

AI-MEDIATED MONOLOGUE SPEAKING FOR
WORKPLACE COMMUNICATION IN A TRANSITIONING ESL CONTEXT

Lê Thị Yến | Hanoi Financial and Banking University (FBU), Vietnam
Abstract ID #2411 | Pedagogy & Curriculum | Contact: leyen@fbu.edu.vn

1. INTRODUCTION & RESEARCH GAP

- Generative AI can support idea generation, language development and feedback in L2 learning (Kasneci et al., 2023; Lo, 2023; Wang et al., 2024).
- Technology can expand learner choice, but autonomy and agency depend on how learners evaluate and act on available resources (Mercer, 2012; Reinders & White, 2016).
- Less is known about how lower-proficiency learners exercise agency while using AI for workplace-oriented monologue speaking.
- Purpose: examine early changes in speaking performance and patterns of learner agency during a six-week AI-mediated classroom intervention.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

RQ1

How did workplace-related monologue speaking performance change from baseline to the early-intervention assessment?

RQ2

What patterns of learner agency were evident during AI-mediated speaking practice?

RQ3

How did learners describe their use of, decisions about, and experiences with AI support?

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

AI-MEDIATED SPEAKING

LEARNING BEHAVIOURS

LEARNER AGENCY

SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

PLANENGAGEDECIDERELECT

4. METHODOLOGY

PARTICIPANTS

114 third-year Chinese Language majors
English 2 · FBU, Vietnam (EFL setting)

DESIGN

Six-week mixed-methods
classroom intervention

INTERVENTION

Tasks 2–6 · guided ChatGPT use
via the learning cycle

ANALYSIS

Paired comparison · descriptive/reliability
analysis · thematic analysis

DATA SOURCES

Speaking n=114

5-criterion rubric · 0–10

Agency n=108

10-item questionnaire

Reflection n=95

Task 2 reflection

Interview n=13

Semi-structured

5. PRELIMINARY KEY FINDINGS

RQ1 · SPEAKING PERFORMANCE

4.12 → 6.34 /10

+2.22 points · 110/114 improved

t(113) = 16.40 · p < .001 · dz = 1.54

Task achievement

+0.66

Fluency

+0.49

Organization

+0.46

Language use

+0.34

Pronunciation

+0.28

Largest gains: Task Achievement and Fluency

RQ2 · LEARNER AGENCY

Autonomous
decision-making

4.26 /5

Strategic AI
engagement

4.25 /5

Goal-directed
planning

4.19 /5

Reflective
learning

4.19 /5

Overall agency M = 4.22 · α = .945

94.4% reported modifying AI suggestions to fit their own speaking purpose and style.

Interpret as self-reported agency patterns, not causal change.

RQ3 · LEARNER EXPERIENCE

AI SUPPORTED
PREPARATION

Ideas · outlining · language
support

LEARNERS ADAPTED
AI OUTPUT

Evaluate · select · simplify ·
modify

BENEFITS WITH
TENSIONS

Difficulty · naturalness ·
dependence

“I selected ideas from several AI responses and then completed the speech myself.”
— P09

Across questionnaire, reflection and interview data, learners consistently reported selecting and adapting AI output. AI appeared to reshape preparation practices more clearly than oral practice itself.

AI-MEDIATED SPEAKING INTERVENTION

SIX WORKPLACE-ORIENTED MONOLOGUE TASKS

1

CAREERS · BASELINE

Professional self-introduction

2

COMPANIES

Company introduction

3

SELLING · INTERIM

Product launch presentation

4

GREAT IDEAS

Innovation proposal

5

STRESS

Workplace stress & coping

6

ENTERTAINING

Business entertaining scenario

Tasks 2–6 · Guided Ai-mediated Practice
Plan → Prompt → Evaluate → Adapt → Practice → Reflect

BASELINE SNAPSHOT

4.12 mean /10 1.71 SD 0–7.5 range

Task achievement

1.03

Organization

0.79

Language use

0.75

Pronunciation

0.87

Fluency

0.68

Lowest baseline dimension: FLUENCY (M = 0.68 / 2)

AI-MEDIATED LEARNING CYCLE

1 PLAN

Set goal & outline

2 PROMPT

Request targeted support

3 EVALUATE

Check relevance, level & usefulness

4 ADAPT

Accept · modify · reject

5 PRACTISE

Rehearse & perform

6 REFLECT

Record decisions & learning

Learner ownership remains central across the cycle.

6. CONCLUSION & IMPLICATIONS

PERFORMANCE

Speaking scores increased substantially from baseline to the early-intervention assessment.

AGENCY

Learners reported active evaluation, selection and adaptation of AI-generated content.

LIMITATIONS: no control group · one rater · agency evidence largely self-reported

PEDAGOGY

AI-mediated speaking tasks should emphasize learner evaluation, adaptation and ownership - not answer generation alone.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Godwin-Jones, R. (2024). Distributed agency in second language learning and teaching through generative AI.

Kasneci, E., et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? Opportunities and challenges of LLMs for education. Learning and Individual Differences, 103, 102274.

Lo, C. K. (2023). What is the impact of ChatGPT on education? A rapid review. Education Sciences, 13(4), 410.

Mercer, S. (2012). The complexity of learner agency. Apples - Journal of Applied Language Studies, 6(2), 41–59.

Reinders, H., & White, C. (2016). 20 years of autonomy and technology: How far have we come and where to next? Language Learning & Technology, 20(2), 143–154.

Wang, C., et al. (2024). ChatGPT for L2 learning: Current status and implications. System, 124, 103351.