

استخدام استراتيجية KWL لتدريس قواعد اللغة الانكليزية للطلبة العراقيين متعلمي اللغة
الانكليزية كلغة ثانية

Using KWL strategy for teaching English grammar to Iraqi EFL
learners

Dr. Khalid Ibrahim Alahmed

Lecturer

University of Ninevah –

College of Nursing

د. خالد ابراهيم محمد الاحمد

مدرس

جامعة نينوى – كلية التمريض

Khalid.ibrahim@uoninevah.edu.iq

تاريخ القبول

٢٠٢٢/١٢/٢٢

تاريخ الاستلام

٢٠٢٢/١٢/٦

الكلمات المفتاحية: KWL، استراتيجيات التعلم، القواعد، متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة
أجنبية

Keyword: KWL, learning strategies, grammar, Iraqi EFL learners

الملخص

من استراتيجيات التعلم الجيدة، هي تلك الاستراتيجية التي تمكن المتعلمين الربط بين معلوماتهم السابقة والمعلومات الجديدة لخلق تعلم ذو معنى . يُعتقد أن KWL هي استراتيجية مناسبة يمكن للمتعلمين استخدامها لبناء المعنى من خلال ربط معلوماتهم السابقة بالجديدة. تشير الأحرف K-W-L إلى عملية بناء المعرفة التي تحدث (K ماذا اعلم ، K ماذا اريد ان اتعلم، ماذا تعلمت ؟). تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على اثر استخدام استراتيجية KWL في تحصيل مادة قواعد اللغة الانكليزية للطلبة العراقيين متعلمي اللغة الانكليزية كلغة ثانية. ولتحقيق هدف البحث ،صمم الباحث تجربة استخدم فيها مجموعتين (كل مجموعة مكونة من ٢٠ طالب) تم اختيارهم بشكل عشوائي من بين طلبة الصف الثالث في معهد الفنون الجميلة- نينوى . كما تم اختيار إحدى المجموعتين لتكون المجموعة التجريبية إذ تم تدريسها مادة قواعد اللغة الانكليزية باستخدام استراتيجية KWL ، أما المجموعة الأخرى فقد اختيرت لتكون المجموعة الضابطة إذ تم تدريسها مادة القواعد باستخدام الطريقة التقليدية. تم تكافؤ كلتا المجموعتين عند المتغيرات التالية :العمر ، التحصيل الدراسي للوالدين، درجات الطلاب في مادة اللغة الانكليزية للعام الدراسي السابق ودرجات الذكاء. وقد تم اعداد اختبار تحصيلي في مادة القواعد وتم عرضه على مجموعة من الخبراء للتحقق من صدقه وتم استخراج ثباته وتم تطبيقه على كلتا المجموعتين في نهاية التجربة. وبعد جمع ومعالجة البيانات إحصائيا أظهرت النتائج بوجود فرق ذو دلالة إحصائية بين متوسط تحصيل طلبة المجموعتين التجريبية

والضابطة في الاختبار البعدي في مادة القواعد ولمصلحة طلبة المجموعة التجريبية. في ضوء النتائج ، اختتم البحث بعدد من التوصيات، فضلا عن ذلك طرحت بعض المقترحات المتعلقة بالبحوث المستقبلية.

Abstract

A good learning strategy is the one that enables learners link between their previous knowledge and new information to create their meanings. It is believed that the KWL is an appropriate strategy that learners could employ to construct meaning through connecting their prior information with new material. The letters K-W-L (Know-Want-Learned) stand for the knowledge construction process that takes place. This research aims at investigating empirically the effect of using KWL strategy on the achievement of Fine Arts Institute students in English grammar. To achieve this aim, an experiment was designed where two groups were chosen randomly from the third year students in the Institute of Fine Arts/Nineveh. One of these two groups was assigned as an experimental group which was taught grammar by KWL strategy, and the other as a control group which was taught grammar by the three Ps (Presentation, Practice, Production) method. To meet the homogeneity assumption, both groups were matched in terms of their age and the level of English for the previous academic year. A grammar test was constructed based on students' syllabus. Reliability and validity of the grammar test were estimated and ensured. A post-test was administered to both groups. The statistical analysis of the results reveals that there is a statistically significant difference between the achievement scores of the experimental group and those of the control group in the grammar posttest in favor of the experimental group. In light of the findings, a number of recommendations to English language teachers have been put forward. Some suggestions for further studies and work are presented as well.

Introduction

During the recent years, the field of applied linguistics and foreign language education has witnessed a shift in teaching strategies to be more learner-centered rather than teacher-led (Abreu, 2015). The rationale for such change is based on the assumption that increasing students' self-awareness of their learning process would lead to effective development of their performance in acquiring the knowledge. One of these strategies is metacognitive strategies that regard learners as self-regulated thinkers and self-assessors (Oxford, 2016). That is, learners can recognize what would work for them, what would challenge them, and what actions would assist them to learn what they want to know. It is believed that a good learning strategy is the one that enables learners link between their previous knowledge and new information to create their meanings (Shelly et al, 1997). As such, language learning strategies that are capable of facilitating the construction of meaning could enhance foreign/second language acquisition. It has been argued that prior knowledge is extremely important in influencing how learners interpret what they learn. That is, to learn well, a learner must access the knowledge they already have about the topic or make it available appropriately so that comprehension can occur (Achtersold & Field, 1997; Dieu, 2015).

Problem of the study

One of the most controversial issues that has been much debated among scholars and researchers is the role of grammar in learning English as a foreign/second language (Ellis, 2006; Krashen, 1982; Vold, 2017). A number of questions have been raised and dominated for many years concerning "whether grammar should be taught and if so what grammar, when, and how" (Ellis, 2006, p. 83). Although some researchers have argued that explicit grammar instruction doesn't contribute to foreign language acquisition (e.g. Garrett, 1986; Krashen, 1982), others believe that understanding grammar is important for the learners to comprehend the language they speak to be effective communicators (Ellis, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 2011; Terrell, 1991). Explicit knowledge of the grammatical rules can assist learners to articulate sentences accurately which in turn serve as input for acquisition (Maree & Alahmed, 2023; Terrell, 1991). In addition, explicit knowledge can facilitate foreign language acquisition since it sensitises the learners to the presence of mistakes in their interlanguage (Alahmed, 2017; Ellis, 2006). Thus, understanding the grammatical rules along with their appropriate usages is better for foreign language learners than ignoring them and do their best to remember these rules when they produce a language (Stewart-Dore, 1982, p. 3).

However, the challenge that faces most of the English language teachers in Iraqi educational institutes in general and Fine Arts Institute/Nineveh in particular is the low marks of the students in English grammar subject. Students are not aware of the basic rules and structural patterns which they are supposed to have learnt at their intermediate school levels. The reason for this problem could be attributed to the currently used method for teaching English grammar at intermediate schools in Iraq. The method of teaching grammar does not take students' needs and their previous knowledge into consideration.

That is, a teacher, based on the textbook, deductively presents the new grammatical topic to the students regardless of the students' prior knowledge and what they already know about the topic and what they need to know. Accordingly, the significance of the problem of this study lies in the fact that it tackles students' needs and their previous knowledge of the grammatical structures, which is one of the important elements of language required by institute learners of English to make an adequate academic progress. Thus, this study attempts to examine the effect of using KWL strategy on the achievement of Iraqi EFL students in English grammar. It has been claimed that the KWL is an appropriate strategy that foreign language learners could use to construct meaning through connecting their prior information with new material (Ogle, 1986). KWL strategy stimulates learners' self-awareness and encourages them to reflect on their learning experience and knowledge about the topic through asking themselves questions related to the topic such as what I know, what I want to know and what I have learned. The KWL is a teaching strategy in the form of graphic organizer developed by Donna Ogle in 1985. According to ERICA Model developed by (Morris & Stewart-Dore, 1982), KWL as a graphic organizer can be modified to suit learners' needs at any educational stage, in any syllabus, and for any given topic (Fengjuan, 2010). The KWL strategy is widely used for teaching reading comprehension (Apriliana, 2022; Usman, Fata & Pratiwi, 2018). It is also employed for teaching other language skills such as writing (Purwandari & Wiyanah, 2020) and speaking skills (Masnawati, 2015). However, no previous studies have been conducted to examine the effect of KWL on English grammar. This study tries to fill the gap in research by answering the following research question: What is the

effect of using KWL strategy on the achievement of Iraqi EFL students in English grammar?

Significance of the study

The findings of the study are expected to have implications for classroom instructions, material designing and teacher training. The findings could help to:

1. Raise language teachers' awareness of how teaching strategies could be introduced to make the teaching-learning process effective.
2. Stimulate researchers to carry out similar studies in the same area based on the findings of the current study.
3. Provide a new avenue for the English language teachers in Iraq to cross check the grammar teaching approaches that they have been employing and compare them with the KWL strategy.
4. Equip learners with insightful ideas on the learning strategies that could help them to be successful learners in all subjects in general and grammar in particular.

Aim of the study

The present study aims at investigating the effect of using KWL strategy on the achievement of Iraqi EFL students in English grammar.

Limits of the study

The study is limited to the teaching of English tenses to the third-year male students of the Fine Arts Institute/Nineveh during the academic year 2019-2020.

Hypothesis of the study

It is hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference between the achievement of the students who are taught by the "Presentation, Practice, Production" method and those who are taught by the "KWL strategy" in teaching English grammar.

Definitions of basic terms**A- Grammar**

Brown (2001, p.362) defines grammar as “the system of rules governing the conventional arrangement and relationship of words in a sentence”.

B-Strategy:

Williams and Burden (1997, p.44) define strategy as “a technique used by learners to help make their language learning be more effective and increase their independence and autonomy as learners”.

C-KWL: It is “a form of self-monitoring where students are taught to list what they know already about a subject, what they want to know, and later what they learned” (Ogle, 1986, p. 564).

Operational Definition of KWL Strategy

KWL Strategy is a kind of graphic organizer in which third-year students of Teachers' Training Institute/Nineveh use to list in columns what they know and what they want to know about a grammatical topic prior to the teacher's explanations and list what they have learned after completion of the lesson.

Theoretical Background**KWL strategy**

KWL is an instructional strategy introduced by Ogle in 1986 to help learners connect their previous knowledge with the new information. It assists learners to activate what they already know about a topic at the beginning of the lesson. It further encourages the learners to be actively involved in the learning process as it makes genuine link between the presented information and learners' repertoire (Fengjuan, 2010; Pritchard, 2009). The letters K-W-L represent the process of meaning construction. They provide a framework for the learners to make their learning meaningful firstly by recalling what they already know about a

given topic (K). And secondly by writing what they would like to know or learn (W), and eventually listing or verbalizing what they have just learned (L) (Boss and Vaughn, 2002).

One of the merits of this strategy is that it can be implemented by a teacher and his students. Then, it can be easily used by the students as an independent learning style. Shelly et al. (1997) state that during the lesson, “the teacher first leads the group through an oral discussion of each of the components and then turns the process over to the students to individually write their own ideas and questions on a personal worksheet” (p. 565).

The procedures of KWL strategy in the classroom:

Implementation of KWL strategy in the classroom contains three phases. The phases represent the cognitive and metacognitive steps undertaken by the students before, during and after a learning activity. These three phases are:

- 1- Access what we **K**now
- 2- Decide what we **W**ant to Learn
- 3- Recall what we did **L**earn

To apply this strategy, a worksheet has been developed by Ogle (1986) for the learners to be completed during the lesson (See Figure 1below).

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Figure (1) KWL Strategy Sheet (Adapted from Ogle, 1986, p. 565) | | |
| NAME _____ SUBJECT _____ | | |
| 1. | | |
| K - What We Know Tell me everything you know about ...(pre-reading activity, help elicit prior knowledge) | W - What we Want to Learn Tell me what you want to know about(pre-reading activity, set a purpose for reading) | L - What We Have Learned Tell me what you have learnt (post reading activity, monitor students' comprehension, assess their comprehension and expand their ideas) |
| 2. | | |
| Categories of Information We Expect to Use | | |
| A. | D. | G. |
| B. | E. | H. |
| C. | F. | I. |

Consequently, by using the KWL strategy, the lesson is divided into the following steps:

Step one: Column K-What I know

This is the first step which concentrates on eliciting what students know about a topic. It is to be completed at the beginning of the lesson. To access the learners' levels of previous knowledge about a topic, brainstorming can be employed as an elicitation technique. It has been found that a "brainstorming" method is successful in eliciting from students words and concepts they are already familiar with which are related to a particular topic" (Nea, 1982, p. 4). The teacher's role at this step is to write on the board whatever words, phrases and sentences the learners know about the topic. The rationale for using the brainstorming at the beginning of the lesson is twofold: to activate the learners' schemata (find out what they already know) and to discover their lack of information about the topic (i.e. what they do not know) so that they can list in the next column.

Step two: Column W-What I want to learn

In this step the learners list what information they want to learn about the topic. It is to be done before the reading and/or before the teacher's explanation. This step allows students to "direct their own learning within the framework of the topic provided by the teacher"(Boss and Vaughn, 2002, p. 179). In other words, students who are more knowledgeable in the topic would ask deep questions and frequently go beyond the teacher's expectation. It is recommended that step one and step two can be achieved in pairs or in groups of four students. The aim is to provide a platform for the students to share their own ideas with others to help them remember what they know and think of questions to be listed in the second W-column.

Step three: Column L-What I Learned

This step is to be completed after reading, researching and/or teacher's explanation. In this step, the students write notes in the column of what they have learned. They answer the questions that have been set in step two. Further, the students write down and report any new and interesting information. The teacher, at this stage, can open group discussion through asking the students to share their new information. The group discussion would be a good opportunity for the students to refine their understanding and get extra resources about the topic (Deckmat, 2012, p. 13).

The Purpose behind using KWL strategy in the classroom

There are several reasons that stimulate teachers and educationalists to use the KWL strategy in the classroom. Firstly, KWL can activate students' previous knowledge through eliciting from them what they already know about the topic to be learned. It has been stated that the KWL strategy enables students to link their prior knowledge to new information which they identify as "desired-to-know facts, and to use this new information in a synthesis which increases their level of

critical thinking and ability to synthesize in the future" (Fengjuan, 2010, p. 79). Secondly, by using KWL chart, students will have a genuine learning outcome to be achieved by themselves. That is, the students will be able to set the aim of their learning by asking them what they would like to know or learn. This process would promote learners to actively participate and get engaged in the topic since they had an identified and clear learning purpose. Thus, the KWL chart can be employed to steer students' learning process and drive instruction. In this connection, Al-Khateeb and Idrees (2010) argue that the KWL chart can provide a valuable platform for the students to participate in an activity which "lends them strength in organizing material into meaningful, easier to remember, chunks both now and in future lessons" (p.47). Thirdly, this strategy enables the expansion of students' ideas beyond the topics and textbooks that they handle in schools. Based on students' interest, further assignments, papers and projects can be invented by the teachers to be accomplished by the students. Fourthly, it has been proved that the use of graphic outlines like KWL chart in learning is helpful for foreign language learners to comprehend topic organization easily. When students are given a topic/text to prepare or read, they can work in pairs or individually "to complete a chart which indicates the relative importance of and connections between sections of the text" (Stewart-Dore, 1982, p. 7). Finally, the value of using KWL strategy can be summarized by the following points:

- 1-"elicit prior knowledge of the topic of the text;
- 2- set a purpose for reading;
- 3-monitor their comprehension;
- 4-assess their comprehension of the text; and
- 5-expand ideas beyond the text." (Conner, 2006, p.1)

Grammar

What is grammar

Before delving into the discussion of the role of grammar in foreign language teaching, it is important to provide a definition of grammar. Brown (2001, p.362) defines grammar as “the system of rules governing the conventional arrangement and relationship of words in a sentence”. Ur (2009, p. 3) describes grammar as “the way language manipulates and combines words so as to express certain kinds of meaning, some of which cannot be conveyed adequately by vocabulary alone.” That is, understanding grammar rules and being able to apply them correctly can help speakers to convey their communication messages successfully. Similarly, Richards and Schmidt (2013:251) define grammar as “a description of the structure of a language and the way in which linguistic units such as words and phrases are combined to produce sentences in the grammar language.” This research adopted Brown’s (2001) definition of grammar as it suits the aim of the study.

The Role of Grammar in Language Learning

The role of grammar in foreign/ second language learning has consistently attracted the attention of researchers in the fields of TESOL and applied linguistics (Thornbury, 2009). Two *conflicting views* about teaching grammar have been introduced. The first view claims that there is no need for explicit grammar instruction as it does not contribute to the learning of foreign language (Krashen, 1982). The other view argues that grammar occupies a substantial role in second language acquisition and should be taught. Proponents of the second view believe that teaching grammar to language learners helps them construct sentences easily to express themselves in different situations (Aprizani et al., 2018; Ellis, 2006; Larsen-Freeman, 2001; Savage et al., 2010; Thornbury, 2009; Widodo, 2006). According to the second

view, there are two roles that underlie the importance of grammar in language teaching and learning as follows:

Grammar as an enabling skill

It has been considered that grammar is a key element to the four language skills as it makes a link between words and contexts (Widodo, 2006). Grammar enables the learners to produce and comprehend different sentence patterns correctly both in oral and written communication (Thornbury, 2009). However, if grammar is incorrect or misapprehended in any of the four language skills, communication may be disrupted. This is because without correct grammar, efficient communication cannot happen. Grammar is important because it enables language learners to employ and use language creatively (Savage et al., 2010). Grammatical knowledge helps language learners to understand and correctly use structures of the target language, and this contributes to the improvement of their overall performance. Therefore, it is necessary to equip learners' with the required grammatical knowledge to meet their needs in expressing themselves effectively and acceptably in the target language.

Grammar as a means to self-sufficiency

One of the goals for teaching grammar is to help learners notice and correct their own written and verbal language mistakes. The grammatical knowledge aids learners monitor their language use before, during or after production. According to Krashen's (1982) Monitor Hypothesis, second/foreign language learning acts as a monitor to assist language users check and edit their oral or written utterances. Teaching grammar would make learners aware of their mistakes and correct them without any support of teachers. This process would prepare the learners for the real-world. In writing, for instance, students are required to write notes, reports, and e-mails.

However, if they have not learned how to monitor their language, they might face problems in delivering their messages correctly (Alahmed, 2010). Savage et al. (2010) state that the ability of self-correction leads to the development of “self-sufficiency” (p.2). Thus, learning grammar is beneficial to all English language learners.

Methodology

The Experimental Design

This research adopts the “Experimental-Control Group Design: pre-test Post-test Design” (Cohen et al, 2007). It represents the random selection of two groups from the population. The first group is assigned as an experimental group (EG henceforth) which is taught English grammar according to the KWL strategy. The second group is assigned as a control group (CG henceforth) which is taught grammar according to the PPP method. Both groups (EG and CG) are equalized in terms of their age in months, score of English for the previous year, parents’ education background and IQ test scores results. The independent variable KWL is administered to the EG only. The scores on the dependent variables (grammar), measured by the posttest, are compared to see whether there is any significant difference between both groups. (See Table 1).

Table (1)
The Experimental Design

| Group | Treatment | Posttest |
|-------|--------------------------------|----------|
| EG | KWL | Grammar |
| CG | Traditional Approach (PPPs) | |

Population and sampling

The population of the present research included all the third-year students in the Fine Arts Institute/Nineveh. The total number of population was 122 male students. The sample of this research was selected randomly from among the population. Two groups, each of which consisted of 20 students, were selected randomly to participate in the study. One group was assigned as the experimental group (EG), and the other served as the control group (CG).

The instruments of the research

To accomplish the aim of the study and verify its hypothesis, the following instruments were employed:

(a) The Instructional Material

The researcher has selected the instructional material that will be used for teaching grammar during the period of this study. Respectively, the material is taken from the textbook English for Institute Students, Book 3, units 2,3,4,5 and 6.

(b) Lesson plans

The plans for teaching grammar to the EG were set according to the methodology of the KWL strategy. As far as the CG is concerned, the plans for teaching grammar were set according to the currently used method i.e. PPP. The plans were submitted to a jury specialized in teaching English, methodology and education to make sure that they were correctly and formally formulated. They have been accepted and approved by all the members with certain modifications.

(c) The grammar achievement test

The grammar achievement test was designed by the researcher and conducted the EG and the CG after the experimental teaching.

The grammar test consists of two parts. The first part is a recognition test which comprises 20 items that assess the 5 units of the grammatical

structures taught during the experiment and measures students' ability to recognize appropriate grammatical forms and to manipulate structures. The second part is a production test which consists of six questions and measures students' ability to produce and use the correct form in real-life situations. Further, the value of each question type is given, and each type has its own objective. Therefore, the test is considered an objective test; it is reliable, accurate, and suitable to the students and can be utilized to test specific areas of language. The main point here is to assess students' abilities to recognize and use the English grammatical structures they have learnt.

The pilot administration of the grammar test

The pilot test is implemented to try out the grammar test before it takes its final version. The rationale for piloting the grammar test was fourfold. Firstly, to check the clarity of the items; that is, to assesses whether the test items can be easily comprehended by the students. Secondly, to measure the complexity of the test items. Thirdly, to ensure and establish the test validity and reliability. Finally, to calculate the time required for the students to answer the whole test. The test was given to 20 students from the population, rather than the subjects of this experiment. The average time needed for answering the questions was about 60 minutes. In addition, instructions of the test along with their items were found to be clear for the students. However, some too difficult test items were excluded and replaced by others.

The experiment

The experiment lasted for ten weeks. The instruction of both groups was undertaken by the researcher himself to control the teacher variable in the experiment. Before starting the experiment, both groups were matched in terms of their age, parents' level of education, the level of subjects' achievement in English for the previous academic year, and IQ. The results obtained showed that the EG and the CG were

statistically equivalent across the pretreatment measures. Therefore, the two groups were ready to start and observe the effectiveness of the independent variable. The researcher had taught both groups the materials indicated in the prescribed book (English for Institute Students, Book 3).

The Final administration of the grammar test

At the end of the experiment, the students of both groups (the EG and the CG) were posttested. The time was 60 minutes. After the distribution of test papers, instructions were given on how to answer to avoid any ambiguity relative to the test. Extraneous factors had no interference as the good examination conditions were available for the testees.

Results and Discussion

Result Analysis

The results obtained from the grammar test have been analyzed to determine whether there was a significant difference between the two mean scores of the EG and the CG in the total scores of the grammar post-test. Consequently, the mean score was found to be 70.85 for the EG and 51.60 for the CG. The “T” test formula for the two independent samples was used to find out if there was any significant difference between the mean scores of the two groups. The “T” value calculated was found to be 6.755 at 0.05 level of significance, under 38, the degree of freedom, indicated that there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups. This proves that the EG is better than the CG (see Table 2).

Table (2)

The Mean, Standard Deviation and T-Test Value of the grammar Post-Test Scores of Both Groups

| Group | No. | Mean | SD | T-value | |
|-------|-----|-------|-------|------------|-----------|
| | | | | Calculated | Tabulated |
| EG | 20 | 70.85 | 13.01 | 6.755 | 2.0252 |
| CG | 20 | 51.60 | 10.88 | | |

The statistical analysis of the results indicates that the achievement of the students in the EC was significantly higher in average than that of the students in the CG on total scores of the grammar post-test. The results of the study affirm the contribution of KWL strategy to the third-year students. Thus, the null hypothesis should be rejected.

The findings of the present study reveal that the KWL strategy is able to improve students' achievement in English grammar. These findings could be attributed to the fact that KWL strategy has provided the EG students an excellent opportunity to perform different roles as thinkers,

problem-solvers and decision makers. Playing several roles in the classroom would undoubtedly help the learners acquire and employ English language in different situations more easily. Moreover, this strategy has enabled the students to be more active and participate in the process of learning. The active participation of the students could be ascribed to that the KWL strategy is based on learners' needs and interests. These explanations are supported by Rahmawati's (2018) findings who argued that KWL strategy increases students' activation and independency in achieving the variety of tasks given to them by their teachers. In the first step of KWL lesson, students think independently to explore their previous knowledge about the grammatical aspect (e.g. English tenses, parts of speech, plural forms, etc.) of the language. Then, the second step increases their desire to further learning and create a list of questions about what they want to know. Finally, the students obtain the new information and assess their learning outcomes. Accordingly, the students, in KWL lessons, are considered the centre of the learning process as they have the right to determine what they would like to learn and know at the beginning of each lesson. The result of this study is aligned with the findings of previous studies (e.g. Al-Khateeb & Idrees, 2010; Deckmat, 2012; Dieu, 2015; Fengjuan, 2010). These studies have also found that the KWL has a positive effect on enhancing and developing students' learning skills and activating their learning behavior.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of the present study, it can be concluded that teaching English grammar through KWL strategy is more effective than the PPP method. This is because KWL strategy has created rich learning conditions for the learners to actively participate and engage in the learning process. This would have a positive effect on the learners' achievements in English language. In addition, KWL strategy has increased students' enthusiasm towards learning new information by having the right to list and state what they would like to know and learn. Moreover, KWL strategy helps the learners make their learning process meaningful through setting the aims of their learning and linking their previous knowledge with new information. KWL strategy also has provided a safe and comfortable environment for the learners to learn and acquire the English language.

Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Work

Recommendations

On the basis of the above findings and conclusions, teachers are recommended to adopt KWL strategy in teaching the other language skills and micro-skills like reading, writing, listening, vocabulary and pronunciation. English language teachers can create a friendly and non-threatening classroom environment through employing KWL strategy to build a positive rapport with the students. They are also recommended to alter their teaching roles from dominant figures to facilitators who support their learners to achieve the learning outcomes successfully. English language teachers can encourage students to be independent learners by supplying them with new learning techniques and strategies like KWL strategy. They can make the process of learning meaningful by taking students' needs and their previous knowledge into consideration.

Suggestions for Further Studies

KWL strategy should be applied to investigate other English skills and sub-skills. Further studies could be carried out to investigate the effectiveness of using KWL strategy on developing EFL students' speaking, writing, listening, and pronunciation skills. Other studies could be conducted to assess and measure the impact of KWL strategy on EFL students' motivation, critical thinking and enhancing their attitudes towards learning English at different levels of learning.

References

- ❖ Abreu, L. (2015). Changes in beliefs about language learning and teaching by foreign language teachers in an applied linguistics course. *Dimension*, 136, 163.
- ❖ Achersold and Field (1997). *From reader to reading teacher*. CUP
- ❖ Alahmed, K. I. (2010). *The Effect of the Task-Based Approach on the Achievement of First – Year Students of English in Conversation and Composition at the College of Education*, University of Mosul. (Unpublished M.A. Thesis) University of Mosul, Iraq.
- ❖ Alahmed, K. I. (2017). *Developing Strategic Competence through Task-Based Language Teaching: A Comparison of Implicit and Explicit Instruction*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The University of York.
- ❖ Al-Khateeb, O. & Idrees, M. (2010). The impact of using KWL strategy on grade ten female students' reading comprehension of religious concepts in Ma'an city. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(3), 471-487.
- ❖ Apriliana, A. C. (2022). The effect of DRTA and KWL strategies on students' reading comprehension skills in terms of their reading interest. *PrimaryEdu: Journal of Primary Education*, 6(1), 14-29.
- ❖ Aprizani, Y., Islamiah, N. & Furryanto, F. (2018). Explicit grammar instructions to enhance students' reading ability on cognitive aspect, *Journal of Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 19-25.
- ❖ Boss, C. & Vaughn, S. (2002). *Strategies for teaching students with learning and behaviour problems*. (3rd ed.). USA: Allyn and Bacon press.
- ❖ Brown, H. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). USA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- ❖ Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6th ed.). London: Routledge. Tylor and Francis Group.
- ❖ Conner, J. (2006). Advanced study of the teaching of secondary school reading. In: Instructional reading strategy. Available Online at: <http://www.Indiana.edu/~1517/KWL.htm>.

- ❖ Deckmat, A. (2012). *The Effect of KWL on ELL middle school students' listening comprehension of science content*. (Unpublished M.A thesis). The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.
- ❖ Dieu, T. (2015) Trying K-W-L strategy on teaching reading comprehension to passive students in Vietnam. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 3/6,481-492.
- ❖ Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA Perspective, *Tesol Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- ❖ Fengjuan, Z. (2010). The integration of the know-Want-Learn (KWL) strategy into English language teaching for Non-English Majors. *Chinese Journal of Applied linguistics (bimonthly)*, 33(4), 77-85.
- ❖ Garrett, N. (1986). The problem with grammar: what kind can the language learner use? *The modern language journal*, 70(2), 133-148.
- ❖ Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- ❖ Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching english as a second or foreign language*, (pp.251-266), Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- ❖ Larsen-Freeman, D. (2011) *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University
- ❖ Maree, R. F. & Alahmed, K. I. (2023). Errors Made by Iraqi EFL Learners in the Use of Articles: An Error Analysis Study. *Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities*, 30(7), 71-89.
- ❖ Masnawati, B. (2015). Improving the students' speaking skill through know-want-learn (KWL) Strategy. (Unpublished master's thesis) Muhammadiyah University of Makassar, Makassar, Indonesia.
- ❖ Morris, B. and Stewart-Dore, N. (1981). *Assigning Reading as a Teaching Strategy*, Brisbane C.A.E., Kelvin Grove.
- ❖ Ogle, D.M. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher*, 39(6). 564-570.

- ❖ Oxford, R. L. (2016). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies: Self-regulation in context*. Routledge.
- ❖ Pritchard, A. (2009). *Ways of learning: Learning theories and learning styles in the classroom*. Madison Avenue and New York: Routledge.
- ❖ Purwandari, I., & Wiyanah, S. (2020). Combination off power and KWL strategies to teach writing. ELTICS. *Journal of English Language Teaching and English Linguistics*, 5(1).
- ❖ Rahmawati, E. (2018). Analysis of students' English reading comprehension through KWL (KnowWant-Learn) learning strategies. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education*, 2(3), 238-247.
- ❖ Richards, J. C. and Schmidt, R. W. (2013) *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*, Routledge.
- ❖ Salvucci, S., Walter, E., Conley, V., Fink, S., & Saba, M. (1997). *Measurement error studies at the national center for education statistics (NCES)*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- ❖ Savage, K., Bitterlin, G., & Price, D. (2010). *Teaching grammar in adult ESL programs*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- ❖ Shelly, A. C., Bridwell, B., Hyder, L., Ledford, N., & Patterson, P. (1997). Revisiting the K-W-L: What we Knew; What we Wanted to Know; What we Learned. *Reading Horizons. A Journal of Literacy and Language Arts*, 37 (3), 233-242.
- ❖ Stewart-Dore, N. (1982). Where is the learning we have lost in information? Strategies for effective reading in content areas. Paper presented at the 9th World Congress on Reading, Dublin, Ireland, July 26-30. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED232138.pdf>
- ❖ Terrell, T. D. (1991). The role of grammar instruction in a communicative approach. *The modern language journal*, 75(1), 52-63.

-
- ❖ Thornbury, S. (2009) *How to teach grammar*, Essex England: Pearson Education Limited.
 - ❖ Ur, P. (2009) *Grammar practice activities paperback with CD-ROM: a practical guide for teachers*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - ❖ Usman, B., Fata, I. A., & Pratiwi, R. (2019). Teaching reading through Know-Want-Learned (KWL) strategy: The effects and benefits. *Englisia: Journal of Language, Education, and Humanities*, 6(1), 35-42.
 - ❖ Vold, E. T. (2017): Meaningful and contextualised grammar instruction: what can foreign language textbooks offer?, *The Language Learning Journal*, DOI: 10.1080/09571736.2017.1357745
 - ❖ Widodo, H. P. (2006). Approaches and procedures for teaching grammar, *English teaching: Practice and critique*, 5(1), 122-141.
 - ❖ Williams, M. & Burden, R. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.