TEACHER AND STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF L1-ORAL LANGUAGE LESSONS IN DUTCH SECONDARY EDUCATION

J.G.R. WURTH*, E.H. TIGELAAR*, H. HULSHOF*, J.C. DE JONG** AND W.F. ADMIRAAL*

Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching, Leiden University
**Leiden University, Faculty of Humanities, Journalism and New Media*

Abstract

Little is known about contemporary L1-oral language lesson practices in secondary education. In The Netherlands experts work on an upcoming L1-educational reform. In this study, we investigate teachers' and students' perceptions of contemporary L1-oral language lesson practices as well as the underlying rationales of these lessons. Eleven L1-teachers were interviewed and 212 of their students completed a digital questionnaire. Both teachers and their students mentioned L1-oral language education is important, even though in most cases it forms a rather small part of the L1-curriculum. In general, both groups reported that in L1-oral language lessons attention is paid to cognitive (such as rhetoric and argumentation theory), linguistic and presentational content elements. Teachers also reported that they teach their students how to use feedback and how to give constructive peer feedback. Both teachers and students considered practising and receiving feedback as mutually reinforcing for developing oral language skills. However, due to shortage of time in the lessons, teachers and students in particular, expressed concerns about having insufficient opportunity to practise oral language skills. The teachers reported two other hindrances for good L1-oral language teaching: difficulties with organizing a safe learning environment and valid assessment procedures. These barriers have to be taken into account when designing educational innovations for L1-oral language lessons.

Key words: L1-oral language, teaching practice, secondary education, curriculum, teacher and student perceptions

1.   INTRODUCTION

In recent decades, L1-oral language education has been incorporated into the L1-curricula for secondary education in many countries, such as Denmark, Finland, Flanders, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the USA and the United Kingdom (Van de Ven, 2005). In 2001, the Council of Europe published The Common European Framework with a clear place for L1- and L2-oral language education. Subsequently, the OECD's DeSeCo documents (2005) for the global educational PISA project clearly emphasized the importance of students' verbal competency and described spoken and written language as 'an essential tool for functioning well in society and the workplace and participating in an effective dialogue with others. Terms such as "communication competence" or "literacies" are associated with this key competency' (p.10).

Despite these developments, this period has only produced a small body of scientific literature that addresses L1-oral language education in secondary schools (Hoogeveen & Bonset, 1998; Bonset & Braaksma, 2008; Kaldahl, Bachinger & Rijlaarsdam, 2019; Kaldahl, 2019; Wurth et al., 2019). In recent decades, L1-experts have repeatedly underlined the importance of research into L1-oral language practices, including teaching practices, oral language curricula and the assessment of oral language competency, in order to empirically build a knowledge base to support the development of L1-oral language education (Lammers, 1993; Hoogeveen & Bonset, 1998; Bonset & Braaksma, 2008; Kaldahl et al., 2019). With a comprehensive reform of the Dutch L1-curriculum ahead, it seems even more pressing to build a solid, contemporary scientific foundation to inform the L1-oral language curricula changes.

Yet, academic research on education often faces obstacles in finding its way into the classroom. An important explanation for this might be the significant gap between the educational innovations envisioned and the reality of the classroom practice. To successfully implement a new curriculum, therefore, it is necessary to connect it to contemporary classroom practice experiences. In addition, Janssen, Westbroek, Doyle and Van Driel (2013) argue that for educational developmental work to be meaningful, it is essential to create innovative designs that are practical for teachers to use, i.e., there must be a practical connection between the innovation and the reality of teaching.

To improve our understanding of *teacher practicality* of innovations in L1-oral language education, it is crucial to first of all investigate how teachers and students perceive contemporary L1-oral language teaching practices. This could contribute to deepen our understanding of how they perceive teaching practices in terms of lesson objectives, content and learning activities, as well as the underlying rationales of those practices (Van den Akker, Kuiper & Nieveen, 2012). In line with this reasoning, the aim of this study is to investigate teachers' and students' perceptions of contemporary L1-oral language lesson practices as well as the underlying rationales of these lessons. To the existing body of literature on L1-oral language education, this study adds recent findings and deepening insights about what teachers and students think

of the contemporary L1-oral language classroom curriculum. It could therefore contribute to the process of making L1-oral language educational innovations practical and successful.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH FOCUS

2.1 Oracy, oral presentation competence and oral language skills

Wilkinson (1965) introduced the concept of *oracy* and specified this as speaking and listening skills which are relevant in all kinds of speaking situations, from formal to informal and from a large audience to a small group of listeners. In recent scientific studies, such as Kaldahl, et al. (2019), Kaldahl (2019), and Wurth, et al. (2019), this concept has been used in an attempt to describe the essence of contemporary L1-oral language education. A connected concept to oracy is the notion of *oral presentation competence*. De Grez (2009) defines oral presentation competence as the 'combination of knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to speak in public in order to inform, self-express, relate, or to persuade' (p. 5). A specification of oracy, *oral language skills*, is defined by Mercer, Warwick & Ahmed (2016) as a set of skills being important for oracy, among which are physical (e.g., voice and body language), linguistic (e.g., vocabulary and structure), cognitive (e.g., content, reasoning and audience awareness) and social and emotional skills (e.g., confidence while speaking). These concepts of oracy, oral language competence and oral language skills are operationalized in the examination programmes of several Western countries such as Great Britain, Norway, Australia and The Netherlands and consequently fuel L1-oral language teaching practices (Department for Education, 2014; Knowledge Promotion, 2006; Australian Curriculum, 2015; Meestringa, Ravesloot & Bonset, 2012). The programmes mentioned show some educational differences, i.e. in Norway oracy is not only part of L1-education but is taught throughout all of the different school subjects (Kaldahl, 2020). The current study focusses on Dutch oral language education in L1-classes in secondary education. To be able to effectively examine the curriculum, as perceived by teachers and students, it is important that the current study is informed by previous research.

2.2 Research into L1-oral language curriculum development

Wurth, et al. (2019) described several studies on L1-oral language education in their review study. We first discuss some of these studies which focus on aspects of L1-oral language curriculum development and, second, we discuss the major findings of this review study (2019). An example of a study which aims to contribute to the development of the L1-oral language curriculum is the ethnographic case study among 24 students in the United Kingdom of Baxter (2000). Baxter explored the characteristics of an effective 'public' speaker at General Certificate of Secondary Education (GSCE) level with the aim of providing pedagogical guidance to help students develop

speaking skills. To become an effective speaker, students have to develop: 1. their ability to speak out; 2. case-making skills ('in order to construct a persuasive argument, drawing upon a wide range of types of speech', p.31); 3. flexibility while speaking; 4. the ability to challenge dominant views; and 5. the ability to use humour to persuade. To support these skills, Baxter argues that teachers have to create a safe learning environment, competitive learning settings (e.g., organizing difficult discussions), and frequent opportunities to discuss and analyse the effectiveness of speaking exercises and speaking examples on video.

In another, descriptive qualitative study, Oliver, Haigh & Rochecouste (2005), examined oral language and communicative competence as part of the teaching and assessment practices of secondary schools in Western Australia. The participating Australian L1-teachers considered L1-oral language education important for students' future lives. The teachers reported that they mainly teach and assess public speaking rather than a broad range of oral language forms, such as 'types of talk required for social interaction' (p. 215). Furthermore, the teachers reported that they focus on writing skills rather than speaking skills and that they lack oral language assessment skills. Their students mentioned that they lack confidence in carrying out oral language tasks in the classroom. They also thought that L1-oral language education did not adequately address weaknesses of their communicative competence. According to Oliver et al. (2005), a needs-based approach in oral language teaching seems to be desirable to further develop the L1-oral language curriculum in secondary education.

Yet another research focus was chosen for the case study of Mercer, Warwick & Ahmed (2016), a study among teachers from 4 schools in the UK and 24 of their students. The researchers examined a toolkit being tested for teachers which provided guidance on monitoring and assessing students' progress in oral language skills. The toolkit contained the Oracy skills framework for understanding spoken language skills, a set of assessment tasks, and a rating scheme for formative and summative assessment. The Oracy skills framework was developed after studying research into oral language use, consultations and discussions with L1-teachers and other relevant experts (such as drama teachers and experts in English studies and sociolinguistics) and analysing 'previously developed assessment tools' (p.55). The four areas distinguished in the framework - 'physical, linguistic, cognitive, and social and emotional' - represent the different types of skill that are involved in the effective use of spoken language' (p.55). Teachers and students were motivated to work with this toolkit as they regarded the toolkit elements as comprehensible and clear.

Finally, Wurth, et al. (2019) conducted an internationally oriented literature review on L1-oral language education in secondary education for the period of 1995 to 2019. The research question of this study was: *"What are the key elements of good-quality L1-oral language teaching in secondary education?"* (2019, p.3). From thirteen studies, Wurth, et al. (2019, p.18) identified five key elements that they concluded to be important for L1-oral language teaching: *1) a clear oral language skills framework with criteria; 2) the exploration of students' speaking potential by*

analysis and assessment of oracy skills; 3) self-, peer- and teacher-feedback on speaking; 4) observations of and discussions about videotaped speakers; and 5) regular practice with various speaking tasks. This review as well as the other studies mentioned make clear that teachers of L1-oral language need support to elaborate and improve their teaching practice.

2.3 Dutch L1-oral language education

L1-oral language education in the Netherlands, the context of this study, is operationalized as the teaching of monological and dialogical skills (Meestringa, Ravesloot & Bonset, 2012). This involves learning how to search for and select relevant information for a speaking task, and learning to present the selected information adequately considering the speaking goal of the given oral-language task, the speaking genre, and the audience. Of all tasks, such as a debate or a discussion, formal public speaking is the most widely taught and assessed L1-oral language task in Dutch upper secondary education (Meestringa & Ravesloot, 2012). The narrow base of Dutch L1-curricular research indicates that over the last few decades L1-teachers in secondary education have mainly experienced L1-oral language education as important but hard to teach and assess, too time consuming with too large class sizes to manage (i.e. 25 to 30 students) and too laborious (Lammers, 1993; Bonset, 1996; Hoogeveen & Bonset, 1998; Bonset & Braaksma 2008).

In the Netherlands, two literature reviews (Hoogeveen & Bonset, 1998; Bonset & Braaksma, 2008) commented on research into L1-oral language education in The Netherlands and Flanders (Belgium), covering a period of almost four decades (1969-2007). Apart from the picture described above, these two review studies reported about studies that focused on teaching practices. In particular, these studies generated some recommendations on possible ways to improve L1-oral language lessons.

Hoogeveen and Bonset (1998) reported in a review study for the period 1969-1998 on 30 studies that partly (14) or solely (16) focused on L1-oral language education. These descriptive studies, large-scale and small-scale, focused largely on learner needs, learning objectives, learning activities, assessment tools and evaluation (p. 395). Two studies (Couzijn, 1992; De Glopper & Van Schooten, 1990) showed that students and L1-teachers (in secondary schools and higher education) did value L1-oral language education, although rather less positively than education in writing. The results of the other large-scale studies mentioned in the review study of Hoogeveen and Bonset showed that both teachers and students consider the development of L1-oral language skills to be important. However, students generally experienced developing speaking skills as quite challenging and teachers reported L1-oral language skills as difficult to teach and assess. As a result of this, many teachers seemed to spend little time on oral language skills in their L1 lessons.

Yet, the small-scale studies described in the review study of Hoogeveen and Bonset (1998) showed some local good practices in L1-oral language education. Two recommendations were mentioned to resolve the time issues: let the students

cooperate during L1-oral language tasks and link the preparation of L1-oral language tasks to reading and writing lessons. The structure of the described lessons could be typified as a small cycle of the performance of the whole task- reflection—a new performance of the whole task. Teachers and students reported however, that the effectiveness of the reflection phase was low because of the quality of the given feedback (p. 379).

As a follow up to this review study, Bonset and Braaksma (2008, p.143) reported on only three more studies in this field for the period 1998-2007, all descriptive studies, with a focus on learning activities and assessment tools. In Gelinck (2000), teachers reported an increase in L1-oral language lessons in the L1-curriculum, compared to the situation in 1987. Gelinck concluded that the speech or lecture was the most frequently used form in L1-lessons, followed by discussion and debate. Teachers and students who were familiar with debating in class positively appraised this type of lesson. However, overall, L1-oral language teachers still perceived available time and assessment as problematic. Opinion-forming conversation in L1-education was the focus of research by Bonset (1998) who found different outcomes related to pedagogical design, possible roles for students, and students' experienced level of challenge with the task. Heuves and Kuhlemeier (1998) studied the validity and reliability of an assessment tool developed for the assessment of discussion skills. Teachers who had tested the tool reported that the particular instrument was manageable and acceptable.' Following Bonset and Braaksma (2008, p. 145) these three studies have in common that they show evidence of a positive trend for the teaching and assessment of L1-oral language skills.

2.4 Research focus

Although the studies presented above do provide some general insights into how L1-oral language teaching is perceived and evaluated and although some of them provide some guidance for L1-oral language teaching, a more thorough understanding of teachers' and students' experiences with contemporary L1-oral language classroom practices is needed to further the knowledge base of L1-oral language education and to develop L1-oral language classroom practices. Therefore, where other studies illuminated parts of the L1-oral language curriculum, this study focusses on all curricular aspects of the L1-oral language curriculum. We formulated the following research question: How do students and teachers at Dutch secondary schools perceive and value contemporary L1-oral language teaching practice?

3.   METHOD

3.1 Participants

To recruit participants, fifteen schools across the Netherlands from the researchers' institutes' network received an open invitation to participate. Each school addressed

was invited to put forward one teacher (on a voluntary basis) who taught students aged 15 to 18. Furthermore, during a national conference, teachers were informed about the study and invited to participate. The participating teacher's class could be either an upper general secondary class or a pre-university class.

In total, eleven L1-teachers (six females and five males) from different schools participated in an interview. Most of the participants' schools were situated in the Western part and central part of the Netherlands with a mix of urban and rural districts. The participating teachers were experienced teachers (5 years of teaching or more) and had an academic teaching qualification. Each teacher invited the students from one upper-secondary class (age 15-18) to complete a questionnaire. In total, 212 students agreed to participate. Both teachers and students cooperated on a voluntary basis and were informed about the research project before they were asked for their written consent. Research clearance was obtained from the Ethical Committee of the ICLON Graduate School of Teaching, Leiden University, file number: ICLON-IREC 2017-02.

3.2 Instruments and procedure

This research focuses on student and teacher perceptions of L1-oral language education. To gain insight into students' perceptions, the students completed an online questionnaire. This questionnaire was based on the described oracy concepts, the Dutch examination program and the findings from described previous studies, in particular the study of Wurth, et al. (2019). Moreover, the elements of the often used and generally accepted curricular spiderweb of Thijs & Van den Akker (2009) informed and structured the instrument. We used the curricular spider web of Thijs & Van de Akker because we aimed to describe current L1-oral lesson practices on the curriculum level. The five key elements for L1-oral language teaching based on the literature study by Wurth, et al. (2019) are formulated in a way that is too general for the current study. To gain insight into the perceptions of the eleven teachers, a semi-structured interview protocol was developed with use of the same resources and structuring as described above.

The curricular spiderweb of Thijs & Van den Akker is a general curriculum model that shows all interconnected elements of an educational curriculum. The vision, or the rationale, forms the centre of the web and connects all the other nine curriculum elements. Ideally the curriculum elements are interconnected as well, so that together they form a consistent and coherent curriculum (SLO, 2019).

The spiderweb is used for analyzing the present as well as the ideal situation (SLO, 2019) and is based on Goodlad's (1979) curriculum work. This study mainly focused on what Goodlad calls the perceived curriculum, referring to what teachers believe about what is being taught and learned, and the experienced curriculum, referring to students' reported experiences in classroom practice.

The majority of the curricular elements described in the developed instruments correspond to the terms Thijs & Van den Akker used. Two terms were adapted

because the focus in the current study was on classroom practice. For this reason, the term 'Teacher Role' was changed to 'Organization and Teacher Role' and 'Location' became 'Learning Environment'. Furthermore, to simplify the terms, 'Rationale/vision' became 'Rationale' and 'Aims and Objectives' became simply 'Objectives'.

Both the instruments were tested by a L1-teacher and eight of her students from an upper secondary school class (5 havo). While the test responses seemed functional and useable, the tests did not lead to alternations of the instruments. Only some small adjustments were made to improve the instruction for students.

3.2.1   Student perceptions

Students received instructions and a link to the online survey. They also participated on a voluntary basis. Each participating class students had 20 minutes to complete the questionnaire in a computer room in the school. Students provided their answers to the 65 questionnaire items on a 4-point Likert-type scale with 1= totally disagree, 2= slightly agree, 3= moderately agree, 4= totally agree. Use of the 4-point Likert scale forced the students to make a clear choice but for each item they also had the option to tick the box "I don't know". Answers with 'I don't know' were excluded from the analysis. One item about how often oral language is addressed in L1-classes (Time) was measured on a five-point Likert-type scale (see Table 1) because it was a different type of question. Four open questions were added at the end of the questionnaire. In Table 1, we show the curriculum elements, the scales distinguished for each curriculum element, the reliability in terms of Cronbach's alpha and example items. In general, the reliability of the scales was satisfactory. For the curriculum elements Grouping, Materials, Time and Learning Environment, single items were used.

Table 1. Student questionnaire [i= question item]

Curriculum elements	Scale name [items]	Cronbach's Alpha	Example item
Rationale	Importance explained by teacher [i 7-9]	0.67	My Dutch teacher talks to us in class about why the speaking skills component is important.
	Importance as experienced by students [i 4-6]	0.69	I think it is important to develop my speaking skills.
Objectives	Clarity of objectives [i 10, 14-19, 34, 64]	0.90	It is clear to me what we are learning in the lessons on speaking skills.
Content	Content elements of L1-oral language teaching [20-29]	0.91	In the lessons on speaking skills, I learn about my posture (e.g., how to search for information and practising giving the presentation)
Learning activities	Practising in class [i 31, 36, 38, 39]	0.77	I'm given the opportunity to practise my speaking skills during the Dutch lessons.

	Feedback [i 35, 41-45]	0.87	I want to use my teacher's feedback to improve my speaking skills myself
Organization and teacher role	Teacher-centred approach [i 55-57]	0.80	My teacher explains a lot during the lessons on speaking skills.
Grouping	[3 items]	Single item	We work in small groups in the speaking lessons. We work independently in the speaking lessons. We work together as the whole class in the speaking lessons.
Materials and Resources	[2 items]	Single item	We use the course book for the speaking skills component. We use other materials (other than the course book) for the lessons in speaking skills.
Time	[1 item]	Single item	Choose as appropriate: how often is attention given to speaking skills in the lessons? (1) Every lesson/ (2) every week/ (3) twice a month/ (4) monthly/ (5) less than monthly.
Learning environment	[2 items]	Single item	The way our classroom is set up is suitable for speaking lessons. There are enough resources at school for me to practise my speaking skills (e.g., computers and rooms to practise in).
Assessment Open question items	Assessment [i 62-64, 66]	0.69	I get clear instructions about the final test on speaking skills.

1. What mark would you give to the teaching of speaking skills in Dutch?
2. What aspect of the speaking lessons helps you the most in developing your speaking skills?
3. Suppose you could change some aspect of the lessons on speaking skills, what would that be?
4. Is there anything else you would like to say about your school lessons on speaking skills?

3.2.2 Teacher perceptions

The interview questions of the semi-structured interview that was used to collect teacher perceptions were structured around the curriculum elements from the 'curricular spiderweb' of Thijs & Van den Akker (2009). In the interview, the researcher used a fixed set of starting questions and a set of possible follow-up questions. In Table 2, we present each element and starting question.

The interviews lasted 60-70 minutes, were audio-taped and transcribed verbatim. The verbatim report was sent to the teacher for a member check before it was added − anonymized − to the final data set. In the results section, pseudonyms are used for the participating teachers.

Table 2. Elements from the curricular spiderweb (Thijs & Van den Akker, 2009) and starting questions used in the interview

Curriculum elements	Starting questions
Rationale	What do you want to achieve with L1-oral language education?
Objectives	What are the learning goals when teaching L1-oral language to this student group?
Content	What content do you teach in your L1-oral language lessons?
Learning activities	Which specific learning activities and teaching methods do you use while teaching L1-oral language?
Organization and teacher role	How would you describe your teacher role during the oral language lessons?
Grouping	Which student grouping forms do you prefer (and why?) in your L1-oral language teaching?
Materials and Resources	What materials and resources do you use in your oral language lessons, how do you use them and why?
Time	How many teaching hours per school year do you teach L1-oral language?
Learning environment	Which conditions of students' learning environment are necessary to teach oral language efficiently?
Assessment	How do you assess public speaking competence?

3.3 Data analysis

In total, 212 student questionnaires were collected, of which 175 provided valid answers on all items. Descriptive statistics were used to analyse the data. The answering option "I don't know" was recoded to a missing and scales that consist of scores of more than one item were based on all valid scores. A reliability analysis was conducted, in which some items were eliminated to improve the reliability of the item scales. The answers on the open questions were sorted per question. To test differences in student scores between teachers, analyses of co-variance were performed using a corrected significance level based on the Bonferroni method. To examine whether the teachers differed in their student evaluations, we used the Scheffé method, which is a post-hoc test commonly used in the analysis of variance.

Content analyses were performed on the teacher data based on the curriculum elements of Thijs and Van den Akker (2009). In each interview report, data addressing one of the curriculum elements were coded and sorted using the software package Atlas.ti.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Student perceptions of the L1-oral language teaching practice

In Table 3, we present a summary of the scores of the different groups of students (per school/teacher) and the total of the student scores for the various scales.

The highest total scores were seen on the scales 'Importance as experienced by students' (2.96) and 'Assessment' (2.76), the latter involved the students' oral language competency being assessed in front of the group and the students being given clear instructions on the assessment. The students generally agreed more than disagreed that they recognized this in their classroom practice. The scale 'Practising in class' had the lowest total score (2.38), meaning the students generally disagreed more than agreed that they experienced this in their classroom practice.

Student group scores (per teacher) on all curriculum elements except for Learning environment and Time significantly differed from each other (all with p <.001). The largest differences between the teachers related to clarity of the learning objectives (F(10,211)= 22.83; p<0.001; η^2= 0.53), practising (F(10,205)= 19.92; p<0.001; η^2= 0.51), feedback (F(10,204)= 15.99; p<0.001; η^2= 0.45), and content (F(10,206)= 13.63; p<0.001; η^2= 0.41). This means that, on those four curricular scales, the classroom practices of the various teachers showed considerable differences, following the students' responses.

For content elements in the L1-oral language classroom the following items were involved: learning how to prepare an oral language assignment, how to persuade the public, how to take account of the audience's views and needs, learning about linguistics and tropes in order to speak attractively, how to use humour and learning about body language. There was an opportunity for the students to write down a possible missing content element when filling in the questionnaire. However, this resulted in no responses, which would seem to mean the students did not perceive any content element to be missing from the questionnaire regarding their L1-oral language lessons.

For all eight scales, the posthoc-tests (Scheffé) showed that the scores of Gwen's' students were significantly higher than the scores of the other groups, with an especially high score for importance of L1-oral language education as experienced by students (3.62) and Grouping Work Plenary (3.73). This means that her students stated that they appreciated L1-oral language education considerably and that they recognized working plenary in these kinds of lessons. For four of these scales, Britt's students also showed significantly higher scores than the other groups, namely on: Importance explained by teacher, Clarity of objectives, Content elements of L1-oral language teaching and Feedback. This means that Gwen's and Britt's students considered these aspects to be more relevant for their language lessons, than other students. In contrast, the students of Frank and Jacob scored significantly lower than other groups of students for the scales Clarity of objectives, Content elements of L1-oral language teaching and Feedback, meaning that their students considered these

themes as less relevant for their L1-oral language classroom practice. This also seemed to apply to the scale Practising in class in the L1-oral language lessons of the students of Richard, Jacob, Yasmine and Pim. Their students scored Practising in class significantly lower than the other student groups. Finally, for the scale Teacher-centred approach a significantly low score is seen for Franks' students. In the next section we will connect these differences between teachers to their own perceptions of the curriculum elements.

Table 3. Student mean scores (M) and standard deviations (SD) per school/teacher group, per curriculum scale and per single items of curriculum elements on a 4-point Likert-type scale with 1= totally disagree, 2= slightly agree, 3= moderately agree, 4= totally agree, 5= don't know (excluded from the data analysis).

Single items

	Learning Environment: Tools M (SD)	Learning Environment: Interior M (SD)	Grouping: Work Plenary M (SD)	Grouping: Work Individually M (SD)	Grouping: Work in Groups M (SD)	Materials: Other Materials M (SD)	Materials: Text book M (SD)
	3.04 (0.88)	3.05 (0.59)	3.26 (0.54)	2.05 (0.72)	3.18 (0.59)	2.90 (0.54)	1.83 (1.03)
	2.82 (1.01)	3.23 (0.92)	3.73 (0.46)	2.36 (1.09)	2.82 (0.96)	3.68 (0.65)	1.09 (0.29)
	3.39 (0.78)	3.25 (0.68)	2.83 (0.99)	2.32 (1.11)	3.60 (0.82)	2.89 (1.13)	1.85 (0.99)
	3.50 (0.54)	3.33 (0.52)	2.67 (0.82)	2.67 (1.21)	2.17 (1.17)	2.71 (1.11)	2.50 (0.84)
	2.75 (1.02)	2.50 (0.99)	2.56 (0.78)	2.56 (0.63)	2.79 (0.98)	2.53 (1.12)	1.83 (1.15)
	3.19 (0.79)	2.65 (0.94)	3.12 (0.97)	1.86 (0.94)	3.39 (0.72)	2.18 (1.18)	1.45 (0.67)
	2.90 (1.21)	2.50 (0.99)	1.95 (1.16)	1.95 (1.07)	2.00 (1.08)	2.33 (1.23)	1.68 (1.00)
	2.71 (1.38)	2.17 (1.47)	2.67 (1.51)	1.17 (0.41)	1.71 (0.95)	1.63 (1.06)	1.00 (0.00)
	3.27 (0.79	2.00 (1.20)	2.50 (1.07)	2.20 (1.14)	1.80 (1.23)	2.25 (1.03)	1.89 (1.05)
	2.67 (0.91)	2.75 (0.86)	3.44 (0.71)	2.29 (1.05)	3.41 (0.62)	3.00 (0.97)	1.11 (0.47)
	3.26 (0.75)	2.95 (0.79)	2.40 (0.88)	2.53 (1.02)	2.21 (0.92)	2.68 (1.00)	1.19 (0.51)
	3.04 (0.93)	2.82 (0.93)	2.89 (1.01)	2.20 (1.00)	2.80 (1.06)	2.70 (1.10)	1.53 (0.87)

Curricular elements → School/teacher (n students) →	Scales [i=number of items]							
	Rationale: Importance explained by Teacher [i=3]	Rationale: Importance as experienced by Students [i=3]	Learning Objectives: Clarity of objectives [i=9]	Content: Content Elements of L1-oral language Teaching [i=10]	Learning Activities: Practising in class [i=4]	Learning Activities: Feedback [i=6]	Organization and Teacher Role: Teacher centred Approach [i=3]	Assessment: Assessment [i=4]
	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)
1/Francis (n=23)	2.71 (0.74)	2.86 (0.47)	2.67 (0.57)	2.80 (0.46)	2.83 (0.45)	2.64 (0.43)	2.80 (0.40)	2.34 (0.89)
2/Gwen (n=22)	3.14 (0.58)	3.62 (0.45)	3.59 (0.30)	3.41 (0.30)	3.42 (0.29)	3.21 (0.47)	3.27 (0.60)	3.35 (0.49)
3/Britt (n=20)	3.19 (0.62)	2.80 (0.57)	3.37 (0.34)	3.18 (0.57)	2.68 (0.68)	3.26 (0.50)	2.98 (0.83)	3.31 (0.46)
4/Ria (n=11)	2.09 (0.67)	3.22 (0.48)	2.72 (0.51)	2.67 (0.61)	2.38 (0.81)	2.79 (0.48)	2.50 (0.46)	2.80 (0.65)
5/Richard (n=20)	2.13 (0.61)	2.88 (0.51)	2.36 (0.63)	2.34 (0.57)	1.72 (0.58)	2.35 (0.53)	2.19 (0.72)	2.93 (0.59)
6/Frank (n=27)	2.06 (0.84)	2.75 (0.69)	1.92 (0.53)	2.12 (0.68)	2.33 (0.71)	1.91 (0.57)	2.28 (0.69)	2.16 (0.96)
7/Jacob (n=24)	2.03 (0.76)	2.72 (0.67)	1.93 (0.62)	2.02 (0.63)	1.77 (0.70)	1.73 (0.70)	1.67 (0.76)	2.39 (0.93)
8/Yasmine (n=11)	1.94 (0.80)	2.88 (0.86)	2.15 (0.83)	2.33 (0.71)	1.52 (0.46)	1.85 (0.73)	1.90 (1.01)	2.79 (0.69)
9/Pim (n=13)	2.08 (0.90)	2.77 (0.64)	1.96 (0.57)	2.34 (0.58)	1.65 (0.53)	2.03 (0.64)	1.94 (0.84)	2.27 (0.82)
10/Lisa (n=18)	2.94 (0.56)	3.09 (0.52)	2.88 (0.44)	2.94 (0.52)	3.08 (0.51)	2.48 (0.69)	3.01 (0.55)	3.14 (0.36)
11/Steven (n=23)	2.62 (0.69)	3.04 (0.48)	2.87 (0.64)	2.94 (0.56)	2.14 (0.69)	2.78 (0.69)	2.46 (0.81)	2.79 (0.53)
Total (n=212)	2.49 (0.83)	2.96 (0.62)	2.60 (0.78)	2.65 (0.72)	2.38 (0.83)	2.47 (0.78)	2.51 (0.84)	2.76 (0.80)

4.1.1 Responses to time, materials and open questions

The total mean score for the curricular element Time (3.92) showed that the oral language lessons seemed to be organized monthly. The overall low score (1.53) for

Materials (textbook) means that, in general, the students only slightly recognized that they used the textbook in L1-oral language classes (SD 0.87). Considering the higher total score (2.70) for Other Materials, students clearly seemed to use other materials more than a textbook in the L1-oral language classroom. As response to the open question 'What in the oral language lessons helps you the most to develop your oral language competency?' the whole group of students mostly mentioned practising (n=63), receiving feedback (n=30), observing good examples of speakers (n=16), receiving instruction and tips and tricks from the teacher (n=14) and debating as an exercise (n=11). The students also gave a variety of suggestions for altering the current L1-oral language lessons: 'more oral language lessons' (n=30); more practice (n=27); and 'better instructions on the assessment assignment' (n=19). Finally, 'There are not enough lessons' was reported quite often [n=35].

4.2 Teacher perceptions of the L1-oral language teaching practice

In the following section we will focus on teacher perceptions. The links with the student results will also be discussed.

4.2.1   Rationale

Near all of the L1-teachers stated that it is very important to teach L1-oral language, even though most of them indicated that it is a rather small part of their curriculum. To illustrate, in one of the interviews Gwen, who had the overall highest scores on the eight scales, stated: 'I think L1-oral language skills are very important [..] it is necessary to work on speaking in order to develop a continuous learning line through the consecutive years in our school.' On the question about the envisioned higher goal of L1-oral language (why are they learning?), Steven claimed that education in oral language skills is 'important to learn to unlock what is going on inside you for the outside world' and Pim stated: 'It all links up with the greater purpose [of L1-education], learning to think critically.' Together with four other interviewed teachers, Pim and Steven mentioned that they strongly believe and explain in their classroom that developing L1-oral language skills goes hand in hand with developing critical thinking skills.

More than half of the teachers in this study claimed that this type of education is important for the personal development and social education of their students, for further education, and ultimately for a successful career. Lisa mentioned: 'When you are capable of expressing yourself orally, then that's valuable in every profession. [..] If you can express yourself, then you will be able to start initiatives, to involve people in what you do. [..] good language competence is power.' Richard stated that he believes that L1-teachers are in the lead of teaching oral language skills in secondary schools. Only Jacob argued that as well as L1-teachers, other subject teachers, like civics teachers, can also teach students oral language skills.

4.2.2 Learning objectives and content elements

The teachers reported oral language learning objectives that ranged from more generic, curriculum level objectives to more detailed learning goals. Most teachers had defined more detailed learning goals with respect to knowledge (e.g., (classical) rhetoric), skills (e.g., using voice and body language) or attitude. Regarding attitude Steven mentioned: 'they have to experience that fake it till you make it really works but then you have to act like you really mean it.'

The teachers reported four categories of content elements that were related to the reported learning objectives: 1) cognitive elements, 2) linguistic elements, 3) information about presentation skills and 4) information about how to provide and use feedback.

Firstly, the cognitive elements mentioned, related to aspects of the (classical) rhetoric or aspects of the speech content itself. The teachers reported teaching argumentation theory (fallacies and points of contention), the structuring of argumentation (how to be persuasive and balanced), and the importance of distinguishing main and side issues. They also taught about preparing public speeches, such as how to choose the topic of public speeches and how to find relevant and trustworthy information on the topic.

Secondly, the linguistic elements teachers mentioned in the interviews referred to using correct formulations and avoid common errors, using language that supports the message, stylistic rules and metaphors. Furthermore, teaching about the influence of using a local accent versus standard dialect in public speech was also reported.

Thirdly, the information about presentation skills referred to the deliberate use of posture/ body language, gestures, voice, timing and fluency. In addition, the use of PowerPoint presentation was taught because teachers believed a proper use of PowerPoint presentation influences the impact of a speech performance.

Finally, teachers reported that they taught how to give and use feedback for oral language development. For example, Lisa teaches her students 'that they have to give positive feedback, have to give feedback respecting the other. Like, "I've heard this, that could have been dealt with otherwise, and give someone a tip and a top".'

The Learning objectives and Content elements outlined above correspond largely with how the total group of students seemed to perceive them in the L1-oral language lessons. However, the interviews provided more scope for detailed and nuanced information about what was being taught. For example, the teachers regarded feedback as learning content and as a learning tool. In contrast, the students did not seem to miss feedback in the list of content items and seemed to think of giving or receiving feedback as a learning activity.

4.2.3   Learning activities

The teachers mentioned the following learning activities: 1) observing and analysing examples of videotaped speakers; 2) practising oral language skills in various ways and forms; and 3) organizing feedback (self-evaluation, teacher feedback and peer feedback).

Observing and analysing speaking examples was felt to improve the students' argumentation skills and presentation skills in particular. The teachers reported that they explained and discussed the speaking criteria that are relevant for the examination during this kind of learning activities.

Practising speaking skills was another learning activity mentioned for in and outside of the L1-oral classroom. The teachers reported organizing improvised, spontaneous forms of speaking exercises, debating exercises and look-a-like test exercises, sometimes in combination with a video recording of the exercise for later analysis.

According to the teachers, practising oral language skills has several benefits. Practising would stimulate students to reflect on how to improve their speaking skills and would also help them to deal with potential speaking anxiety. The teachers reported that lack of time and the size of the student group are threats to practising oral language skills. To overcome the time problems, speaking exercises were organized in other L1-subject courses, such as students preparing a literature lesson for their peers. In addition, teachers used homework assignments to overcome time and group size problems.

The teachers reported that they regularly provided feedback to their students and that they also organized peer feedback and self-evaluation. Teacher feedback consisted in most cases of information about how students had performed in relation to the speaking criteria taught in class. Gwen, who together with Britt had the highest scores, explained that her students were aware of their strong points and weaknesses: 'This is due to the feedback exercises and the oral language exercises.'

The total student group scored relatively low (2.38) on the scale 'Practising in class' and the separate student group scores show significant differences in perceived opportunities to practise. Additionally, a group of 35 students reported that they got no or hardly any opportunities to practise. It appears that the students' perceptions did not entirely match what the teachers reported about practising in the L1- oral language classroom as most of the teachers stated they do let students practise, while also reporting lack of time as a limiting factor. As Yasmine argued: 'They learn [..] by doing it.' However, her and Richards', Jacobs' and Pim's student scores do indicate that this view was not recognized in the L1-classroom. Only Pim explicitly mentioned sometimes cancelling oral language practice: '...it is difficult to organize. In a classroom with 22 students it is doable but in a classroom with 27, full of teenage hormones, then sometimes I think, just forget it.'

Concerning 'Feedback', the students' post-hoc tests showed a varied but matching image of teachers who did indeed seem to have integrated feedback into their

oral language lesson practice, such as Gwen, and those who had not, such as Frank and Jacob.

4.2.4   Organization and teacher role

Many teachers reported similar teaching strategies which they use in L1- oral language lessons: 1. facilitating discussions about video recordings of speakers with the use of a framework with skills criteria; 2. facilitating oral language exercises in combination with providing feedback; 3. explaining the learning content; 4. instructing exercises or assessment tasks; 5. monitoring students' learning processes; and 6. motivating their students to become better speakers.

In the interviews, teachers mentioned creating a safe learning environment, particularly as an important condition for an effective L1-oral language lesson. They believed it would help to let students practise in small groups. Nevertheless, the teachers reported that they regularly worry about whether all students feel safe to express themselves in their oral language classroom. Ria formulated this as follows: 'I have one group who won't give another student the chance to do the presentation. [..] It is really the class atmosphere, feelings of safety.' And Jacob stated: 'You have to create a safe learning environment. In a safe learning environment, it is possible for students to reflect critically on each other. I think that a safe learning environment is even more important than instruction.' The student findings do not contain specific information on how safe the students perceived the oral language classroom environment to be.

Finally, teachers reported that ideally differentiation in competence level would support students' L1-oral language skills development. However, it is not common practice to differentiate. Some students however, said this would indeed be an improvement: 'make it more difficult when you are good at it'.

4.2.5   Grouping, materials and learning environment

With respect to grouping, teachers preferred to use different types of group compositions in the L1-oral language classes, varying from plenary sessions to individual or small group sessions. Teachers indicated that students with speaking anxiety in particular could benefit from working in small groups and familiar groups.

The learning materials teachers used can be divided into three categories: 1) the standardized teaching methods e.g., a text book, 2) materials developed by themselves and 3) authentic materials. Many teachers reported that they only use bits of the text book. They add materials from a self-written syllabus and some pages with theory on oral genres (public speaking, discussions and debate) and associated oral competencies. A common practice is to use materials from educational websites and authentic materials, such as news items, YouTube videos and TEDx-talks.

With respect to the physical learning environment, the teachers preferred to use a spacious classroom where it is possible to reorganize tables and chairs. Other

important facilities that were mentioned in the interviews were a computer, a beamer and an electronic learning environment for homework assignments. The results on these three curricular elements matched what the students reported.

4.2.6   Time

As mentioned above, teachers reported that lack of time hinders the oral language development of their students. This perception seems to correspond with the student findings. The majority of the teachers (6) mentioned that it is difficult to estimate how many teaching hours per school year they teach L1-oral language. On average, the other five teachers spend 17 lesson hours per year on the subject but with a range of 12 lesson hours to 24 lesson hours. These teachers stated that a significant part of these lessons is reserved for assessing the students' oral language skills. With the aim of building a continuous oracy learning line through the consecutive years of study in secondary school, some of the teachers stated they regularly organise project weeks or special learning modules on oral language development.

4.2.7   Assessment

To determine whether their objectives had been achieved, the teachers mentioned that they organize assessments with, for example, persuasive presentations or speeches about topical issues or news items, debating rounds, vlogs and discussions with peers. Some teachers combined the assessment of L1-oral language skills with other L1-objectives, such as Literature and oral skills and Argumentation theory or Linguistics and oral skills.

Teachers reported that it is important to give clear instructions on both oral language assessment assignments and their assessment criteria. Most of them have set their own criteria with respect to presentation skills (use of voice such as diction, intonation, fluency; body language such as posture and eye-contact), text structure (e.g., an effective introduction or closing words that generate impact), trustworthy and in-depth content, reasoning to support views, style (e.g., humour and original use of language), audience awareness, use of visual props and time management. In addition to grading, all teachers reported that they provide qualitative feedback on the assessment performance.

The teachers were critical about the use of a framework with skills criteria as an objective assessment tool as they find oral language competency difficult to grasp. Steven explained: '...the way you fill out the form reflects your own intuition. In that way, the framework is a set of tools to channel your own subjectivity.' Anticipating this subjectivity issue, most of the teachers involved students in co-assessing the speaking performance of their peers. Other reasons for involving students as co-assessors were to create a safety net for the teacher (extra eyes and ears) because of the ephemeral character of the oral assessment assignment, to make assessment a

learning opportunity for others, and to involve other students socially with their peers.

5.   CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Rationale, learning objectives and content

We have grouped together the curriculum elements to promote more coherence. The student and teacher participants appeared to have a shared understanding of the importance of oral language education, what has to be achieved and therefore taught in the L1-classroom. The list of content elements set out in the student questionnaire matched the more elaborate and detailed picture the teachers drew up about the teaching content. From the teacher findings, three categories of content elements emerged that matched the student findings: cognitive content elements (such as rhetoric and argumentation theory), linguistic and presentation elements. The teachers added a fourth content element category: feedback. The students mainly seemed to perceive feedback as just a useful learning tool. In our opinion it is essential to explicitly distinguish between specific tools, skills and content elements in the classroom. When feedback is well trained, then it could be an effective tool in the L1-classroom. Without training or instruction, the risks for poor quality of the given feedback will be higher, like Hoogeveen and Bonset already reported as problem in 1998.

5.2 Learning activities and the organization and teacher role

The teacher and student findings concerning Learning Activities, Organization and teacher role provided much information about their perceptions of what contemporary L1-oral language teaching practice looks like. The findings relate to at least four of the five key elements of good L1-oral language lessons (Wurth et al, 2019), i.e., *1) a clear oral language skills framework with criteria; 2) observations of and discussions about video-taped speakers; 3) self-, peer- and teacher-feedback on speaking performance; and 4) regular practising with various speaking tasks.*

In relation to key element 1, i.e., a clear oral language skills framework with criteria, many teachers appeared to have implemented a (often self-developed) framework with skills criteria in their L1-oral language classes. Teachers mentioned that they use such frameworks, e.g., to provide clarity about the learning goals. The teachers also used a framework of criteria in combination with key element 2 and 3, when analysing and discussing speaking examples and organizing feedback. Students' results on the open questions showed that only a small number of the student participants (n=16) especially valued key element 2 for the development of their speaking skills. However, the students did not report on the use of frameworks with speaking criteria. We can cautiously hypothesize that, while a substantial group perceived the learning goals as quite clear, use of a criteria framework could be helpful

in making them clearer. The speaking skills criteria reported by the teachers in this study showed notable similarities with the 'Oracy skills framework' of Mercer et al. (2016) who distinguish four categories of skills criteria (p.55): 'physical, linguistic, cognitive, and social and emotional'. First of all, the teachers in the current study mentioned skills criteria which met three of the four categories, namely the physical, linguistic and cognitive. However, the teachers did not mention skills relating to the social and emotional category as criteria for assessment: working with others, listening and responding and confidence in speaking. The teachers did seem to see confidence in speaking as a factor for success but without treating it as an L1-oral language assessment criterion. They also mentioned an assessment criterion which does not meet the criteria of Mercer, et al. (2016), namely time management.

Because of the clear similarities, it seems likely that this British study with its developed and tested oracy toolkit could be of help in designing usable innovations, especially because the teachers expressed criticism of their often self-developed frameworks in relation to objective assessment of oral language.

In relation to key element 3, i.e., self-, peer- and teacher-feedback on speaking, the teachers stated that they provide feedback to their students on a regular basis and organize peer feedback and self-evaluation in the L1-oral language classroom. As stated earlier, the teachers believed that it is wise to teach feedback first before implementing feedback in the oral language lessons. There was significant variation in the scores of the separate student groups on integration of feedback into their L1-oral language classroom practice but, in general, they regarded feedback as important for the development of their oracy skills.

The implementation of key element 4, regular practice with different speaking tasks, was perceived strikingly differently by teachers and the whole student group and also between student groups. To start with a similarity: both groups thought of practice (key element 4) and feedback (key element 3) as essential and mutually reinforcing learning activities for oral language skills development. However, bearing the scale scores and the answers to the open questions in mind, the overall picture was that many students felt quite strongly that they lacked enough opportunities to practise oracy. Although teachers said that they too experienced problems concerning the tight teaching schedule and the implementation of speaking exercises, they seemed to worry less about this than their students did. A feasible explanation for these different perceptions could lie in how the teachers defined the oral language teaching period. The teachers considered the assessment period as part of the learning period and they deliberately incorporated oracy exercises into other subject classes, like Literature lessons. The student results, however, might indicate that the teachers had failed to make this broader view clear to their students.

Wurth, et al. (2019) mention a fifth key element, i.e., the exploration of students' speaking potential by analysis and assessment of oracy skills, so it is possible to differentiate. The teachers reported that this element had not yet been structurally effectuated in their L1-oral language lessons. This may have been due to the reported time restraints and problems with class atmosphere (safety) and assessment.

It seems that some students touched upon this missing key element by making remarks such as wanting the teachers to make the lessons more difficult for students who already have certain abilities.

5.3 Grouping, materials, time, learning environment and assessment

The results for the whole student group seemed to match the teachers' perceptions of the remaining five curricular elements in the contemporary lessons. Both groups reported the use of different kinds of learning groups while practising oral language skills in the classroom.

The text book was not used frequently in the L1-oral language classroom. Various other learning materials (videos, frameworks with skills criteria and different assignments involving speaking in public, debating, discussing and listening and reacting) were used.

The available lesson time was generally felt to be a concern and some students explicitly reported that there are not enough lessons (n=35), that they wish for more lessons (n=30) and more time to practise oral language skills (n=27). Both groups reported more positively about the quality of the current learning environment.

Various kinds of speaking assignments were assessed, mostly involving public speaking, including use of persuasion. The teachers seemed to use similar speaking criteria to assess oral competency but reported problems regarding the objectivity of the assessments. The use of a framework of speaking skills and letting students co-assess did not resolve this issue, according to the teachers. The findings, especially those on the open questions (such as 'What mark would you give to the teaching of speaking skills in Dutch?', see Table 1), together with the responses to the questions about practising in class suggest that students, in general, did not think that the contemporary oral language lessons were supportive enough to prepare them for these assessments.

5.4 Implications of this study

Although four of the five key elements for good L1-oral language education (Wurth et al, 2019) were broadly visible in the teachers' and students' perceptions of the current lesson practice, this study shows that there is still much work to be done to reinforce L1-oral language education in the Netherlands. The reported concerns with regards to time (by teachers and students), a safe learning environment and assessment (primarily mentioned by teachers) were perceived as negatively influencing the current quality of L1-oral language education.

A possible reason for there being no specific student findings about the safety of the classroom environment could lie in the reported lack of time for oral language lessons and students' consequent limited experience with group dynamics in these kinds of lessons. And although the student findings were not conclusively about concrete problems they face during the assessment of L1-oral language, students clearly

expressed concerns about the educational route to assessment. Their expressed concerns about the limited time available to develop their L1-oral language skills and their desire for 'better instructions on the assessment assignment' give reason to believe that the students lack confidence about the assessment of their oral language skills.

It seems likely that the concerns expressed by teachers and students may also hinder the implementation of envisioned pedagogical innovations. As a first step toward developing educational innovations with *teacher practicality* (Janssen et al., 2013), it would be useful to investigate how to resolve the concerns reported by the participants in this study. For this it would seem fruitful to explore ways to develop a well-structured L1-oral language learning line implemented in the broad L1-curriculum and throughout the school year with regular opportunities to practise in groups, with more emphasis on personalized learning by organizing feedback and support. As Lammers mentioned in 1993, it is necessary to build a tradition of coherent and relevant L1-oral language education, starting by developing concrete L1-oral language lessons which incorporate promising criteria. Such a tradition or learning line, could bridge the gap between what teachers and students currently experienced as negative in their classroom practice, what they wish for and what scientific literature has concluded about good L1-oral language education.

5.5 Limitations of this study and suggestions for future research

This explorative study gives a first insight into how L1-oral language nowadays is being taught in Dutch secondary classrooms according to the teachers and students. The number of participants (11 teachers and 212 students) was relatively small, which limits the generalizability of this study. Moreover, because we used convenience sampling, there is a possibility of a selection bias. However, the results show that there is variation in the classroom practices reported by the teachers. For example, the lesson time that the teachers reserved for their L1-oral language lessons varied from 12 to 24 hours and also, teachers organized these lessons in different ways.

In the current study, student data have been collected during one lesson hour, which means that students had only one chance to participate. In the classes of Ria (37%) and Yasmin (55%) the response was lower because many students were absent. However, the mean scores of their students were very similar to the scores given by students in the other classes.

Another limitation is that only self-report data were collected. Although this is an important first step, future research could collect additional data, such as video recordings and lesson observations in order to map out actual classroom dynamics in L1-oral language lessons more precisely.

Now that we have mapped with this broad scope the current L1-oral language lesson practice and now we have learned (from the review study by Wurth et al. (2019)) what key elements are for good qualitative L1-oral language lessons, it is possible to take the next step in research. It would be interesting to investigate a specific envisioned improvement of the current lessons (e.g., by focusing on better integration of a specific key element) to see what kind of influence this would have on the development of the oral competencies of students. It would also be interesting to focus on certain kinds of learning problems, such as how to support students with speaking anxiety in the L1-oral language classroom. That could be the second phase of curriculum development (Van den Akker et al., 2012), in the form of curriculum design research.

REFERENCES

Australian Curriculum (2015). Retrieved from: https://australiancurriculum.edu.au

Baxter, J. (2000). Going public: teaching students to speak out in public contexts. *English in Education*, 34(2), 81–98. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-8845.2000.tb00575.x

Bonset, H. (1996). Een nieuw begin? 25 Jaar spreek- en luisteronderwijs. [A new starting point? 25 Years of education of oral language and listening skills.] *Levende Talen, 509*, 188-191.

Bonset, H. , & Braaksma, M. (2008). *Het schoolvak Nederlands opnieuw onderzocht, Een inventarisatie van onderzoek van 1997 tot en met 2007*. [Dutch mothertongue education re-examined. An inventarisation of research from 1997 to 2007.] Enschede: SLO.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Couzijn, M., M. Woudstra & A. Zwart (1992). *Doorstuderen na de Scholengemeenschap Noord: over taal- en studietaalvaardigheid.* [Continue studying after Scholengemeenschap Noord: about language and study language competencies] In: *Spiegel 10*(1), 59-73.

De Grez, L. (2009). *Optimizing the instructional environment to learn presentation skills*. Ghent University. Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Ghent, Belgium. Retreived from https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/7051516/file/7051518.pdfhttps://biblio.ugent.be/publication/7051516/file/7051518.pdf

De Grez, L., Valcke, M., & Roozen, I. (2009). The impact of goal orientation, self-reflection and personal characteristics on the acquisition of oral presentation skills. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 24*(3), 293. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03174762

De Grez, L., Valcke, M. & Roozen, I. (2012). How effective are self- and peer assessment of oral presentation skills compared with teachers' assessments? *Active Learning in Higher Education, 13*(2) 129–142. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F1469787412441284

Department for Education (2014). *The national curriculum in England, Key stages 3 and 4 framework document.* Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/840002/Secondary_national_curriculum_corrected_PDF.pdf

DeSeCo (2005). *Definition and selection of competencies. Executive summary*. Paris, France: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond school/definitionandselectionofcompetenciesdeseco.htm

Ginkel van S., Gulikers J., Biemans, H. & Mulder, M. (2017). Fostering oral presentation performance: does the quality of feedback differ when provided by the teacher, peers or peers guided by tutor? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 42(6), 953-966, https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2016.1212984

Glopper, K. de & E. van Schooten (1990). *De inhoud van de examens Nederlands voor havo en vwo.* [The content of the Dutch core standards for upper secondary education] SCO rapport 243. Amsterdam: SCO.

Goodlad, J. I. and Associates (1979). *Curriculum inquiry: The study of curriculum practice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoogeveen, M. & Bonset, H. (1998). *Het schoolvak Nederlands onderzocht. Een inventarisatie van onderzoek naar onderwijs Nederlands als eerste en tweede taal in Nederland en Vlaanderen.* [The classroom subject Dutch language examined. An inventory of research of L1- and L2 Dutch language education in The Netherlands and Flanders.] Leuven/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Janssen, F., Westbroek, H., Doyle, W. & Van Driel, J. (2013). How to Make Innovations Practical. *Teachers College Record, 115*(7), 1-42.

Kaldahl, A.-G. (2019). Assessing oracy: Chasing the teachers' unspoken oracy construct across disciplines in the landscape between policy and freedom. *L1- Educational Studies in Language and Literature*, 19, 1-24. https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL- 2019.19.03.02

Kaldahl, A.-G., Bachinger, A., & Rijlaarsdam, G. (2019). Oracy matters: Introduction to a special issue on oracy. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 19*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL-2019.19.03.06

Kaldahl, A-.G. (2020). *The educational challenge of oracy - a rhetorical approach: Exploring and articulating the oracy construct in Norwegian schools.* Oslo Metropolitan University, Norway.

Knowledge Promotion (2006). Knowledge promotion curriculum reform of 2006 [Kunnskapsløftet, Læreplanen 2006]. Oslo, Norway.

Lammers, H. (1993). De impasse in het onderwijs in de mondelinge vaardigheden. [The impasse of oral skills education.] *Spiegel, 3*, 9-35.

Meestringa, T., Ravesloot, C., & Bonset, H. (2012). *Handreiking schoolexamen Nederlands havo/vwo, Herziening naar aanleiding van het referentiekader taal*. [A guideline for the Dutch language school exam upper secondary education, Revision in response to the language reference framework.] Enschede: SLO.

Meestringa, T., & Ravesloot, C. (2012). *Het schoolexamen Nederlands op havo en vwo; verslag van een digitale enquête.* [The Dutch language school exam at upper secondary education level; a report of a digital survey.] Enschede: SLO.

Mercer, N., Warwick, P., & Ahmed, A. (2016). An oracy assessment toolkit: Linking research and development in the assessment of students' spoken language skills at age 11-12. *Learning and Instruction, 48*, 51-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.10.005

Oliver R., Haig, Y., & Rochecouste, J. (2005). Communicative Competence in Oral Language Assessment. *Language and Education*, *19*(3), 212-222. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500780508668675

SLO (2019). *Curriculumontwikkeling.* [Curriculum development.] Retrieved from: https://www.slo.nl/thema/meer/curriculumontwikkeling/instrumenten/spinnenweb/inleiding/?utm_source=instant-magazine&utm_content=curriculumwaaier

Thijs, A., & Van den Akker, J. (2009). *Curriculum in development*. Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO), Enschede.

Van de Ven, P.H. (2005). *Stabilities and changes in (mother tongue) education. European identities in mother tongue education* (74-94). Linz: Universitätsverlag Rudolf Trauner.

Van den Akker, J., Kuiper, W. en Nieveen, N. (2012). Bruggen slaan tussen beleid, praktijk en wetenschap in curriculumontwikkeling en -onderzoek. [Building bridges between policy, practice and research to guide curriculum development.] *Pedagogische Studiën, 89*(6), 399-410.

Wilkinson, A. (1965). *Spoken English*. Edgbaston, UK: University of Birmingham.

Wurth, J.G.R., Tigelaar, E.H., Hulshof, H., De Jong, J.C. & Admiraal, W.F. (2019). Key elements of L1-oral language teaching and learning in secondary education. A literature review. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature, 19*, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.17239/L1ESLL2019.19.01.15

APPENDIX

Digital student survey for use in a research project on speaking skills in the senior years of secondary school (school subject Dutch)

This questionnaire forms part of a research project examining speaking skills (verbal language skills) in the school subject Dutch. Thank you for taking part in this study.

The questions below concern the *Speaking* component. *Speaking* prepares students for a variety of tasks such as giving persuasive presentations, convincing talks/lectures and opening debates. Please answer the survey questions as honestly as you can. There are no right and wrong answers. Please answer all of the questions. Your answers will be anonymised. The survey will take about 20 minutes to complete.

General questions
1. School:
2. Date:
3. Teacher's name:

Score the following questions according to how far you agree with the statement.

1= strongly disagree, 2= slightly agree, 3= moderately agree, 4= strongly agree, 5= don't know

Component
Your view on the speaking skills component (think about learning to give presentations/talks, including preparing for a debate for example)
4. I think it is important to develop my speaking skills.
5. I enjoy the lessons on speaking skills.
6. I find the lessons on speaking skills useful.
7. Sufficient attention is paid to speaking skills in the Dutch lessons.
8. My Dutch teacher talks to us in class about why the speaking skills component is important.
9. We are given tests on speaking skills which count toward our grades.
Learning objectives
10. It is clear to me what we are learning in the lessons on speaking skills.
11. The speaking lessons challenge me personally.
12. I find the speaking part of the Dutch lessons difficult.
13. We look at the qualities of good speakers in our lessons.
14. We use an assessment form in our speaking lessons.
15. I know what my strengths and weaknesses are in speaking skills.
16. My teacher gives me the opportunity to look at **my own** strengths and weaknesses in the lessons on speaking skills.
17. My teacher gives me the opportunity to look at the strengths and weaknesses **of my fellow students** as they practise speaking skills in the lessons.
18. My teacher knows the students' level in speaking skills in this class.
19. I know very well what is expected of me in the final test on speaking skills.
Learning content
In the lessons on speaking skills, I learn about:
20. …how to prepare the content of my presentation (searching for and selecting information, structuring the material I'm going to present);
21. …practical ways to prepare my presentation (e.g., how to search for information and practising giving the presentation);
22. …how I can persuade the audience of my viewpoint;

23.	…how I can make my argument as strong as possible;
24.	…my posture (e.g. how I stand and move while speaking);
25.	…how I can make contact with the audience (e.g., through eye contact or by asking questions);
26.	…how I can adapt my material to the audience;
27.	…how I can adapt my use of language to my audience (e.g., by not being too informal);
28.	…how I can use figures of speech to make my presentation more attractive (e.g., hyperbole, metaphor, etc.);
29.	…how I can use humour to make my presentation more attractive;
30.	Other, i.e., …..

Learning activities

31.	I'm given the opportunity to practise my speaking skills **during the Dutch lessons**.
32.	I have to practise my speaking skills mainly **outside the Dutch lessons** (as homework).
33.	I practise my speaking skills both during and outside the Dutch lessons (as homework) to about the same extent.
34.	My teacher explains in the lesson(s) what will be expected of us in the final test on speaking skills.
35.	My teacher explains in the lesson(s) what progress is expected of us during the lessons on speaking skills.

In class I practise:

36.	…with short speaking exercises;
37.	…with tasks from the course book;
38.	…with fairly free tasks (such as improvisation);
39.	…by learning from the example of a speaker (e.g., on a video, or from the teacher who demonstrates something).
40.	I find the exercises in class useful.

The questions below contain the word feedback. By feedback we mean advice, comments or tips that are intended to help you develop your skills, in this case your speaking skills.
In the lessons on speaking skills:

41.	…the teacher asks me to reflect on my own strengths and weaknesses when speaking/presenting;
42.	…I get feedback from the teacher on my speaking skills;
43.	… I get feedback from my fellow students on my speaking skills;
44.	…attention is paid to how you should **give** feedback;
45.	…attention is paid to how I can use feedback for my own development.

46.	Feedback is an important means by which I can develop my speaking skills.
47.	I want to use my teacher's feedback to improve my speaking skills myself.
48.	I want to use feedback from my fellow students to improve my speaking skills.
49.	I want to evaluate my own speaking skills in order to improve my speaking.

Working method/ Grouping

50.	We work in small groups in the speaking lessons.
51.	We work independently in the speaking lessons.
52.	We work together as the whole class in the speaking lessons.

Learning environment

53.	The way our classroom is set up is suitable for speaking lessons.
54.	There are enough resources at school for me to practise my speaking skills (e.g., computers and rooms to practise in).

Teacher

55.	My teacher explains a lot during the lessons on speaking skills.
56.	My teacher walks around the class and helps students during the lessons on speaking skills.

57.	My teacher demonstrates a lot during the lessons on speaking skills.
58.	My teacher mainly leaves us to work on our own in the speaking lessons.
59.	My teacher tends to stay in the background in the speaking lessons.

Materials and Resources

60.	We use the course book for the speaking skills component.
61.	We use other materials (other than the course book) for the lessons in speaking skills.

Assessment

62.	We are tested on the Speaking component in class.
63.	For the final test on speaking skills, I have to speak in front of the whole class (give a presentation to the whole class).
64.	I get clear instructions about the final test on speaking skills.
65.	The teacher alone is responsible for marking my final test on speaking skills.
66.	Th teacher and my fellow students are together responsible for marking my final test on speaking skills.
67.	After the final test, the teacher will give me feedback on my speaking skills.
68.	After the final test, I will get feedback on my speaking skills from my fellow students.

Time: choose as appropriate

69.	How often is attention given to speaking skills in the lessons?
	every lesson/ every week/ twice a month/ once a month/ less than once a month
70.	Are you given homework for speaking lessons?
	Yes/no
	If yes, how long on average do you spend preparing for these lessons?
	…. minutes

Finally, four open questions that ask you for your opinion

71.	What mark would you give to the teaching of speaking skills in Dutch?
72.	What aspect of the speaking lessons helps you the most in developing your speaking skills?
73.	Suppose you could change some aspect of the lessons on speaking skills, what would that be?
74.	Is there anything else you would like to say about your school lessons on speaking skills?