessment occasion. Third, no pretest, control group, or longitudinal data were available; therefore, causal claims about KWL cannot be made. Fourth, the supplied records do not document independent rubric validation or inter-rater reliability. Fifth, the study did not include interview or questionnaire data, so students' perceptions of KWL cannot be inferred from performance scores alone. Finally, the speaking task durations were recorded, but no audio-based transcription or objective fluency measures such as speech rate or pause frequency were available. These limitations do not invalidate the classroom findings. Rather, they define the appropriate scope of interpretation: the study should be read as an exploratory diagnostic account that generates hypotheses and instructional directions for a stronger subsequent investigation.

CONCLUSION

This exploratory study examined the speaking-performance profile of 17 undergraduate students after a KWL-supported descriptive speaking activity in a Basic Speaking course. The overall mean score was 61.54/100, with content and organization emerging as the strongest dimension (M = 3.50/4.00) and interaction/audience awareness as the weakest (M = 1.76/4.00). Pronunciation and fluency were also relatively weak, both averaging 2.12/4.00. Only three students reached the task's minimum three-minute speaking duration. The findings indicate that KWL is pedagogically promising as a mechanism for activating knowledge and organizing descriptive content, but the present evidence does not establish that KWL alone improves speaking proficiency. The main implication is therefore developmental: KWL should be integrated with rehearsal, pronunciation practice, fluency-building repetition, and structured audience interaction. The study provides a clear foundation for a subsequent quasi-experimental or longitudinal investigation that can test whether this extended KWL-speaking cycle produces measurable gains over time.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors acknowledge the students who participated in the Basic Speaking course and contributed to the classroom assessment data used in this exploratory study.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

[DG] conceptualized the study, conducted the classroom implementation, analyzed the data, and drafted the manuscript. [SA] contributed to methodological review, interpretation, and manuscript revision. All authors reviewed and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

Anhari, B. H., Hartiningsih, S., & Widodo, E. (2026). The effectiveness of Mobile-Assisted Language Learning (MALL) applications in enhancing EFL learners' speaking fluency and autonomy. *English Learning Innovation*, *7*(2), 645–666. https://doi.org/10.22219/englie.v7i2.45283

Burns, A. (2019). Concepts for Teaching Speaking in the English Language Classroom. *LEARN Journal : Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *12*(1), 1–11. https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/168564

Campbell, M., & Tigan, A. (2022). Translanguaging and product-oriented drama: an integrated pedagogical approach for language learning and literacy development. *Edinburgh Research Explorer*, *25*(10), 3745–3757. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2022.2104115

Cherrez, N. J. (2021). Leveraging asynchronous speaking tasks to promote willingness and confidence to speak in Spanish: A qualitative study. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.6657

Dang, T. D., & Le, T. H. (2023). Students' Perceptions on Using Rubrics as a Peer and Self-Assessment Tool in EFL Speaking Courses. *International Journal of TESOL & Education*, *3*(3), 119–136. https://doi.org/10.54855/ijte.23337

Fan, J., & Yan, X. (2020). Assessing Speaking Proficiency: A Narrative Review of Speaking Assessment Research Within the Argument-Based Validation Framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 330. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00330

Fernández, S. S., & Andersen, H. L. (2019). Oral proficiency in second and third foreign languages in the Danish education system. *Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies*, *13*(1), 49–67. https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201903011689

Isaacs, T., & Trofimovich, P. (2012). Deconstructing Comprehensibility. *Bristol Research (University of Bristol)*, *34*(3), 475–505. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263112000150

Jong, N. H. de. (2022). Assessing Second Language Speaking Proficiency. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, *9*(1), 541–560. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-030521-052114

Kafabih, A., Margana, M., Herda, R. K., & Majid, S. (2026). Conversational AI in Informal EFL Speaking Practice: Learners' Experiences and Pedagogical Implications. *Research and Innovation in Applied Linguistics-Electronic Journal*, *4*(2), 345–364. https://doi.org/10.31963/rial.v4i2.6456

Katushemererwe, F., & Rugyema, R. (2025). Vocabulary Knowledge for Proficiency in English as a Second Language – A Literature Review. *East African Journal of Education Studies*, *8*(4), 191–207. https://doi.org/10.37284/eajes.8.4.3910

Kim, H., & Hwang, H. (2026). Cognitive Approaches to Examining the Modality-Specific Development of Lexical Sophistication in Young EFL Learners. *Vigo International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.35869/vial.v0i23.5861

Koizumi, R., & In'nami, Y. (2013). Vocabulary Knowledge and Speaking Proficiency among Second Language Learners from Novice to Intermediate Levels. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *4*(5). https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.4.5.900-913

Kurnihayati, K., Nurkholidah, E. S., & Phatthanawiwat, A. (2026). Enhancing IELTS Speaking Preparation: The Development of a Self-Paced Learning Model Integrating Edpuzzle and Authentic Materials. *International Journal of Educational Qualitative Quantitative Research*, *5*(1), 81–91. https://doi.org/10.58418/ijeqqr.v5i1.200

Lam, D. M. K. (2018). What counts as "responding"? Contingency on previous speaker contribution as a feature of interactional competence. *Language Testing*, *35*(3), 377–401. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532218758126

Lambert, C., Aubrey, S., & Leeming, P. (2020). Task Preparation and Second Language Speech Production. *TESOL Quarterly*, *55*(2), 331–365. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.598

Li, C., Wei, L., & Lu, X. (2024). Task complexity and L2 writing performance of young learners: Contributions of cognitive and affective factors. *Modern Language Journal*, *108*(3), 741–770. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12954

Liao, M.-H. (2025). Cultivating proficient and efficacious L2 English speakers via VoiceThread-mediated self- and peer assessments. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-025-05674-2

Limgomolvilas, S., & Sukserm, P. (2025). Examining Rater Reliability When Using an Analytical Rubric for Oral Presentation Assessments. *LEARN Journal : Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*, *18*(1), 110–134. https://doi.org/10.70730/jqgy9980

Lumbangaol, R. R. (2021). The Effect Of Kwl Technique On Students' Speaking Skill Of English Education Program At Potensi Utama University. *Journal MELT (Medium for English Language Teaching)*, *4*(1), 73. https://doi.org/10.22303/melt.4.1.2019.73-94

Matyakhan, T. (2025). Rethinking Oral Communication Materials: Learner-Informed Coursebook Design in EFL Higher Education Contexts. *International Journal of TESOL Studies*. https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.250825

May, L., Nakatsuhara, F., Lam, D. M. K., & Galaczi, E. D. (2019). Developing tools for learning oriented assessment of interactional competence: Bridging theory and practice. *Language Testing*, *37*(2), 165–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0265532219879044

Muhammad, I., Setyosarı, P., & Fajarianto, O. (2026). Reducing EFL Speaking Anxiety via Blended Mentoring: The Role of Rhetorical Modeling. *Urwatul Wutsqo Jurnal Studi Kependidikan dan Keislaman*, *15*(2), 1172–1186. https://doi.org/10.54437/urwatulwutsqo.v15i2.3401

Pawlak, M. (2018). Investigating the use of speaking strategies in the performance of two communicative tasks: The importance of communicative goal. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *8*(2), 269–291. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.2018.8.2.5

Rozy, F. S. (2025). Activating Prior Knowledge through KWL Strategy in Young EFL Learners' Reading. *Journal Of Early Childhood Education Studies*, *5*(1), 64–83. https://doi.org/10.54180/joeces.v5i1.470

Setiawati, N., Wijayanti, R. N., & Asih, N. S. F. (2021). Efektivitas Strategi Know Want Learned (KWL) dalam Meningkatkan Keterampilan Berbicara Bahasa Jepang. *Chi e Journal of Japanese Learning and Teaching*, *9*(1), 10–22. https://doi.org/10.15294/chie.v9i1.42274

Silva, D. V. M. De. (2020). Developing Self-regulated Learning Skills in University Students Studying in the Open and Distance Learning Environment by Using KWL Method. *Journal of Learning for Development*, *7*(2), 204–217. https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v7i2.389

Sueri, L. E. L. (2023). Strategic sustainable development from scientific research: results, impact and positioning. *Medwave*, *23*. https://doi.org/10.5867/medwave.2023.s1.uta141

Xu, T., & Zhang, L. J. (2023). Effects of cognitive task complexity and online planning on second language learners' argumentative writing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1121994. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1121994

Yunus, S. F. F. Y., Pelu, S. R., Jufri, S. H., & Munirah, M. (2024). Enhance students' speaking skills in learning English using the Know, Want to Know, and Learned (KWL) Strategy for eleventh graders of Ibnu Sina SMAN 11 Pangkep. *Jurnal Guru Pencerah Semesta*, *2*(3), 531–542. https://doi.org/10.56983/jgps.v2i3.794