

Kydyrbayeva G.B.¹, Mukhamedzhan A.Zh.²

^{1 2}Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University

¹PhD, senior lecturer,

² Master's student

THE ROLE OF AUTHENTIC LANGUAGE RESOURCES IN DEVELOPING SCHOOL STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILLS

Abstract

This article examines the pedagogical potential of authentic language resources for developing school students' English speaking skills. The study aims to identify the methodological conditions for using materials originally created for real-world communication rather than language instruction to develop students' oral production and interaction skills. The study adopts a theoretical and methodological approach, drawing on a review of scholarly literature and a comparative analysis of the potential of interviews, podcasts, short videos, and public announcements for teaching speaking. Resource selection criteria are established with reference to students' age-related characteristics, language proficiency, communicative needs, and the comprehensibility of the materials' cultural content. Speech rate, lexical complexity, and the duration of audio and video materials are considered in relation to the extent of pedagogical scaffolding required. Based on these criteria, the article proposes an instructional framework comprising familiarisation with the communicative situation, teacher-guided identification of relevant language expressions, scaffolded interaction, independent speaking, and reflective feedback.

Within this framework, authentic resources serve as models of contextually appropriate language use and provide the content for tasks involving the exchange of opinions, information sharing, and role-play. The proposed indicators for assessing students' speaking performance during these tasks include fluency and intelligibility, contextually appropriate vocabulary use, coherence, and appropriate responses to an interlocutor's contributions. The central conclusion is that the pedagogical value of authentic resources is realised through their integration with tasks directed towards a specific communicative goal. The practical significance of the study lies in the proposed resource selection criteria, instructional stages, and speaking assessment indicators, which can inform lesson planning. The effectiveness of the proposed framework requires empirical testing in school settings.

Keywords: authentic language resources, English speaking skills, school students, communicative tasks, pedagogical scaffolding, oral interaction.

Кыдырбаева Г.Б.¹, Мухамеджан А.Ж.²

^{1 2}КазНПУ имени Абая

¹ PhD, старший преподаватель,

² магистрант

РОЛЬ АУТЕНТИЧНЫХ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ РЕСУРСОВ В РАЗВИТИИ НАВЫКОВ УСТНОЙ РЕЧИ ШКОЛЬНИКОВ

Аннотация

В статье рассматривается педагогический потенциал аутентичных языковых ресурсов в развитии навыков говорения на английском языке у школьников. Цель исследования — определить методические условия использования материалов, изначально созданных для реального общения, а не для обучения языку, в развитии

устной речи и речевого взаимодействия учащихся. Исследование носит теоретико-методический характер и основывается на обзоре научной литературы и сравнительном анализе возможностей использования интервью, подкастов, коротких видеоматериалов и объявлений для широкой аудитории в обучении говорению. Критерии отбора ресурсов определяются с учётом возрастных особенностей учащихся, уровня их языковой подготовки, коммуникативных потребностей и доступности культурного содержания материалов для понимания. Темп речи, лексическая сложность и продолжительность аудио- и видеоматериалов рассматриваются во взаимосвязи с необходимым объёмом педагогической поддержки. На основе этих критериев предлагается система обучения, включающая следующие этапы: ознакомление с коммуникативной ситуацией, выявление необходимых языковых средств под руководством учителя, речевое взаимодействие с педагогической поддержкой, самостоятельное говорение и рефлексивная обратная связь.

В данной системе аутентичные ресурсы выступают образцами ситуативно обусловленного использования языка и содержательной основой заданий, предполагающих обмен мнениями, передачу информации и ролевое взаимодействие. Для оценивания устной речи при выполнении заданий предлагаются такие показатели, как беглость и понятность речи, уместность употребления лексики в конкретной ситуации, связность высказывания и адекватность ответа на реплику собеседника. Основной вывод заключается в том, что педагогическая ценность аутентичных ресурсов реализуется посредством их сочетания с заданиями, направленными на достижение конкретной коммуникативной цели. Практическая значимость работы состоит в предложении критериев отбора ресурсов, этапов обучения и показателей оценивания устной речи, которые могут использоваться при планировании уроков. Эффективность предложенной системы требует эмпирической проверки в условиях школьного обучения.

Ключевые слова: аутентичные языковые ресурсы, навыки говорения на английском языке, школьники, коммуникативные задания, педагогическая поддержка, устное речевое взаимодействие.

Кыдырбаева Г.Б.¹, Мұхамеджан А.Ж.²

¹²Абай атындағы ҚазҰПУ

¹ PhD, аға оқытушы,

² магистрант

МЕКТЕП ОҚУШЫЛАРЫНЫҢ СӨЙЛЕУ ДАҒДЫЛАРЫН ДАМУДАҒЫ АУТЕНТТІ ТІЛДІК РЕСУРСАРДЫҢ РӨЛІ

Аңдатпа

Мақалада мектеп оқушыларының ағылшын тілінде сөйлеу дағдыларын дамытудағы аутентті тілдік ресурстардың педагогикалық мүмкіндіктері қарастырылады. Зерттеудің мақсаты – бастапқыда тіл үйрету үшін емес, шынайы қарым-қатынас мақсатында жасалған материалдарды оқушылардың ауызша сөйлеуі мен өзара тілдесуін дамытуға пайдаланудың әдістемелік шарттарын айқындау. Зерттеу теориялық-әдістемелік сипатта жүргізіліп, ғылыми әдебиеттерге шолу жасауға және сұхбаттар, подкасттар, қысқа бейнематериалдар мен көпшілікке арналған хабарландырулардың сөйлеуді үйретудегі мүмкіндіктерін салыстыра талдауға негізделеді. Ресурстарды іріктеу өлшемдері оқушылардың жас ерекшеліктері, тілдік дайындық деңгейі, коммуникативтік қажеттіліктері және материалдың мәдени мазмұнының түсініктілігі тұрғысынан айқындалады. Аудио және бейнематериалдардағы сөйлеу қарқыны, лексикалық күрделілік пен ұзақтық қажетті педагогикалық қолдау көлемімен байланысты

қарастырылады. Осы өлшемдер негізінде коммуникативтік жағдаятпен танысу, қажетті тілдік қолданыстарды мұғалімнің бағыттауымен анықтау, педагогикалық қолдаумен өзара тілдесу, дербес сөйлеу және рефлексиялық кері байланыс кезеңдерін қамтитын оқыту жүйесі ұсынылады.

Бұл жүйеде аутентті ресурстар жағдаятқа сай тіл қолданудың үлгісі және пікір алмасу, ақпарат бөлісу мен рөлдік тапсырмалардың мазмұндық негізі ретінде қарастырылады. Тапсырмаларды орындау кезіндегі сөйлеуді бағалау үшін сөйлеудің жатықтығы мен түсініктілігі, сөздерді жағдаятқа сай қолдану, ойдың байланыстылығы және сұхбаттасушының репликасына орынды жауап беру көрсеткіштері ұсынылады. Негізгі тұжырым аутентті ресурстардың педагогикалық құндылығы оларды нақты коммуникативтік мақсатқа бағытталған тапсырмалармен ұштастыру арқылы жүзеге асатынына негізделеді. Жұмыстың практикалық маңызы сабақ жоспарлауда қолдануға болатын ресурстарды іріктеу өлшемдерін, оқыту кезеңдерін және сөйлеуді бағалау көрсеткіштерін ұсынумен айқындалады. Ұсынылған жүйенің тиімділігі мектеп жағдайында эмпирикалық тексеруді қажет етеді.

Түйін сөздер: аутентті тілдік ресурстар, ағылшын тілінде сөйлеу дағдылары, мектеп оқушылары, коммуникативтік тапсырмалар, педагогикалық қолдау, ауызша тілдесу.

Introduction

Developing school students' speaking skills involves enabling them to use linguistic knowledge to express intentions, organise ideas, and respond appropriately to other speakers. Successful oral communication requires coordination between language production and the interpretation of an unfolding communicative situation. Learners need opportunities to formulate intelligible messages, manage conversational turns, clarify misunderstandings, and adjust their contributions to an audience. This understanding is consistent with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which positions learners as social agents and connects language education with purposeful communicative activity. Its distinction between oral production and interaction also provides a basis for recognising that speaking development encompasses both constructing a coherent utterance and participating responsively in dialogue. [1] Authentic language resources are relevant to this objective because they provide examples of language situated within identifiable social purposes. In the present article, the term refers to spoken and audiovisual materials originally produced for communication, information, or entertainment beyond formal language instruction. These include interviews, podcasts, short videos, and public announcements. Authenticity nevertheless requires careful conceptual treatment. Gilmore's review demonstrates that the concept encompasses the origins of a text, its interpretation by learners, and the relationship between material and classroom activity. The review also identifies differences between textbook discourse and naturally occurring communication, alongside questions concerning linguistic difficulty, motivation, and task design. [2] Accordingly, this article treats authenticity as a resource characteristic whose educational significance depends on how the material is selected and used.

Empirical research provides a basis for examining this significance while also establishing limits to generalisation. In a longitudinal classroom investigation involving Japanese university learners, Gilmore compared instruction using authentic materials and associated tasks with instruction based on textbook materials. The authentic-materials group achieved stronger outcomes on several measures of communicative competence, although advantages were not consistent across all measures. [3] These findings support the potential of a carefully designed instructional approach incorporating authentic input. However, the

contribution of the materials cannot be separated straightforwardly from the tasks accompanying them. Moreover, results obtained with university students require consideration of developmental and instructional differences before being applied to school learners. Audiovisual resources introduce further possibilities and demands. Images, gestures, and situational cues can help establish the context of an utterance, while captions offer an additional representation of spoken language. At the same time, learners must allocate attention across speech, visual information, and any accompanying text. Montero Perez's review examines these relationships through research on audiovisual comprehension, vocabulary, grammar, and listening, highlighting the relevance of vocabulary demands and different forms of on-screen support. [4] For speaking instruction, this evidence raises a specific methodological question: how can understanding a recorded message become a basis for producing a new, purposeful utterance? Comprehension and vocabulary learning are relevant resources for speaking, but evidence of improvement in these areas does not by itself establish development in spontaneous oral interaction. Research involving school-age learners makes the relationship between exposure and language use particularly relevant. De Wilde, Brysbaert, and Eyckmans investigated English proficiency among Dutch-speaking children aged ten to twelve before the beginning of formal English instruction. Their assessment included receptive vocabulary and listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. The findings revealed considerable differences between learners and associations between proficiency and interactive forms of exposure involving language production. [5] This evidence suggests that the nature of engagement deserves attention alongside the amount of contact with English. Because the investigation concerned informal exposure, however, it does not establish the effectiveness of a particular classroom resource or teaching sequence. A subsequent longitudinal investigation by De Wilde extends this perspective by examining adolescent learners' receptive vocabulary and engagement with English outside school. The study identifies reciprocal relationships between proficiency and extracurricular language contact, indicating that stronger language knowledge may influence subsequent engagement as well as develop alongside it. [6] For the present article, this finding cautions against interpreting resource exposure as a simple, one-directional explanation of learning. Students bring different linguistic resources and experiences to the same material. Furthermore, the vocabulary focus of this longitudinal evidence reinforces the need to specify speaking outcomes independently when designing classroom applications.

A theoretical basis for connecting exposure with productive language use is provided by Nation's four-strands framework. This framework distinguishes learning through meaning-focused input, meaning-focused output, deliberate attention to language, and fluency development. [7] Applied to authentic resources, it suggests that listening or viewing should form part of a broader sequence of learning opportunities. An interview, for example, can supply information for a discussion, illustrate expressions used to explain a position, and support a subsequent exchange in which learners formulate their own responses. The instructional purpose determines which features of the resource warrant attention and what students are expected to do with them. Pedagogical support is consequently central to the transition from encountering language to using it. Goh identifies pre-task planning, task repetition, and communication strategies as relevant areas for supporting speaking development, while distinguishing the ways research findings can inform classroom practice. [8] Within an approach using authentic resources, such support may include establishing the communicative situation, identifying useful expressions, allowing brief rehearsal, and providing another opportunity to communicate after feedback. The methodological challenge is to make the task manageable while preserving opportunities for independent formulation and responsiveness. The literature reviewed therefore establishes a clear rationale for integrating authentic resources into speaking instruction, while leaving their classroom contribution dependent on several connected decisions. These concern the

relationship between resource difficulty and learner readiness, the communicative purpose of the task, the support available during production, and the evidence used to judge development. The problem addressed in this article is how to bring these decisions together within a coherent framework for school English teaching. Particular attention is required to distinguish the successful reproduction of a model from the ability to communicate meaning in a different situation. The article aims to develop a theoretically grounded methodological framework for using authentic language resources to support school students' speaking skills. Its objectives are to identify resource-selection criteria, relate spoken and audiovisual features to communicative tasks, and specify a progression from supported engagement to independent speaking and reflective feedback. Speaking development is considered through fluency, intelligibility, lexical appropriateness, discourse coherence, and responsiveness to interlocutors. The intended contribution is an integrated account of resource selection, instructional support, and purposeful oral activity that can guide classroom planning and provide a basis for subsequent empirical evaluation.

Methods

The study integrated a focused literature review with an empirical investigation of classroom performance at General Education School No. 32. The empirical component involved 25 Grade 10 students and followed a single-group pre-test–post-test design. Its purpose was to examine changes in assessed achievement during an intervention addressing the use of authentic language resources in English speaking instruction. The literature review established the conceptual relationships between resource characteristics, communicative tasks, instructional support, and speaking performance. The empirical analysis examined the distribution of participants across achievement categories at the beginning and end of the intervention. The documentary basis comprised the theoretical, empirical, and methodological publications cited in the article. Sources were selected purposively according to their relevance to the research objectives. Inclusion was guided by the contribution of each publication to defining authenticity, explaining the relationship between language input and oral production, identifying conditions affecting resource accessibility, or informing the design and assessment of speaking activities. Scholarly provenance and the availability of sufficient contextual information were also considered. The review followed a narrative synthesis approach in which selected publications were brought together to clarify a methodological problem and establish connections between complementary areas of research [9]. Particular attention was given to evidence involving school learners. Findings from other educational contexts were interpreted with reference to differences in learner age, proficiency, and instructional circumstances.

The interpretation of the literature was organised around six analytical categories: communicative purpose, linguistic demands, contextual support, opportunities for oral production, interactional requirements, and pedagogical assistance. These categories translated the research objectives into a consistent set of questions concerning what a resource communicated, what demands it placed on learners, and how its content could support subsequent speaking. The procedure drew on directed qualitative content analysis, which uses established theoretical concepts and research findings to guide the initial organisation of material [10]. Within each category, resource characteristics, instructional conditions, and reported learning outcomes were examined separately. Evidence concerning comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, oral performance, and learner perceptions was differentiated to ensure that conclusions remained consistent with the outcomes investigated in the original studies. The comparative analysis addressed interviews, explanatory or narrative podcasts, short videos, and public announcements as resource formats represented in the literature. Each format was examined in relation to its original audience and communicative purpose, speech rate, lexical demands, duration, discourse organisation, cultural accessibility, and available visual or textual support. These characteristics were interpreted alongside learner preparation

and the speaking requirements of the associated activity. The analysis therefore connected resource selection with adaptation and classroom use, reflecting the contextual approach to materials development discussed by Tomlinson [11]. Communicative function received particular attention because delivery formats could overlap: an interview, for example, could be presented through either an audio recording or a video. The resulting comparisons informed the resource–task correspondences presented in Table 1. The instructional framework linked resource characteristics with tasks requiring learners to communicate information, explain an interpretation, clarify meaning, or respond to another speaker. Task analysis identified the information available in the source, the contribution expected from the learner, the communicative need addressed, and the intended outcome of the exchange. The methodological basis emphasised meaning, a communicative gap, the use of learners' available linguistic resources, and an identifiable outcome [12]. This connection established how information encountered through listening or viewing could become relevant to a new spoken contribution.

The framework organised instruction into contextual preparation, guided noticing, supported interaction, independent speaking, and reflective feedback. Contextual preparation addressed the situation, participants, and purpose of the original communication. Guided noticing focused attention on expressions and discourse features relevant to the speaking objective. Supported interaction connected these resources with an initial communicative attempt, while independent speaking increased learners' responsibility for organising and formulating their contributions. Reflective feedback related the examination of performance to priorities for further practice. The coherence of these components was considered through constructive alignment, linking the intended learning outcome with the activity and the evidence needed to assess achievement [13]. The conceptual assessment framework encompassed fluency, intelligibility, lexical appropriateness, discourse coherence, and responsiveness to interlocutors. These dimensions informed the descriptors presented in Table 2 and established the focus for interpreting speaking as both individual production and participation in interaction. Their inclusion reflected the importance of defining the speaking construct and relating assessment interpretations to appropriate evidence [14]. The quantitative records analysed in the empirical component contained overall achievement categories. They did not provide separate numerical scores for the five speaking dimensions, so changes in those dimensions were not estimated independently.

The empirical assessment consisted of a pre-test and a post-test administered to the participating group. Performance was reported on a 100-point scale and classified using identical thresholds at both measurement points. Scores of 0–59 represented the low achievement category, scores of 60–79 the intermediate category, and scores of 80–100 the high category. These classifications served as internal performance bands for the study. The pre-test established the initial distribution of participants, while the post-test documented their distribution following the intervention. Quantitative processing involved verifying category totals, calculating percentages, and comparing the distributions across the two assessment occasions. The frequencies at each stage summed to 25 participants. The percentage within a category was calculated by dividing its frequency by the total sample and multiplying the result by 100. One learner therefore represented four percentage points of the sample. Change was expressed through the difference between post-test and pre-test frequencies and the corresponding difference in percentage points. This procedure enabled the direction and extent of change to be described without assigning numerical values to unreported individual scores.

Methodological recommendations were developed by considering the observed distributional changes alongside the resource-selection criteria, task requirements, and forms of instructional support established through the literature review. The empirical component informed discussion of overall achievement within the participating group. The conceptual

analysis provided the basis for interpreting the pedagogical relevance of accessible resources, purposeful communication, and opportunities for independent formulation. This integration maintained a clear relationship between the evidence available and the scope of the conclusions drawn.

Research Results

The comparison of pre-test and post-test distributions revealed a shift towards higher achievement categories among the 25 Grade 10 students. At the initial assessment, 15 participants, representing 60% of the group, obtained scores within the low achievement band of 0–59. Seven students, or 28%, were classified at the intermediate level, while three students, or 12%, reached the high level. The baseline distribution was therefore concentrated in the lowest category, with ten participants, equivalent to 40% of the sample, attaining scores of at least 60 points.

Following the intervention, three students remained within the low category, accounting for 12% of the group. Eleven students, or 44%, were classified at the intermediate level, and another eleven students, also representing 44%, attained the high level. The combined proportion of participants in the intermediate and high categories consequently reached 88%. At the group level, the post-test distribution showed a substantially smaller concentration of low scores and a greater representation of achievement at or above the intermediate threshold. The most pronounced change concerned the low achievement category, whose frequency decreased from fifteen to three students. This constituted a reduction of twelve participants and 48 percentage points. The intermediate category increased from seven to eleven students, corresponding to a gain of four participants and 16 percentage points. The high category increased from three to eleven students, representing a gain of eight participants and 32 percentage points. These values describe net changes in category frequencies; they do not identify the individual transitions underlying those changes. The proportion of students attaining at least the intermediate level increased from 40% at pre-test to 88% at post-test. This 48-percentage-point difference provides descriptive evidence of an upward shift in classified achievement during the intervention period. The equal post-test proportions in the intermediate and high categories also indicate that performance remained differentiated within the group. Improvement in the overall distribution therefore did not imply that all participants had attained the highest category.

The theoretical synthesis produced three interrelated outcomes: a functional correspondence between authentic resources and speaking tasks, an instructional sequence connecting comprehension with independent oral communication, and a set of observable descriptors for evaluating speaking performance. These outcomes constitute the conceptual contribution of the study; they do not represent experimentally measured improvements among school students. The central proposition emerging from the analysis is that the instructional value of authentic resources depends on the relationship between their communicative features, the demands of the accompanying task, and the support available to learners. The first analytical outcome concerns the selection of discourse features that can serve as models for oral communication. Gilmore's comparison of textbook dialogues and corresponding authentic interactions identified differences in turn organisation, pausing, repetition, hesitation, and listener responses within the samples examined [15]. For the present framework, this finding directs attention to how speakers manage communication while formulating ideas and responding to others. An interview, for example, may illustrate how a follow-up question develops an answer, while an announcement may demonstrate how essential information is organised for a particular audience. Resource selection consequently requires attention to the communicative behaviour that learners will subsequently be expected to perform.

The functional comparison generated the resource–task correspondence presented in Table 1. The categories indicate possible instructional uses rather than fixed properties shared by every resource of a particular format. An individual recording must therefore be examined before its suitability for a speaking objective can be established.

Table 1. Proposed correspondence between authentic resources and speaking tasks

Resource format	Communicative features to examine	Illustrative speaking task	Required pedagogical support
Interviews	Question development, elaboration, clarification, and responses to previous turns	Conduct a peer interview and formulate follow-up questions using information provided by the partner	Context introduction, identification of useful question patterns, and brief planning notes
Explanatory or narrative podcasts	Sequencing, examples, reformulation, and connections between ideas	Explain the central issue to a partner and justify a personal interpretation	A content outline, selective replay, and support for essential vocabulary
Short videos	Connections between speech, actions, setting, and speaker intention	Compare interpretations of an event and explain which interpretation is better supported	Viewing prompts and explicit differentiation between visible information and verbal explanation
Public announcements	Concise instructions, conditions, time references, and information priorities	Exchange relevant information and agree on a plan that satisfies stated conditions	A note-taking frame, clarification expressions, and clearly defined roles

The comparison distinguishes two functions that may coexist within a resource. First, the material can provide a discourse model: learners examine how a speaker introduces an explanation, requests clarification, or connects ideas. Second, it can supply information that learners need to communicate. These functions require different task designs. Reproducing an announcement may direct attention to pronunciation and organisation, whereas explaining its implications to a partner requires selection, reformulation, and adaptation to the listener's needs. The proposed framework therefore specifies both the language feature available for

examination and the communicative purpose of the subsequent speaking activity. A second outcome is the distinction between access to linguistic resources and their independent deployment in speech. Pujadas and Muñoz reported vocabulary gains among secondary school learners following extensive viewing of television episodes with captions or subtitles, with outcomes also related to prior proficiency and vocabulary pre-teaching [16]. This evidence concerns vocabulary learning; it does not establish that newly encountered expressions become readily available during spontaneous interaction. Accordingly, the present synthesis identifies a necessary instructional connection between noticing language in context and using it to express a new meaning. Within the proposed tasks, learners select relevant expressions, adapt them to their own intentions, and employ them when the required response is not supplied by the recording. The analysis also identifies accessibility as a condition that must be considered separately from authenticity. A resource may present an appropriate topic while imposing excessive demands through unfamiliar vocabulary, rapid delivery, or densely packed information. In their investigation involving university learners, Pujadas and Muñoz found a comprehension advantage for captioned viewing and demonstrated the relevance of proficiency and vocabulary knowledge to understanding audiovisual input [17]. Applying this evidence to school instruction requires caution because the population and outcome differ from those addressed in the present article. The resulting proposal is to adjust support according to the information learners can recover and use, rather than to remove captions according to a predetermined timetable.

This distinction clarifies the relationship between supported comprehension and independent speaking. Captions may remain available while learners establish what a resource communicates. During a later speaking task, however, continuous access to a complete script would limit the evidence available about independent formulation. The framework therefore proposes a transition from comprehensive input support to selective speaking support, such as keywords or a brief content outline. The purpose of this transition is to preserve access to meaning while creating opportunities for learners to organise their own contributions. The third outcome is an operational interpretation of the five-stage instructional sequence established in the methodology. Contextual preparation defines the communicative situation; guided noticing identifies language relevant to the intended task; supported interaction provides an initial opportunity to use that language; independent speaking introduces greater responsibility for formulation; and reflective feedback establishes priorities for another attempt. The distinctive feature of the sequence is the changing function of the original resource. It initially supplies information and examples, subsequently supports interaction, and finally becomes a reference against which learners can examine their own communicative choices.

An illustrative application involves an authentic announcement about a change to an event schedule. During contextual preparation, learners establish who issued the announcement, whom it addresses, and which arrangements have changed. Guided noticing focuses on expressions used to state conditions, explain changes, and clarify details. In supported interaction, partners receive different practical constraints and discuss whether a proposed arrangement is feasible. The independent task introduces a new constraint, requiring learners to revise their explanation or recommendation. Reflective feedback then addresses whether the revised arrangement was communicated clearly and whether each contribution responded to the partner's information. This example illustrates the proposed framework; it is not an account of an implemented classroom intervention. Task repetition provides a relevant empirical basis for incorporating further speaking attempts. Lambert, Kormos, and Minn found that immediate repetition of oral tasks was associated with gains in fluency, although speech rate, pausing, and self-repair followed different patterns across successive performances [18]. Within the present framework, repetition offers an opportunity to revisit a communicative objective after feedback. A subsequent variation in information or audience is proposed to

examine whether learners can adapt their language beyond the rehearsed response. Improved delivery of an unchanged task would, by itself, provide insufficient evidence of such transfer.

Feedback constitutes another connection between authentic input and learners' developing production. Lyster and Saito's meta-analysis identified benefits of oral corrective feedback for target-language development in classroom studies, with outcomes varying according to feedback type and assessment conditions [19]. Drawing on this evidence, the proposed sequence includes selective feedback followed by an opportunity to reformulate. For example, feedback may identify an unclear time reference or an inappropriate expression that affected the intended message. The learner then revises the relevant contribution. Broader reflections on organisation and responsiveness are included as components of the proposed framework, rather than presented as outcomes established by that meta-analysis. The final analytical output is an assessment matrix connecting the five speaking dimensions identified in the methodology with observable performance. A distinction is required between intelligibility and resemblance to a particular accent model. Munro and Derwing demonstrated that strongly accented speech can remain intelligible, supporting the separate consideration of accentedness, perceived comprehensibility, and actual listener understanding [20]. In the present matrix, intelligibility is therefore approached through evidence of message recovery. Listener paraphrases or accurate responses can provide classroom indicators, although they must be interpreted in relation to the listener's proficiency and familiarity with the content.

Table 2. Proposed descriptors for examining speaking performance

Speaking dimension	Observable performance descriptor	Suitable evidence
Fluency	Sustains a contribution and manages pauses or reformulations without repeatedly abandoning the intended message	A recorded explanation and a subsequent attempt under comparable conditions
Intelligibility	Communicates essential information that the listener can accurately recover	A listener's paraphrase, identification of key details, or appropriate task response
Lexical appropriateness	Selects words and expressions that fit the intended meaning, topic, and communicative situation	Contextual analysis of vocabulary used in explanations and exchanges
Discourse coherence	Presents ideas in an identifiable sequence and makes relevant connections explicit	A short explanation containing a main point, supporting information, and a connected outcome

Responsiveness to interlocutors	Addresses preceding contributions and adjusts an explanation when clarification or new information is introduced	An exchange containing unscripted follow-up questions or changing conditions
---------------------------------	--	--

The matrix makes the relationship between task design and assessment explicit. A prepared monologue can provide evidence of organisation and delivery, but offers limited evidence of responsiveness. An interactive task can reveal how a learner handles clarification, although performance also depends on the partner's contributions. Consequently, the framework proposes complementary evidence from individual production and interaction. Input comprehension should also be checked separately so that misunderstanding the original resource is not automatically interpreted as a weakness in speaking. The conceptual contribution of the study is thus a specified relationship between resource characteristics, instructional support, communicative action, and observable speaking performance. Its empirical evaluation would require evidence that learners can apply relevant language in new speaking situations and sustain performance as support is reduced. Until such evidence is available, the framework provides a basis for classroom planning and subsequent investigation rather than a demonstrated estimate of instructional effectiveness.

Conclusion

This conceptual study identifies the instructional conditions under which authentic language resources can support school students' English speaking development. Their pedagogical value depends on the alignment of resource characteristics, learners' needs, and purposeful speaking tasks. Appropriately selected interviews, podcasts, short videos, and public announcements provide contextualised examples of language use and meaningful content for explanation, interpretation, and interaction. Realising these opportunities requires support that enables learners to understand the material and progressively formulate their own contributions. The principal contribution of the study is a framework connecting contextual preparation, guided noticing, supported interaction, independent speaking, and reflective feedback. The proposed assessment descriptors relate this sequence to fluency, intelligibility, lexical appropriateness, discourse coherence, and responsiveness to interlocutors. Together, these components provide a methodological basis for selecting resources, designing speaking activities, and examining communicative performance. As the framework has not undergone classroom validation, its effectiveness remains an empirical question. Further research should investigate its suitability across school proficiency levels and determine whether learners can sustain and adapt their speaking performance in unfamiliar communicative situations.

References

1. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment — Companion Volume. — Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. — 278 p. — ISBN 978-92-871-8621-8. — [Electronic edition](#).
2. Gilmore A. Authentic materials and authenticity in foreign language learning // Language Teaching. — 2007. — Vol. 40, No. 2. — P. 97–118. — DOI: [10.1017/S0261444807004144](#).
3. Gilmore A. “I Prefer Not Text”: Developing Japanese Learners' Communicative Competence with Authentic Materials // Language Learning. — 2011. — Vol. 61, No. 3. — P. 786–819. — DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00634.x](#).

4. Montero Perez M. Second or foreign language learning through watching audio-visual input and the role of on-screen text // *Language Teaching*. — 2022. — Vol. 55, No. 2. — P. 163–192. — DOI: [10.1017/S0261444821000501](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444821000501).
5. De Wilde V., Brysbaert M., Eyckmans J. Learning English through out-of-school exposure. Which levels of language proficiency are attained and which types of input are important? // *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. — 2020. — Vol. 23, No. 1. — P. 171–185. — DOI: [10.1017/S1366728918001062](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728918001062).
6. De Wilde V. Adolescent learners' L2 English vocabulary knowledge and contact with extramural English: Longitudinal development and relationships between L2 vocabulary and extramural English // *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. — 2026. — Vol. 29, No. 4. — P. 992–1003. — DOI: [10.1017/S1366728925100540](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728925100540).
7. Nation P. The Four Strands // *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*. — 2007. — Vol. 1, No. 1. — P. 2–13. — DOI: [10.2167/illt039.0](https://doi.org/10.2167/illt039.0).
8. Goh C. C. M. Research into practice: Scaffolding learning processes to improve speaking performance // *Language Teaching*. — 2017. — Vol. 50, No. 2. — P. 247–260. — DOI: [10.1017/S0261444816000483](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000483).
9. Snyder H. Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines // *Journal of Business Research*. — 2019. — Vol. 104. — P. 333–339. — DOI: [10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039).
10. Hsieh H.-F., Shannon S. E. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis // *Qualitative Health Research*. — 2005. — Vol. 15, No. 9. — P. 1277–1288. — DOI: [10.1177/1049732305276687](https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687).
11. Tomlinson B. Materials development for language learning and teaching // *Language Teaching*. — 2012. — Vol. 45, No. 2. — P. 143–179. — DOI: [10.1017/S0261444811000528](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000528).
12. Ellis R. Task-based language teaching: sorting out the misunderstandings // *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. — 2009. — Vol. 19, No. 3. — P. 221–246. — DOI: [10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x).
13. Biggs J. Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment // *Higher Education*. — 1996. — Vol. 32. — P. 347–364. — DOI: [10.1007/BF00138871](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871).
14. Fan J., Yan X. Assessing Speaking Proficiency: A Narrative Review of Speaking Assessment Research Within the Argument-Based Validation Framework // *Frontiers in Psychology*. — 2020. — Vol. 11. — Article 330. — DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00330](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00330).
15. Gilmore A. A comparison of textbook and authentic interactions // *ELT Journal*. — 2004. — Vol. 58, No. 4. — P. 363–374. — DOI: [10.1093/elt/58.4.363](https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.4.363).
16. Pujadas G., Muñoz C. Extensive viewing of captioned and subtitled TV series: a study of L2 vocabulary learning by adolescents // *The Language Learning Journal*. — 2019. — Vol. 47, No. 4. — P. 479–496. — DOI: [10.1080/09571736.2019.1616806](https://doi.org/10.1080/09571736.2019.1616806).
17. Pujadas G., Muñoz C. When to switch captions off? Exploring the effects of L2 proficiency and vocabulary knowledge on comprehension of captioned and uncaptioned TV // *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*. — 2024. — Vol. 14, No. 3. — P. 545–570. — DOI: [10.14746/ssllt.38036](https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.38036).
18. Lambert C., Kormos J., Minn D. Task repetition and second language speech processing // *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. — 2017. — Vol. 39, No. 1. — P. 167–196. — DOI: [10.1017/S0272263116000085](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263116000085).
19. Lyster R., Saito K. Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis // *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. — 2010. — Vol. 32, No. 2. — P. 265–302. — DOI: [10.1017/S0272263109990520](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263109990520).

20. Munro M. J., Derwing T. M. Foreign accent, comprehensibility, and intelligibility in the speech of second language learners // *Language Learning*. – 1995. – Vol. 45, No. 1. – P. 73–97. – DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1995.tb00963.x).