

**1 author name(s),****Grace Hui chin Lin****2 publication/presentation/acceptance date, Dec. 19, 2024****3 name and date of conference or journal citation information.****the 26th International Conference and Workshop on TEFL & Applied Linguistics, which will be held from Friday, March 7, 2025, to Saturday, March 8, 2025****Location: Ming Chuan University, Jihe Campus (No. 130, Jihe Rd., Shilin District, Taipei City 111, Taiwan)****Article: International Views to See English Speaking, a Global Village Communication Tool**

Author name: Grace Hui chin Lin

PhD, Texas A&amp;M University, College Station

Master of Science, University of Southern California

**ABSTRACT**

The primary goal of this project is to assess the students' better communication attainment after applying a series of five interactive strategies to an experiment group of subjects. This class will be compared with a control group of other participants, and in their class, the interactive approaches are not emphasized and practiced openly.

The target students of the experiment and control groups in this project are non-English major freshmen. The students in the experiment group are supposed to make more improvements in communication competence after being directed with designed interactive strategies in this research study, which emphasizes the significance of interaction in an appropriate way.

This project highlights that the EFL learners' proficiency in listening and speaking which applies in the real world is imperative. To facilitate students' learning and assist them in making progress in substantial communication and using English in their real life, this study supposes that interactive strategies should be offered to college students who have fewer requirements in examination preparations than high school students.

The designed interactive strategies in this study are divided into two types, including pedagogic and pragmatic models. They are hypothesized to be effectual, competent, and realistic for the university students of Taiwan because they contain both traditional and innovative pedagogic and pragmatic skills for fluent and appropriate communication.

These strategies activate knowledge of English which students acquire at school. They make students more familiar with English applications in the real world because they are skills in facilitating English message transmission, expression, and intercourse.

**Keyword:**

Pedagogical Model, Pragmatic Model, Interaction, Strategic Competence, Holistic Proficiency of Speaking, English Testing Rubric as Strategies of Speaking

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The applied interactive strategies in this project are divided into pedagogical and pragmatic models from perspectives of classical and prestigious interactive approaches done by Bejarano (1997), and Swain (1998). On the other hand, two pragmatic transfer techniques in current papers which make available concepts of flexible communication methods with communities from different cultures are also introduced. In this project, five strategies in the pedagogic model and pragmatic model will be tested and compared.

The strategies mentioned in the pedagogical model are “checking for comprehension and clarification strategy,” “collaboration strategy” and “reflection strategy.” On the other hand, the strategies designated in the pragmatic model are “culturally responding strategy” and “international setting strategy.” These two models present significant and updated interaction skills for improving strategic communication competence because they cover up practical knowledge of both general communication tips and cultural differences.

The objectives of this study are to build up an assessment system on interactive strategies with elevated reliability and validity, to collect the data offered regularly in-class examinations, and to promote interactive approaches in the universities of Taiwan.

### **1. Historical Perspectives**

In Taiwan, since 1999, students have been obligated to be educated in subject matters of English from grade five in elementary schools. Taiwan's government has been trying to achieve foreign affairs objectives of entering international societies, such as WTO (Taiwan entered in Jan 2002) and the United Nations, and to avoid being isolated from the

modernized global village. Primary school principals and administrators in Taiwan aggressively cooperate with the government and have practiced this policy for six years so far. Furthermore, many schools make students begin to enroll for English courses from the second grade.

Nonetheless, although Taiwanese students learn English for a long time, for most university freshman in Taiwan, after their eight years of English learning in primary school, junior high school, and senior high school, they still have problems in actual English application of speaking and listening.

I presuppose these problems might be caused by the rationales that many students who are trained English in Taiwan, especially those who study in senior high school, tend to focus English study objectives on passing the examinations with a higher grade for entering a better university. Additionally, another reason is the materials utilized in schools of Taiwan do not indicate sensitively the importance of EIL issues (English as an international language).

## **2. Forms of EIL:**

### **EIAL, EWL and EIL**

Since in our contemporary global society, genuine communication with people from all over the world in international settings is not as essential as talking to native speakers in English-speaking countries. Consequently, “the use of English has led to the development of functional perception of English as an international language EIL.” (Smith, 1976; Quirk, 1978; Smith, 1981; Campbell et al., 1982; Stern, 1992; & Talebinezhad & Aliakbari, 2001). Thus new terms such as ESL (English as an international language), EIAL (English as international auxiliary language), EWL (English as a world language), and EIL (English as international or international language) have been introduced and have achieved world recognition.” (Talebinezhad & Aliakbari, 2002) As a result, I believe that the students ought to construct pragmatic concepts to communicate well in an international setting.

## **3. Taiwanese Students Should Be Familiar with EIL**

Smith (1976) noted that an “international language” is applied by people of different nations to communicate with one another. I consider students in the universities of Taiwan to be obliged to learn English from a wider view through appropriate materials that include “source culture, target culture, and international culture” (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999) and pragmatic concepts, to build an ability to handle international situations.

In all, I assume that after employing the right materials of EIL and interactive strategies of pedagogical model and pragmatic model for students of Non-major English learners of Taiwan, we will perceive the students generate a great deal of advancement in international interactive competence because they are trained with present pragmatic examples that point out the culture differences.

Their English acquaintance and learning paradigm are shifted to a more successful one that consists of interactive manipulation skills not only in the Anglo-English communities, but also in various universal situations in non-native speaking countries.

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

When designing interactive strategies and their assessment system in order to improve the communication teaching and learning methods and promote the right materials for of Non-English major students, many books and journals are found and referred for doing this study. First of all, two research journal references that are found on the equivalent topic arguing the interactive strategy significance are read. There are two research methodologies of it, for interactive approaches processed, practiced and accomplished in Israel and France schools. These two studies inspired the researchers of this study to broaden their theories and come up with five more interactive fitting strategies to make students of Taiwanese Technology University engaged in this proposal with the principle of making improvements in their communication components.

### **1. Studies of Israel and France**

The first periodical is “Modified-interaction Strategies and Social-interaction Strategies” (Bejarano, Levine, Olshtain & Steiner, 1997). It is a research project done in Israel, which focused on wide-ranging interactive conversation skills. The second journal is another investigation completed in France. Within this research, the games “Jigsaw Task”, and “Cooperative Strategies” (Swain & Lapkin, 1998) are applied by the authors to collect students’ performance records and survey data. What this study different from theirs is that besides centralizing the importance of pedagogical strategies appeal in their journals, I take the pragmatic material issue as a significant component into consideration for an “EIL paradigm” shift into students’ minds.

The researchers of this study adopted an updated perspective of “pragmatic transfer” that promoted issues of English as an international language, referred to an online Linguistic

journal that demonstrates Iran's Current ELT (English Language Teaching) with its title of "Evaluation and Justification of a Paradigm Shift in the Current ELT Models in Iran." Moreover, the researcher also developed two interactive pragmatic strategies for students to learn.

Hence, a journal, "Pragmatic Transfer in Intercultural Communication" (Zegarac & Pennington, 2000) is also referred as a powerful material that the researchers of this study assume it helps students be more familiar with EIL principles and pragmatic transfer methods after reading examples of EIL communication difficulties caused by cultural differences. This article "touches the ways in which culture-specific aspects of communicative competence affect what goes on in situations of communication between people from different culture backgrounds. (Zegarac & Pennington, 2000)

## **2. Assessing Students' Learning Effectiveness**

For assessing how much progress students carried out through trained with above strategies, I apply Browns' book, "Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices" (Brown, 2004) as a resource to design an assessment system in interactive communication competence. There are two assessment instruments in this project, an interview and a questionnaire. Both of them belong to quantitative methods.

The researchers of this study adopt the Brown's ideas in Chapter Six: Assessing Listening and Chapter Seven: Assessing Speaking in order to develop an interview task to test students' learning effectiveness before and after they are taught by five interactive strategies in two models.

The functions of this interview are not only for regular school quiz, midterm, and final examination, but also for research data collecting and analyzing. For designing the questionnaire, another book reviewed is Zoltan Dornyei's "Questionnaires in Second Language Research." (Dornyei, 2003)

The researchers of this study adopted Dornyei's "semantic differential scales" as questionnaire data collecting method. With this form, students are supposed to do the questionnaire paper writing and present their reflections toward the effect and efficiency of interactive approaches.

This study did not make the control group fill in this form since they were not trained by the selected strategies. The researchers only compare control group's learning

result of communication ability with experiment group of students.

### III. QUANTITATIVE STUDY

Through comparing their learning effect by interview tasks before and after their one semester course, we test our research null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis. The null hypothesis assumed through T-test function, in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, is interactive strategies which make significant difference in students' improvement of communicative components and the alternative hypothesis there is no dissimilarity in improving communicative ability after students are guided to study with pedagogic and pragmatic model. For finding out students' differences in communicative competences, a grading sheet, including all important components of communicative competence will be applied as criteria.

#### 1. Instrument: Grading Sheet

This grading sheet is designed by referring to General Rating Criteria of the Center for Teaching & Learning Service at the University of Minnesota (Alderson, Clapham, & Wall, 1995; Bachman, 1990; Buck, 1990; Dandonoli, & Henning, 1990; Hughes, 1989, Lumley & McNamara, 1995). All elements associated with the five strategies are taken into considered.

**TABLE I. Rating Criteria of Training with Communication Strategies**

Score of Individual: \_\_\_\_\_ (/100%)

<b>Range and control of linguistic repertoire</b>	<b>Verbal communication production</b>	<b>Language utilization and instructional context awareness</b>	<b>Interactive communication (verbal and non-verbal)</b>
Employ field-specific vocabulary that promotes understandable expression of	Flowing	Candidates are <i>appropriately</i> concise or elaborate depending on	Gestures, eye-contact, and body language promote intended

<p>concepts; use <i>some colloquial and idiomatic terms</i> and expressions</p>		<p>context. ( <i>Culturally responding strategy</i>)</p>	<p>message</p>
<p>Apply expressions, terms and <i>mind map</i> to connection concepts and highlight key points (<i>Reflection strategy</i>)</p>	<p>Comprehensible</p>	<p>Frame or preview concept or link concept to prior acquaintance (<i>Checking for comprehension approach</i>)</p>	<p>Blackboard use or other visuals promote communication of concepts</p>
<p>May show some lexis choice variation but this does not inhibit communication of concepts</p>	<p>They may have phonological variation or some variation in rhythm or rate but are intelligible. (<i>International setting strategy</i>)</p>	<p>Convey a coherent explanation of a concept, offer relevant examples or analogies</p>	<p>Anticipate what might not be understood (<i>Collaboration strategy</i>)</p>
<p>Grammatical deviations, when present, are negligible and not predominantly distracting</p>	<p>Speech is lucid and projected adequately.</p>	<p>Define terms, summarize or rephrase points understand <i>cultural perspective</i>, provide appropriate suggestions and direction.</p>	<p>They are attentive to communication and monitor the communication; they understand spoken English well</p>

Score: ( / )	Score: ( / )	Score: ( / )	Score: ( / )
--------------	--------------	--------------	-----------------

## 2. Pedagogical Model

There are two models that we need to test in this project. In the pedagogical model, “searching for realization and explication strategy,” “collaboration strategy” and “reflection strategy” are assumed to help student produce a higher comprehension level, because through them non-native speakers have supplementary opportunities in negotiation and modification in their discourse. Research has shown that negotiation for meaning makes input more comprehensible to the non-native speaker and that conversational modification is a well-organized way to bring about such negotiation (Pica, 1996; Varonis & Gass, 1985).

First, by “searching for realization and explication strategy” the speakers are brought up to have competence of asking questions for eliciting and understanding the interlocutor’s exact meaning. For example, they may ask questions such as “Do you get what I mean?” or “Could you explain what you said?” This way, speaker asks questions to ensure listener’s deep level of comprehension and realization, very much the same, the listener answer to reconfirm his/her interpretation to the question maker.

Second, in “collaboration strategy”, interlocutors need to help each other to complete a discourse when the speaker might encounter difficulties of words, grammar or pronunciation. Interlocutors may engage in any type of assistance and exchange messages by words reminding or grammar error corrections.

Third, in “reflection strategy,” the speakers and listeners may use graphic organizers such as a mind map or Venn’s (1880) Diagram to illustrate and convey a message that they want to express.

## 3. Pragmatics Model

In the second pragmatic model explains the culture differences and makes students talk with an appropriate way. The strategies in this model are “culturally responding strategy,” and “international setting strategy.” The first “culturally responding strategy” suggests that students need to arrange appropriate ways, attitudes, and behaviors when speaking to people with different nationalities and cultures.



For example, when talking to Americans, we need to make more agreements revealed in discourses because Americans appreciate more positive attitude in speaking. (Yoon, 1991)

Second, through the “international setting strategy,” learners are taught to be adequate and capable in communicating from the perspectives of EIL, which emphasizes that native-like pronunciation is not required but cultural identity is a necessary constituent in international situations. It emphasizes that the “pragmatic transfer” in culturally speaking (Zagarac & Pennington, 2000) and confident communication for EIL situations in our real world are two of the focal purposes of learning English.

#### **4. Assessments for Learning Effectiveness**

For designing an assessment system in this project, this study applies the “Interactive Speaking Tasks” and “Authentic Listening Tasks” as two primary test methods. With one of two interactive categories that Brown mentioned as “relatively only stretches of interactive discourse” and “less interaction.” (Brown, 2004) This project adopts interactive speaking tasks that involve relatively long stretches of interactive discourse. According to Michael Canale’s (1984) proposed framework for communicative proficiency testing, a developed interview task is assumed to be reliable, valid, practical, and authentic.

He proposed that students will carry out the language at the highest level if the interview processes are led through four stages of “warm up, level check, probe, and wind-down.” “Warm-up helps the test-takers become comfortable with situation, appraises the test-taker of the format, and allays anxieties.” (Brown, 2000) Therefore, its reliability is high because students' test results will not be influenced by the testing environment which may cause anxiety and discomfort. Students’ learning results will not be consistent because of the calm down step of “warm up.”

Michael Canale’s (1984) “level check” makes the interviewer stimulate the test takers to answer with an expected and predicted content forms such as peer collaboration for a sentence construction and culture related messages, which is a good mode to lead students to employ the interactive communication style. This “level check” procedure offers high content validity because with a “level check” rating form indicating the material content points, the test takers can be reminded to use the interactive strategies by the rater as well as the examiner. They are expected to say things by applying what they had learned about interactive approaches after learning.

The third step of this assessment is “probe.” “Probe questions and prompts challenge test-takers to go the heights of their ability, to extend beyond the limits of the interviewer’s expectation through increasingly difficult questions.” (Brown, 2003) As I see it, the authenticity in assessment is high in the “probe” design because English as an International language of real-world knowledge can be a challenge for students. The “Probe” step makes students perceive a new aspect of communicating, so it offers an opportunity for students to face the challenge and make progress during the interview.

That is the factor, why “probe” saves students’ and teachers’ time for the beginning instruction and achieves the practicality. Its practicality is elevated because when the first “probe” step (before course interview) can be completed as a content prediction and interactive approach introduction for students who are not familiar with pedagogical and pragmatic strategies. In the “probe” step, students might encounter the limitation of using interactive strategies during the first “probe” step, but they will be stimulated to reflect the in-class training, perhaps in a stressful way, and finally become more familiar with the usages after the probing step. “Probe” assists students in gaining a new perspective in conversation.

And the “wind-down” is a method of wash back because the interviewee finally discuss with students about their feelings toward all four types of questions, and provides information about when and where to obtain the results of the interview. This interactive interview task is designed as follows for using before teaching interactive strategies:

**TABLE II.**  
**Processes and Questions in Assessment for Effectiveness**

---

Process	
Questions:	
Warm up:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· How are you?</li> <li>· What’s your name?</li> <li>· Let’s talk about what we are going to learn.</li> </ul>
Level check:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· When you communicate with a person with problems of understanding, what you can do?</li> <li>· How do you help your partners to complete a conversation?</li> <li>· What you can do to enhance understanding and</li> </ul>

comprehension when talking to people.

- Have you talked to a foreigner?
- What difficulty did you encounter when talking to him/her?
- Describe an international situation that you came across or your friend came across.

Probe: (for two students) · Students do self-introducing to each other.

(The interviewer analyzes them of pedagogy model strategies by checking times of using designed strategies, such as mind map and word reminding)

- Students do the role play in various situations like shopping in Japan, looking for a job in the US, and be treat as a guest in China.

(Interviewer analysis their level of pragmatic model by checking understating culture difference and appropriate way of speaking.)

Wind-down:

- Did you feel Okay about his interview?
  - You can receive your score of this interview next Friday morning.
- 

As you can see, through interviewing, the administrator, teachers and examinees sit down face to face with the interviewer. They exchange messages, ask questions and interact with teacher. Examinees are guided to bring into playing the interactive approaches and act in response and answer with well-mannered, attitude and correct appropriated discourses during four steps of consultation as well as the interview. Students are rated by ranking from 1 to 5 in two steps, “level check” and “probe” parts with their frequency of using five designed strategies in pedagogical and pragmatic models. By audio data recording, the same rater carefully listens to their speeches twice in order to make certain the reliability of this assessment and accuracy scoring with collected taped data in the end period of this project. This interview framework of Michael Canale should be used for twice in both experiment and control group before and after training process.

#### **IV. ASSUMPTION**

It is anticipated that that the researcher might see a significant dissimilar grade in the

final examination between the experiment group and the control group. Furthermore, we suppose that the “before and after” interview scores of the experiment group should also be different. Experiment subjects are assumed to formulate a great deal of progress in communication with pedagogical and pragmatic models after they are taught with interactive strategies.

## V. SEMANTIC DIFFERENT SCALES

In addition, through “semantic differential scales” (Dornyei, 2003), the researcher of this study think that we can more evidently distinguish students’ improvement after learning interactive approaches. “Semantic different scales are very useful in that by using them we can avoid writing statements which is not always easy; instead, respondents are asked to indicate their answers by marking a continuum with a tick or an ‘X’ between two bipolar adjectives on the extremes (Zoltan, 2003).

It is supplied for getting to recognize students’ feeling and stage of their understanding deepness in manipulated interactive models. According to the data result from interactive approach semantic differential scales, the researchers can very quickly obtain students’ feedback of this study and give wash back to students in a short time to achieve a high practicality.

**TABLE III.**  
**INTERACTIVE APPROACH SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCALE**

1. “Checking for comprehension and clarification strategy” is	Useless _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useful
2. “Collaboration strategy” is	Useless _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useful
3. “Reflection strategy” is	Useless _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useful
4. “Culturally responding strategy” is	Useless _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useful
5. “International setting strategy” is	Useless _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useful

Designed by Grace Hui Chin Lin, 2024

## **VI. INTERACTIVE STRATEGIES**

As can be identified, this project emphasizes when it goes to the interactive approach, both the pedagogical strategies and pragmatic principles should be regarded as applicable interactive methods in speaking and listening. To see the effect of the interactive approach, we had gone through face-to-face interview tasks for twice in two classes that involved one teacher-to-one student discourse and student-to-student pair role play. From recorded tape data, the rater count students' frequency of fluently demonstrating pedagogical strategies and their deep level of understanding in pragmatic transfer in a 1-5 scale. According to these collected data, we are going to analysis them with a quantitative research method.

We attempt to achieve that by illustrating and promoting the significant interactive approaches from perspectives of pedagogical and pragmatic models, students can talk more fluently and appropriately. As you can imagine, this project predicts that an experiment class of Non-English-major Freshmen in a Taiwanese University will learn better in communication competence with well-designed strategies, cautiously selected EIL material, unambiguous pragmatic transfer examples, and reliable interview task.

## **VII. Limitation**

There are few unavoidable limitations in this assessment project in the following. First of all, only two classes of freshmen may not represent all the population of Taiwan. Besides, the reliability in scoring the using of mind map in "reflection strategies" may be affected by students' speed and clear level of hand drafting and writing. This assessment project is designed as a data colleting method of an empirical interactive approach study, and as an evaluation form of in-class tests.

## **IIIX. Discussion and Conclusion**

Above speaking testing proposal is a demonstration for how a research project can be designed and conducted. Due to the research environment of Taiwan where students might not easily agree to be the sample of this experiment teaching and learning project, the proposal writer of this schoolwork has not come across an opportunity to conduct the above research plan. However, readers of this proposal and participants of the conference are welcome to apply the above proposal by contacting the proposal writer Grace Lin, the curriculum and instruction expert from Texas A&M University, College Station. It is anticipated that through your assistance, you and I will be able to assess the data collected from a conducted project in two of your classes and report the learning orientation of our

Taiwanese university students.

For the other grading methods such as writing, some scholars Liu et al (2024) suggested an effective method of grading writing, the first and last paragraphs as well as the introduction and conclusion can be a fast way for grading.

“While recent language models can take long contexts as input, relatively little is known about how well they use longer contexts. We analyze the performance of language models on two tasks that require identifying relevant information in their input contexts: multi-document question answering and key-value retrieval. We find that performance can degrade significantly when changing the position of relevant information, indicating that current language models do not robustly make use of information in long input contexts. In particular, we observe that performance is often highest when relevant information occurs at the beginning or end of the input context, and significantly degrades when models must access relevant information in the middle of long contexts, even for explicitly long-context models. Our analysis provides a better understanding of how language models use their input context and provides some new evaluation protocols for future long-context language models.” (Liu et al, 2024)

Zhang et al (2024) suggested processing and reasoning ability, over long contexts is crucial. For grading the teachers can refer to "many practical applications of Large Language Models such as document comprehension" and the reasonable contexts that are easily being understood.

The following tips are suggested to do perfect language grading and the teachers of language can apply them. Language grading involves assessing holistic language proficiency based on certain criteria or standards. Here's a general outline of how you can approach language grading:

#### 1. Assessment Criteria:

Determine the precise criteria you will use to assess language proficiency. This may include vocabulary, grammar, fluency, pronunciation, comprehension, and writing skills.

#### 2. Calculation Tools:

Choose appropriate tools to assess each criterion, such as written tests, oral interviews, listening exercises, and reading comprehension tests.

### 3. Rubrics & Standards:

Develop clear rubrics or grading scales that outline the expectations for each proficiency level. This will help ensure consistency in grading.

### 4. Level Characterizations:

Familiarize yourself with the different language proficiency levels (e.g., A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2 according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) and what each level entails in terms of skills and abilities.

### 5. Test Methods:

Procedure a variety of assessment methods to get a comprehensive understanding of the learner's language abilities. This could include both formal assessments and informal observations.

### 6. Feedback:

Offer constructive feedback to learners based on their language performance, highlighting areas of strength and areas for improvement.

### 7. Tracking Progress:

Keep track of learners' development over time to assess growth and identify areas that may need additional support.

8. Individualized Style: Consider the individual needs and learning styles of each learner when evaluating language proficiency, and tailor your approach accordingly.

Remember that language proficiency is dynamic and can vary depending on the context and language skills being assessed. Positive and encouraging words from two or three raters are important for higher validity, they can be the instructors and student assistants. Anticipation for students' higher grades during the middle of teaching and learning is necessary, the results would be impacted to be better. However, if the students really do not make any progress, to fail students could be required by the advisors, such as vice president of a university that I am teaching. It's important to approach language grading with sensitivity and fairness to support learners in their language development.

### REFERENCE

- Alderson, J.C., Clapham, C., & D. Wall (1995). *Language Test Construction and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, G. (1990). *The testing of second language listening comprehension*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Lancaster.
- Bejarano, Y., Levine, T., Olshtain, E. & Steiner, J. (1997). The skilled use of interaction strategies: creating a framework for improved small-group communicative interaction in the language classroom. *System*, 25/2, 203-214.
- Brown, H. D. (2004), *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*, Longman.
- Campbell, D. et al. (1982): "English in international settings: problems and their causes", In: Smith, L. (ed.) (1983): *Readings in English as an International Language*. London, Pergamon Press: 30-38.
- Zhang X et al. (2024) Bench: Extending long context evaluation beyond 100k tokens. <https://synthical.com/article/6302dd05-fda5-4abf-a29d-c7efa362a06d>
- Cohen, A. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.



- Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural Mirrors: materials and methods in the EFL classroom, in E. Hinkel (Ed.) *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 149-176.
- Dandonoli, P., & Henning, G. 1990: An investigation of the construct validity of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines and oral interview procedure. *Foreign Language Annals*, 23, 11–22.
- Dornyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research, construction, administration, and processing*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associate, Publishers.
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Liu N.F et al (2024) “Lost in the middle: How language models use long contexts.” *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 12:157–173.
- Lumley, T. and McNamara, T. F. (1995). Rater characteristics and rater bias: implications for training. *Language Testing*, vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 54–71.
- McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language: rethinking goals and approaches*, Oxford Handbooks.
- Pica, T. (1996). Do second language learners need negotiation? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 34, 1-19.
- Qiurk, R. (1978): "Aspects of English as an International Language." *Sproglaeren* 9: 15-28.
- Smith, L. E. (1976): "English as international auxiliary language". *RELC Journal*, 7: 1-8.
- Smith, L. E. (1981): "English as international language" In: Smith L. (ed.) (1983): *Readings in English as an International Language*. London, Pergamon Press: 1-8.
- Stern, H. H. (1992): *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82, 320-335.

Talebinezhad, M. R., & Aliakbari, M. (2002). Evaluation and justification of a paradigm shift in the current ELT models in Iran, *Linguistik online*

Talebinezhad, M. R. & Aliakbari, M. 2001. "Basic assumptions in Teaching English as an International Language" *The Internet TESL Journal*. 7/ 4. Available online: <http://iteslj.org/Article/Talebinezhad-EIL.html>

Varonis, E., & Gass, S. (1985). Non-native / non-native conversations: A model for negotiation of meaning. *Applied Linguistics*, 6, 71-90.

Yoon, K. K. (1991). Bilingual pragmatic transfer in speech acts: Bi-directional responses to a compliment. In L. Bouton & Y. Kachru (Eds.), *Pragmatics and Language Learning*, monograph series vol. 2 (pp. 75-100). Urbana-Champaign, IL: Division of English as an International Language, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Zegarac, V., & M. Pennington (2000) "Pragmatic transfer in intercultural communication." In: *Culturally Speaking. Managing Rapport through Talk across Cultures*. Ed. H. Spencer-Oatey. London: Continuum, 165-190.

Cited by:

Grace Hui Chin Lin

Ph. D. in C&I, Texas A&M University, College Station.

Master of Science, University of Southern California

Address and Ways of Contact:

No. 154, Chang-Lu Rd.,  
Changhua, 500, TAIWAN.

Tel: (04) 728-3321

Cell Phone: (886933) 503-321

Fax: (04) 752-3107

Email: [Lingrace\\_us@yahoo.com](mailto:Lingrace_us@yahoo.com)