Oral Skill Development in Second Languages: A Review in Search of Best Practices

Jordana F. Garbati
Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Callie J. Mady
Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario, Canada

Abstract—**There are many avenues of research in the field of second language (L2) acquisition. One that continues to be of great importance to researchers but also teachers is the development of students' oral proficiency skills. Research regarding effective teaching and learning strategies to aid L2 oral development has garnered much attention, yet a clear set of "best practices" remains absent. In an attempt to bring to the forefront some effective strategies for L2 oral skill development, we undertook a review of the literature in the areas of oral proficiency, academic language development, and L2 teaching and learning strategies. As our review presents research findings from various contexts around the world, our aim is not to provide a one-size-fits-all approach to improving students' L2 oral proficiency but to share issues from research that can and do inform teaching practice. Practical suggestions for L2 teachers that are connected to the findings of research are offered throughout the paper.**

Index Terms—**oral skills development, second language pedagogy, oral proficiency, teacher preparation, second language teaching and learning strategies, communicative competence**

I. INTRODUCTION

Learning to speak in a second language (L2) is often judged to be the most vital of the language skills. In fact, many L2 classes devote much of their time to developing students' oral proficiency. Despite this concentrated effort, a review of the literature in the area of L2 oral skill development reveals that a clearly defined set of best teacher practices does not exist. While researchers and educators tend to agree about some aspects of oral skill development (e.g., the requirement of L2 input), opinions regarding, for example, optimal teaching and assessment strategies differ. The purpose of this paper is to highlight several issues that are currently guiding research and practice in the area of L2 oral skill development; implications for classroom practice will be addressed as well. We begin with an explanation of oral proficiency and a brief overview of our current understanding of academic language development. We then share our methods for conducting this review of the literature. This is followed by a thematic description of research on effective teaching strategies. Our conclusion points to the need for educators to reflect on how classroom communication forwards L2 development.

II. DEFINING ORAL PROFICIENCY

What is oral proficiency? Fisk (1969) questioned whether it is the "ability to express one's thoughts, limited only by vocabulary and knowledge of [language] structure" or "merely the ability to imitate accurately the spoken sounds of the second language and to respond with an appropriate dialogue line if one is asked a familiar question" (p. 65). While decades have passed since her questioning, defining oral proficiency is not as simple as one might imagine. Bachman (1990), for example, proposed two main components to oral communicative competence: organizational and pragmatic. Organizational competence includes grammatical (e.g., vocabulary, morphology, syntax) and textual competence (e.g., discourse genres). Pragmatic competence is composed of illocutionary competence (e.g., requests, promises, offers), and sociolinguistic competence (e.g., sensitivity to language register, dialect). We take into account all these aspects – and consider context as suggested by Hymes' (1972) conceptualization of communicative competence – in our use of the term oral language development.

Teachers' conceptualization of L2 oral language development may be influenced by the theories presented above through their use of frameworks, curriculum documents and/or textbooks, even if they do not consult such theories directly. For example, in draft second language documents in Australia (Australia Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2012), developers have considered the importance of context by preparing students to speak in different contexts (e.g., making a purchase in a store). Whether teachers consult theory directly or turn to other resources that are grounded in theory to inform their practice, the development of length, breadth, spontaneity, and students' ability to engage in a range of topics underscores oral skill improvement as gained from the commonalities among definitions, frameworks, documents and texts.

III. ACADEMIC LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Beyond the definition of oral proficiency, when thinking about "best practices" for L2 oral language teaching, it is important to consider the classroom context. In immersion classroom contexts in particular, L2 learners need to go beyond conversational language; they must develop the language skills required for academic endeavors. Cummins (1980) uses the term "Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills" (BICS) to refer to the language required for basic oral communication and "Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency" (CALP) to refer to the language of schooling. In immersion classrooms, and in contexts where the L2 is the language of schooling, L2 students are required to not only learn the language of communication, but are also required to learn the subject under study. Making note of the importance of academic language development helps us to understand that academic oral language requires specific instructional strategies.

IV. METHODS OF OUR STUDY

Given the above conceptualizations of L2 oral proficiency and academic language development in a variety of contexts, we asked the following question: What does research reveal about how teachers can best support their students' acquisition of L2 speaking skills? In order to explore this question, we conducted a thorough literature search. We first turned to academic databases (e.g., JSTOR) to pull articles related to L2 oral language development. Key words used in our data base search included: *L2 oral skills, proficiency, teaching strategies*. Next, we used the list of key words to search the university library system and the Internet (using Google Scholar). We limited our search to the years 1998-2013 (and made a few exceptions to include a few seminal pieces of research). Next, we conducted a manual search and review of titles and abstracts in well-known academic journals in the areas of education, pedagogy, and applied linguistics (e.g., *The Canadian Modern Language Review, TESOL Quarterly*). Once resources were found, we read articles multiple times and organized the findings from the literature into themes as they emerged. The findings from our thematic analysis of the literature are presented below.

V. TEACHING STRATEGIES

What strategies are the most effective for developing oral language skills? On the one hand, research in the area of oral skill development for L2 learners is varied and plentiful (e.g., see literature in the area of corrective feedback which is discussed below). On the other hand, the varied nature of research contexts, research participants, and research methods has resulted in a large number of suggestions for "best" teaching strategies to assist learners in their L2 oral skill development. We do not intend for this section of our paper to be exhaustive, but our goal is to explain some of the practices that have been shown to be successful and that continue to gain interest in both research and practice. We limit our discussion to the following strategies: explicit teaching, scaffolding, providing authentic encounters, planned and spontaneous presentations, task planning, fluency activities, questioning, role-play, and assessment and feedback.

A. Explicit Teaching

Explicit teaching has the potential to enhance accuracy and expand the range of topics with which our students can engage. Goldenberg's (2008) summary of the key findings of research from the National Literacy Panel and the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (both in the United States) revealed that explicit teaching of the components of an L2 (e.g., syntax, grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and use) is necessary and learners must be provided with a multitude of opportunities for meaningful engagement with the L2.

Researchers agree that a combination of explicit teaching plus opportunities for meaningful and authentic communication helps promote L2 production (e.g., Spada & Lightbrown, 2008). Gibbons (2007) reviewed research in L2 acquisition and systemic functional linguistics and, in particular, explored how classroom discourse mediates academic language learning in the ESL context. She summarizes that language learning does not occur with mere exposure to the L2 in a mainstream classroom. Instead, if subject teaching is planned, specific contexts to develop academic language will be provided (Gibbons, 2007). Researchers conclude that classroom discourse needs to include both general discourse and discipline-specific discourse.

Koike and Pearson (2005) studied the effectiveness of teaching pragmatic information through explicit and implicit instruction for English-speaking learners in a Spanish class. Data was collected from pre-, post- and delayed posttests with comparison groups. Results revealed that the students who received explicit instruction and feedback during exercises performed significantly better than those who did not.

In the Canadian French immersion context where there is a focus on academic L2 production, Lyster (2004) found that form-oriented instructional strategies were more effective than those focused solely on meaning.

Practical application of the above findings, then, requires explicit teaching for the purpose of communication within a specific context. For example, when teaching students how to agree and disagree or express protest or ignorance, explicit teaching may come in the form of a chart (see Table 1), which provides language for different contexts:

TABLE I.
SAMPLE CHART THAT COULD BE USED IN TEACHING STUDENTS HOW TO STATE THEIR OPINION

Express Agreement	Express Disagreement	Protest	Express Ignorance
Of course!	*I don't agree.*	*That is wrong.*	*I am not familiar with…* *I don't know about…*
You're right. *Oh yeah!* *Right on!*	*I don't think so.* *You what?*	*I am against…* *No way.* *You have got to be kidding.*	*Huh?*

B. Scaffolding

Scaffolding instruction is another common way to increase students' L2 oral skill development. Gibbons (2007) refers to scaffolding as "the means whereby a student is able to carry out a task that, alone, he or she would be unable to complete" (p. 703). She suggests that scaffolding is a temporary support that teachers use to help learners and as students show that they are able to produce the target language on their own, the scaffolded instruction is removed.

Scaffolding is beneficial for L2 learners because it involves helping learners "to do" something as well as helping them "to know *how* to do" (Gibbons, 2007, p. 703). Providing effective scaffolding allows teachers to maintain high expectations of learners while also guiding learners to complete tasks successfully. Scaffolding instruction integrates L2 instruction in content-area classes, which may enable L2 learners to demonstrate their knowledge without overly relying on L2 skills. Further, it can provide the learner with tools they need for learning both the L2 and specific subject-related content.

Ewald (2005) investigated student interaction during a formalized, but collaborative, assessment task involving 20 intermediate students of Spanish. Data was collected from students' recorded small-group quiz interactions, their graded written quizzes (which involved both comprehension and production tasks), and questionnaires that elicited information about their perspectives on the use of small-group quizzes. Findings revealed several instances of scaffolding (collaborative interaction) and private speech (self-directed utterances). Ewald's results showed that there was evidence of a high level of interaction among students, which often helped them to make discoveries and reach conclusions about the target language (e.g., grammar topics, test-taking strategies).

Donato (1994) designed a study to explore the ways in which L2 learners co-construct language learning experiences in a classroom setting. Students were observed as they completed a familiar task. In this study, the three learner participants collectively constructed a scaffold for one another's performance (p. 45). During their interaction, it was observed that the students provided guided scaffolded support. In fact, 32 cases of scaffolded help were noted in the one-hour task planning session that was observed in this study and 24 of these were observed during the task performance activity. The author concludes that collaborative tasks can result in scaffolded support among peers and benefit all learners in a group, not simply the individual who originally sought support.

As seen in the above examples, it is not always the teacher who provides scaffolding to support oral skills development. Providing opportunities for students to work together to complete joint production activities can offer occasions where students produce higher quality speech than they would have preparing on their own. Teachers can also provide linguistic scaffolding by modifying their language for example, and cultural scaffolding by encouraging use of students' prior knowledge of language (e.g., their L1).

C. Providing Authentic Encounters

Another teaching strategy that was found to be successful for L2 oral language development is to provide opportunities for students to engage in authentic oral encounters. Such opportunities are rare. August (as cited in Soto-Hinman, 2011) reports that L2 learners in the United States spend less than two percent of their school day developing their oral language skills. Further, rather than engaging L2 learners with academic topics or rigorous content, some teachers have lowered expectations (e.g., accepting one-word responses) (Gibbons, 2002). Similarly, Ernst-Slavit and Mason (2011) used ethnographic and sociolinguistic perspectives to examine the oral academic language used by L2 teachers during content area instruction (mathematics, social studies, language arts). Data was collected from classroom observations of five classes (in Grades 4 and 5) in three school districts, interviews with teachers, photographs, field notes and video and audio recordings. The researchers found that students did not have many opportunities to hear the specialized content language from their teachers during oral, content area instruction and, moreover, encountered a variety of linguistic terms (e.g., *homophones, idiomatic expressions*), which potentially hindered understanding (p. 433).

One practical way of encouraging students' development of their L2 is to provide them with multiple, complex opportunities to speak about academic topics throughout the school day (Soto-Hinman, 2011, p. 21). In order to judge the provision of such opportunities, teachers could monitor, and with appropriate permissions record, the learners' use of language over an identified period of time (e.g., at five minute intervals for a two-hour period). In doing so, they can reflect on their own instructional practices and how they may impact student achievement positively or negatively. Soto-Hinman (2011) found that participants (teachers, students, and administrators) are often surprised at how much talking the classroom teacher does, how much of the interaction in the class is lecture-based, even though the teacher's aim is to develop the learners' oral language.

D. Planned and Spontaneous Presentations

Providing students with opportunities for planned and spontaneous presentations is a practice that can be used to promote authentic encounters. Bunch (2009) summarizes that it is important for learners to grasp both the features of an L2 and the ways in which they can engage in classroom participation structures and routines. In addition to providing opportunities for students to develop their linguistic competence, the L2 learning environment should provide opportunities for interaction.

Bunch (2009) studied the challenges and opportunities for L2 learners during oral presentations in mainstream Grade 7 social studies classrooms. One of the tasks was an oral presentation on an assigned topic. The assignment required students to display their learning to their teacher for evaluation purposes while also considering the audience of real classmates who also doubled as a fictional historical audience (e.g., role-play). During such presentations students used presentational language and managed interpersonal interactions at the same time; this required them to maintain an extended discourse and respond to comments and interjections from the teacher. Among the various findings of this study, there was evidence that the L2 students actively participated in the group work and presentations, including when preparing the presentation, listening to the interaction during a presentation, and speaking during their own presentation.

Group presentations, Bunch (2009) says, are both supportive and challenging for students. When students prepare for and deliver oral presentations, they are given the opportunity for planned comprehensible output, which can aid L2 acquisition (see Swain, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1998). These presentations highlight academic language challenges, acknowledge opportunities for language development that come with these challenges, and predict the supports that might assist with overcoming challenges without eliminating opportunities (Bunch, 2009, p. 81). The language used in oral presentations may also increase the challenge for L2 learners. During oral presentations students are expected to use a "presentational mode" (p. 82) where others are left to interpret and negotiate the meaning of messages. This is in contrast to "interpersonal mode" (p. 82) where students can adjust and clarify their speech as needed while participants monitor one another to verify how meanings are being communicated.

Other researchers have also confirmed the importance of providing opportunities for communication. Coleman and Goldenberg (2009) argue that L2 learners must be given opportunities to use the target language for authentic and functional purposes. Higher levels of proficiency can only be attained through extensive language production and comprehension activities. In order to increase learners' L2 development, students need to interact with teachers and peers in both structured practice situations as well as in spontaneous conversation.

When applying these lessons to our teaching, it would be ideal to offer opportunities where our students complete tasks that require both preparation and spontaneous oral production. A jigsaw activity, where students read and prepare to share of their learning prior to sharing with a group who has not done the same preparation, is an example of a strategy that offers both planned and spontaneous interaction. A mock court proceeding is another example where within a team (crown or defense) students could prepare while responding spontaneously in inter-team interactions.

E. Task Planning

Planning for a task can promote L2 oral development as research has shown that some of the benefits of planned speech come at the actual task planning stage. In a pre-task planning, students are given a limited amount of time (e.g., 10 minutes) prior to completing a task (e.g., a decision-making task, a narrative task) (see Foster & Skehan, 1996; Kobayashi, 2003). Ortega (1999) investigated whether or not planning opportunities resulted in an increased level of focus on form for Spanish as an L2 students (n=64). Students' self-reports indicated that planning can strongly benefit their lexical retrieval process and lexical choices.

Ellis (2009) writes that task planning can have a beneficial impact on the fluency, complexity and accuracy of L2 performance. Rehearsal, for example, gives learners an opportunity to perform the task before the main performance. Rehearsal can be beneficial for oral development because it is thought that if a person performs a task once, this could provide him/her with some planning for performing the task a second time. Strategic planning allows learners to prepare the task while they will need to predetermine the content and how to express the content. Strategic planning can have a positive effect on oral fluency and can lead to the production of more complex language.

Providing students for opportunities to plan together and rehearse are strategies that are easily applied to the L2 class. Teachers may also consider having students record their rehearsal so that they can listen, evaluate and improve before their public sharing.

F. Fluency Activities

Benefits that come with task planning and rehearsing may include fluency improvement. Based on work by Skehan and Foster (1999), Ellis (2009) suggests that fluency can be defined as "the capacity to use language in real time, to emphasize meanings, possibly drawing on more lexicalized systems" (p. 475). As with scaffolding instruction and other methods of promotion of L2 oral development, assessing learners' starting point in oral fluency should be the first step in planning appropriate instruction to suit learners' needs. For example, a checklist could be used to rate learners' pause length, frequency, and speech rate for various oral tasks (e.g., monologues, dialogues, structured and unstructured tasks).

In their review of oral fluency activities and literature, Rossiter, Derwing, Manimtim, and Thomson (2010) summarize three types of oral fluency activities: (a) conscious-raising tasks, (b) rehearsal or repetition tasks, and (c) imposition of time constraints.

Consciousness-raising activities raise learners' awareness of fluency features. For example, instructors can record students' speech acts and then have students analyze their performance, making note of identified criteria which impacts fluency (e.g., their use of filler words such as "um"). Boers, Eyckmans, Kappel, Stengers, & Demecheleer's (2006) conducted a small-scale study of L2 learners' use of formulaic sentences and the extent to which they can help learners' development of oral proficiency. Participants were divided into two groups: (a) a control group who were exposed to audio, video, and textual language material and language was analyzed in a traditional way (emphasis on grammar and vocabulary); and (b) the experimental group who were exposed to the same material but were made aware of formulaic sequences. Pre- and post-interviews were conducted to judge students' oral proficiency before and after instruction. It was found that the experimental group was perceived as more proficient than the control group and, in fact, produced a greater number of formulaic sequences (e.g., standardized phrases such as idiomatic expressions). The researchers concluded that the use of formulaic sequences can help language learners come across as proficient L2 speakers in an interview and an instruction method that raises awareness of these sequences can benefit the way students' proficiency is evaluated by others.

Rehearsal or repetition activities can improve L2 fluency as learners gain familiarity with the language through repetitive tasks. Giving a poster presentation, for example, allows students to rehearse and repeat oral language as the speaker shares information about a topic (outlined on the poster) with people (peers, teachers) who "visit" the speaker at the board. Students can engage in oral interaction through a question and answer exchange. A study relevant to the issue of repetition and oral production is one conducted by Gass, Mackey, Alvarez-Torres, and Fernandez-Garcia (1999) who set out to understand how Spanish L2 learners use their knowledge of the L2 in oral production and whether task repletion, in particular, resulted in more accurate or sophisticated language use. In this comparative study, groups of participants (n=103) watched a silent video segment while they simultaneously recorded their own on-line version in the L2. Over the course of a few days – or up to 2 weeks – two experimental groups watched the video four times and the control group watched it twice. The first experimental group watched the same video three times and a different video for the fourth viewing. The second group watched a different video each of the four times. The control group saw the video only at the first and fourth viewing. Analysis of the results of L2 learners' oral production, show that, in general, the repetition of task resulted in improvement in students' overall proficiency, accuracy in morphosyntax, and greater lexical sophistication.

Imposing time constraints is another method of increasing L2 oral fluency. Nation (1989) describes the 4/3/2 technique whereby a learner spends several minutes mentally preparing to talk on a topic, then is asked to prepare the talk for a classmate for 4 minutes. The speaker is then required to give the same talk to a different classmate in a 3-minute time period. Finally, the speaker is paired with a third classmate and his/her talk must remain within a 2-minute period. In doing this type of activity, learners gain confidence and can access language more easily at each talking instance. In Nation's study of advanced adult L2 learners' speaking performance using the 4/3/2 approach, the rate of learners' speech increased over time as they repeatedly gave a talk over increasing time constraints. In addition, the number of false starts, hesitations, and repeated words decreased. It was found that with each repetition of the speech, the learners' confidence increased and they had easier access to the appropriate language required to fulfill the task.

G. Questioning

Questioning has been shown to be another common strategy used in L2 classrooms to develop students' oral proficiency. It may even be the most common strategy to engage with L2 students (Zwiers, 2007). Kao, Carkin, and Hsu (2011) examined teachers' questioning techniques in a three-week intensive drama-oriented L2 course where data were collected in the form of audio and video recorded classroom observations. As well, students' oral proficiency was measured using pre- and post- language standard proficiency tests. It was found that teachers used questions (e.g., confirming and clarifying questions) to gather new information from students, to contribute to the content of the drama scenes, or to remodel students' inaudible or grammatically incorrect utterances. Analysis of the oral tests showed that students had produced significantly more words and communication units; further, the mean length of communication unit was significantly longer in the post-test. The researchers concluded that through appropriate questioning techniques, low-level L2 learners can carry out natural interaction in an L2 classroom.

Collins, Stead, and Woolfrey (2004) use questioning as one way of encouraging interaction in intensive French classes. A daily routine in the intensive French class, for example, may include the teacher modeling questions and answers about the date, weather, seasons, etc., at the initial stage, and then the students take the lead role, asking questions and interacting with other students in the class. The authors write that this type of interactive routine provides students with a language repertoire that they can begin to use automatically which gives them a feeling that they can converse in French. Further, eventually and gradually, students can produce the learned expressions spontaneously.

When teachers implement a questioning approach, Soto-Hinman (2011) warns that it is important that questions elicit language which requires elaboration rather than simply one-word responses. If open-ended questions are used, then students have multiple ways to enter into, and extend, a conversation. When students are asked a question, they should be encouraged to elaborate on them. When students are not aware of how to elaborate, teachers should guide students as to why and how to elaborate.

H. Role-play

Role-play gives learners an opportunity to act in life-like situations so that they can learn, for example, conversational linguistic and behavioural structures for particular situations (New Brunswick Department of Education, 1996). Several researchers have noted the importance of role-plays for the development of L2 oral proficiency. For instance, Guilfoyle and Mistry (2012) investigated the effectiveness of role-play in supporting oral skill development of beginner learners of an L2. Data were collected via teacher questionnaires and interviews as well as observations of four learners over a 1-month period. Findings from this study showed that students demonstrated an improved use of the L2 and a wide range of language learning strategies as well as a decreased use of their home language when engaged in role-play activities.

In Sasaki's (1998) comparison of the use of a written production questionnaire and oral role-play in an L2, students orally responded to four request and four refusal situations (e.g., ask for a pen, ask for a long interview, refuse coffee offer, refuse party invitation). Analysis of L2 learners' response length, range and content of expressions, and native speaker evaluations of these responses revealed that role-plays resulted in longer responses and students' use of a greater number of diverse strategies than production questionnaires.

Dicks and LeBlanc (2005) offer a practical means for L2 teachers to easily use role-play in their classes. They suggest that teachers brainstorm a context and accompanying themes and topics with their students. The students would then identify activities that take place in the chosen context, choose characters and create scenarios. This process is especially feasible due to the opportunity to use it several times throughout a course.

I. Assessment and Feedback

The quality and type of assessment and feedback provided to L2 learners plays an important role in learners' oral language development. Corrective feedback emphasizes both the negative and positive evidence in students' L2 development (Lyster & Saito, 2010). Lyster and Ranta (1997) studied corrective feedback and students' responses to such feedback in junior level (Grades 4 and 5) French immersion classrooms. Data was collected in the form of audio-recordings (which were later transcribed) of classroom interaction in content-area and French language arts lessons. The researchers found that although the four teacher participants in the study implemented six types of feedback strategies four – elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification requests, and repetition – were the most likely to elicit student-generated repair (i.e., "the correct reformulation of an error as uttered in a single student turn") (p. 49). Explicit correction led to student-repair only 50% of the time while recasts, although used often by the four teachers in this study, proved to be the least likely to lead to any type of student-repair. The most successful technique for this is elicitation. That is, all utterances following elicitation feedback involved student-repair.

Gibbons (2003) examined how two teachers, through their interaction with students of English as an L2, mediated students' English skills and their subject matter (science) in a content-based classroom. The data sources, drawn from a larger study involving 9- and 10-year olds (n=60) in an Australian school where 92% of the students in the school were from language backgrounds other than English, included audio recordings and transcriptions of 14 hours of classroom discourse, printed classroom work (i.e., posters, children's work, charts), field notes, and interviews with teachers and students. She concludes that teachers can successfully mediate language in several ways: (a) recasting (where a L2 speaker's utterances are reformulated at the level of morphology or syntax or where a teacher rewords any piece of a student's meaning in a more appropriate way); (b) signaling to students how they can self-reformulate (where a teacher signals a need for clarification, teacher may offer a recoded version of the student's expression once he/she has had sufficient opportunity to self-correct); and (c) modeling alternative ways of recontextualizing personal knowledge (Gibbons, 2003, p. 258, 267).

In practical terms, when interacting with L2 students on a one-on-one or small group basis, teachers can rephrase a student's incorrect oral response and prompt him/her to offer an improved version. The use of audio or video recordings of students' oral (formal) presentations may guide teachers' use of feedback strategies. Listening to recordings or watching videos alongside students can provide opportunities for teachers to explicitly correct L2 learners as well as raise their awareness of their own oral skill development. In implementing corrective feedback, it is important for teachers to use strategies that suit the needs and goals of their learners.

VI. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this paper was to review findings from recent research about L2 oral development. The teaching strategies outlined here were those that emerged as themes in the literature. These strategies are not listed to suggest a "one size fits all" approach. Instead, these strategies are to be implemented with careful consideration of context. It is useful to highlight that the instructional approach that teachers adopt has an impact on the quality and effectiveness of the learning context for L2 learners (Gibbons, 2007). Educators should reflect on the nature of classroom communication and how it "cultivates or hinders the growth of thinking and language" (Zwiers, 2007, p. 113). When educators have a solid understanding of both L2 theory and how it informs practice, they will be able to better meet the needs of L2 learners in language-specific classes as well as in mainstream content classes.

REFERENCES

[1] Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2012). Australian curriculum: Languages Italian. Retrieved April 2015 from http://consultation.australiancurriculum.edu.au/Static/docs/Languages/Italian%20-Draft%20F-10%20Scope%20and%20Sequence%20-%20December%202012.pdf.

[2] Bachman, L. (1990). Fundamental considerations in language testing. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

[3] Boers, F., J. Eyckmans, J. Kappel, H. Stengers & M. Demecheleer. (2006). Formulaic sequences and perceived oral proficiency: Putting a lexical approach to the test. Language Teaching Research 10, 245-261.

[4] Bunch, G. C. (2009). "Going up there": Challenges and opportunities for language minority students during a mainstream classroom speech event. Linguistics and Education, 20, 81-108.

[5] Coleman, R. & C. Goldenberg, (2009). What does research say about effective practices for English learners? Introduction and part 1: Oral language proficiency. Kappa Delta Pi Record 46.1, 10-16.

[6] Collins, J., S. Stead & S. Woolfrey. (2004). Rethinking teaching strategies for Intensive French. The Canadian Modern Language Review 60.3, 355-372.

[7] Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. TESOL Quarterly 14.2, 175-187.

[8] Dicks, J. & B. LeBlanc. (2005). Le centre des jeunes et fondements pédagogiques. Retrieved April 2015 from http://www.unbf.ca/L2/Resources/drama.htm

[9] Donato, R. (1994). Collective scaffolding in second language learning. In J. P. Lantolf & G. Appel (eds.), Vygotskian approaches to second language research. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 33-56.

[10] Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. Applied Linguistics 30.4, 474-509.

[11] Ernst-Slavit, G. & M. R. Mason. (2011). "Words that hold us up": Teacher talk and academic language in five upper elementary classrooms. Linguistics and Education 22, 430-440.

[12] Ewald, J. (2005). Language-related episodes in an assessment context: A "small-group quiz". The Canadian Modern Language Review 61.4, 565-586.

[13] Fisk, S. (1969). What goals for FLES? Hispania 52.1, 64-69.

[14] Foster, P. & P. Skehan. (1996). The influence of planning on performance in task-based learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 18, 299-324.

[15] Gass, S., A. Mackey, M. J. Alvarez-Torres & M. Fernandez-Garcia. (1999). The effects of task repetition on linguistic output. Language Learning 49.4, 549-581.

[16] Gibbons, P. (2002). Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

[17] Gibbons, P. (2003). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a content-based classroom. TESOL Quarterly 37.2, 247-273.

[18] Gibbons, P. (2007). Mediating academic language learning through classroom discourse. In J. Cummins & C. Davison (eds.), International handbook of English language teaching (pp. 701-718). New York: Springer.

[19] Goldenberg, C. (2008, Summer). Teaching English language learners: What the research does – and does not – say. American Educator [A1], 32(2), 8-44.

[20] Guilfoyle, N. & M. Mistry. (2012). How effective is role play in supporting speaking and listening for pupils with English as an additional language in the foundation stage? International Journal of Primary, Elementary and Early Years Education 41.1, 63-70.

[21] Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 53-73). Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books. Retrieved April 2015 from http://humanidades.uprrp.edu/smjeg/reserva/Estudios%20Hispanicos/espa3246/Prof%20Sunny%20Cabrera/ESPA%203246%20-%20On%20Communicative%20Competence%20p%2053-73.pdf.

[22] Kao, S.-M., G. Carkin & L.-F. Hsu. (2011). Questioning techniques for promoting language learning with students of limited L2 oral proficiency in a drama-oriented language classroom. The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance 16.4, 489-515.

[23] Kobayashi, M. (2003). The role of peer support in ESL students' accomplishment of oral academic tasks. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 59.3, 337-368.

[24] Koike, D. A., & Pearson, L. (2005). The effect of instruction and feedback in the development of pragmatic competence. System 33, 481-501.

[25] Lyster, R. (2004). Differential effects of prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 26, 399-432.

[26] Lyster, R. & L. Ranta. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 20, 37-66.

[27] Lyster, R. & K. Saito. (2010). Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 32, 265-302.

[28] Nation, P. (1989). Improving speaking fluency. System 17.3, 377-384.

[29] New Brunswick Department of Education. (1996). A resource guide for educators of English second language learners. Retrieved April 2015 from http://www.gnb.ca/0000/publications/curric/resourceesllearners.pdf.

[30] Ortega, L. (1999). Planning and focus on form in L2 oral performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21, 109-148.

[31] Rossiter, M. J., T. M. Derwing, L. G. Manimtim & R. I. Thomson. (2010). Oral fluency: The neglected component in the communicative language classroom. The Canadian Modern Language Review, 66(4), 583-606.

[32] Sasaki, M. (1998). Investigating EFL students' production of speech acts: A comparison of production questionnaires and role plays. Journal of Pragmatics 30, 457-484.

[33] Skehan, P. & P. Foster. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. Language Learning 49.1, 93-120.

[34] Soto-Hinman, I. (2011, Winter). Increasing academic oral-language development: Using English language learning shadowing in classrooms. *Teaching Language Learning*, 18(2), 21[A1]-23.
[35] Spada, N. & P. M. Lightbrown. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly* 42.2, 181-207.
[36] Swain, M. (2005). The output hypothesis: Theory and research. In E. Hinkel (ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 471-484.
[37] Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal* 82, 320-337.
[38] Zwiers, J. (2007). Teacher practices and perspectives for developing academic language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 17.1, 93-116.

Jordana F. Garbati is the Writing Consultant at Wilfrid Laurier University's Writing Centre. She holds a PhD in Education. Her research interests include second language teaching and learning, French as a Second Language, English as a Second Language, and writing in the disciplines.

Callie J. Mady is an Associate Professor in the Schulich School of Education at Nipissing University. She holds a PhD in Education. Her research interests include additional language learning, inclusive classrooms, French as a second language pedagogy and teacher beliefs.