



CREATIVE COMMUNICATION IN ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES THROUGH MULTIFACETED SPEAKING IN PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Elena PIURKO 

Department of Foreign Languages, Language Studies Centre, Faculty of Creative Studies, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Saulėtekio av. 11, LT-10223 Vilnius, Lithuania

Article History:

- received 23 August 2025
- accepted 28 January 2026

Abstract. In English for specific purposes, students need to manage dialogue as well as prepared delivery; yet, classroom speaking tasks often underemphasize how prepared language is extended into co-constructed interaction. This study examines how a panel discussion format, taught as an extension of preparation, fosters speaking, defined as the coordinated use of planned contributions, reasoning, audience alignment, and collaborative synthesis. The study was conducted at Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Lithuania, with 68 undergraduates in creative programmes. The intervention consisted of preparation with explicit language aims, a peer-moderated panel with audience questions, and a structured debrief. Evidence was collected through a *Mentimeter* survey. Results indicate increased confidence in discussion, faster retrieval of discipline-specific vocabulary, turn-taking, and readiness to move beyond rehearsed material. The contribution lies in operationalizing multifaceted speaking as an interactional route to creative communication within English for specific purposes through a repeatable panel design with transfer to pitches, critiques, and short presentations.

Keywords: creative communication, discipline-specific vocabulary, English for specific purposes, interactional competence, multifaceted speaking, panel discussion.

 Corresponding author. E-mail: elena.pjurko@vilniustech.lt

1. Introduction

English for specific purposes (ESP) focuses on the targeted use of English to perform authentic tasks in specific academic or professional domains. In creative fields, these tasks often involve presenting concepts, justifying design choices, and offering informed critique, all of which demand precise language and a clear sense of audience and purpose. Recent work presents ESP as a pedagogy in which specialized lexis and genre knowledge are tied directly to study and work demands rather than taught in the abstract (Hyland, 2022).

A starting point is genre-informed preparation, which treats genres as recurrent communicative events with recognizable structures. Students analyze exemplars to clarify audience and purpose, trace key steps in the exchange, and notice how stance and evidence are realized in language. Genre-based ESP scholarship shows that these events are patterned and that their typical lexical, grammatical, and rhetorical features can be taught explicitly (Bhatia, 2014; Paltridge & Starfield, 2014). Research on structured academic talk likewise indicates that discussions with a clear frame of purpose, roles, and sequencing support reasoning and uptake and complement genre preparation (Cui & Teo, 2023; Hadjipanteli & Vrikki, 2023).

Preparation alone, however, is not sufficient, as authentic interaction is rarely fully predictable. After any planned contribution, speakers must handle questions, clarification, and new information. Effective speaking, therefore, combines planning with a live response. Studies of integrated speaking tasks show that such conditions, if carefully staged, can support the joint development of fluency, accuracy, and appropriacy and help learners manage the cognitive load of real-time talk (Qin & Zhang, 2022; Zhang & Jun Zhang, 2022).

This highlights interactional competence, including timely entry, uptake of others' ideas, focused follow-ups, repair, and clear closure (Lam et al., 2023). Within this frame, panel discussions function as a mediating format between prepared delivery and spontaneous interaction. Although still under-theorized in ESP, qualitative work with international medical students suggests that well-scaffolded panels can simulate professional exchanges and support confidence, participation, and field-relevant communication (Nasiri & Khojasteh, 2024), while research on dialogic teaching shows that structured academic talk strengthens reasoning, broadens participation, and supports collective knowledge building (Cui & Teo, 2023; Rapanta et al., 2020).

In this study, panel discussions are treated as a context for creative communication, understood as the capacity to generate, connect, and adapt ideas so that contributions are original, audience aware, and aligned with disciplinary discourse. While creative communication is often linked to originality or individual expression, the interactional mechanisms through which ideas are developed with others in real time, such as uptake, reformulation, and collaborative synthesis, are rarely specified. Here, panels are used to make these mechanisms observable and teachable within ESP. Multifaceted speaking is taken as the key construct, emerging when prepared argumentation meets spontaneous reasoning, audience questions prompt real-time synthesis, and peers co-construct meaning through responsive talk.

To realize this framing in practice, the study implements a scaffolded panel sequence in an ESP module for undergraduates in creative fields at Vilnius Gediminas Technical University (VGTU). Students prepare a concise topic brief and explicit language aims, then participate in a live peer-moderated panel with audience questions.

The article aims to examine how this format, conceived as an extension of prepared speaking, fosters creative communication in ESP. It sets three objectives: 1) to specify a three-stage panel sequence linking genre-informed preparation with live exchange; 2) to evaluate the task through student perceptions of gains in multifaceted speaking and creative communication; and 3) to formulate pedagogical scaffolds, based on task design and student feedback, to support balanced participation, interaction, and transfer to related ESP speaking genres.

2. Theoretical background

This study treats creative communication as an interactional achievement. Originality often develops in dialogue, as speakers listen closely, reframe ideas, and build concise syntheses together (Sawyer, 2017). Within ESP, speaking is tied to concrete disciplinary outcomes; specialized lexis and genre knowledge are taught because they enable work in specific fields rather than as decontextualized knowledge detached from practice (Hyland, 2022). To make

creative communication visible in classroom interaction, the analysis adopts multifaceted speaking as the analytical framework, conceptualized here as four interrelated facets.

The first facet concerns a prepared contribution. Effective speaking is more attainable when learners already have a starting point and some language shaped in advance. Work on public speaking suggests that preparation gives them an opening formulation they can fall back on when the discussion begins (Wiśniewska, 2022). Analyses of *TED Talks* likewise emphasize a simple, focused opening and a line of argument that listeners can follow throughout (Anderson, 2016; Gallo, 2014). In ESP classes, repeated work with core lexis and typical formulaic expressions gradually builds the language resources students rely on when questions and follow-up comments arise (Basturkmen, 2010).

The second facet involves responsive reasoning. Once questions appear, learners must explain, defend, and sometimes challenge ideas in real time. Studies of pre-task planning and integrated speaking tasks suggest that this combination of prior preparation and immediate response leads to stronger spoken performance and makes the cognitive load of live interaction more manageable (Qin & Zhang, 2022; Zhang & Jun Zhang, 2022). Other research shows that repeatedly retrieving prepared items boosts oral fluency and makes it easier to reach for disciplinary vocabulary in spontaneous exchanges (de Jong & Perfetti, 2011).

The third facet is audience alignment, encompassing timely entry to a turn, uptake of peers' contributions, focused follow-up questions, repair, and clear closure. Such interactional behaviours are teachable and observable in higher education and provide a shared linguistic basis for feedback and reflection (Lam et al., 2023; Young, 2011). Work on educational dialogue shows that cumulative and exploratory talk, characterized by extending ideas and articulating reasons, supports reasoning, and collective understanding (Littleton & Mercer, 2013).

The fourth facet, collaborative weaving, describes what happens when speakers pick up others' ideas, link them explicitly, and add summaries that carry the discussion forward. Sawyer (2017) connects this kind of talk with collaborative creativity in both professional and educational settings. In a related way, Fisher et al. (2011) work on interest-based negotiation highlights reframing and forging connections between positions to reach common ground, practices that help keep academic dialogue constructive.

Panel discussion makes these facets concrete. It preserves the benefits of preparation while requiring speakers to adapt their contributions in spontaneous interaction before an audience. Studies in ESP and English language teaching indicate that well-scaffolded panel discussions can closely approximate professional exchanges, with many students reporting increased confidence, stronger engagement, and stronger awareness of their ability to communicate in their field (Nasiri & Khojasteh, 2024; Anwar, 2016). These benefits, however, largely depend on how the activity is organized: careful preparation, active and fair moderation, and a brief debrief at the end tend to promote more balanced participation and clearer outcomes, whereas weak chairing often allows a few voices to dominate and narrows the scope of the discussion (Iyer et al., 2024; Gallo et al., 2020; Cui & Teo, 2023; Rapanta et al., 2020).

Within ESP, advanced speaking is often developed through genre work followed by a task that puts this knowledge into practice. In the Lithuanian context, the ESP and research

C1 level course treats panel discussions as an extension of prepared speaking, scaffolding them through clearly defined roles and language aims rather than as a separate, improvised activity (Kriaučiūnienė & Arcimavičienė, 2023). Studies on problem-based learning in ESP offer converging evidence, reporting positive effects on communication and creativity when tasks are realistic and carefully supported (Šliogerienė et al., 2025). Framed around a concrete brief and organized through visible roles and accountable talk, panel discussions can thus serve as a practical way of eliciting creative, interactionally grounded communication in ESP.

3. Methodology

The empirical aim of the study was to evaluate students' perceptions of a scaffolded panel discussion task in ESP as both a structured extension of prepared speaking and a context for multifaceted speaking and creative communication. The objectives were to capture students' self-reported gains and perceived speaking-related outcomes, to identify recurring themes in brief reflections, and to outline implementation-informed scaffolds for panel discussions in ESP. The research was conducted in an ESP module at VGTU with 68 undergraduates in creative programmes in the 2024–2025 academic year.

The task was a three-stage panel sequence in English. Groups of three to five panellists sat with a peer moderator facing the class. Each panel followed the same structure: short openings to frame the topic, a moderated exchange that coordinated turns and probed for clarification or counterarguments, an audience question period, and a brief debrief. Roles were rotated so that all students experienced both panel and audience positions, and time limits were used to keep contributions balanced.

Student perceptions were collected immediately after the panels via an in-class *Mentimeter* questionnaire on students' own devices. The instrument comprised eight closed Likert-type scale items, two multiple-choice items on perceived skills and enjoyment, and five short open prompts, aligned with the four facets of multifaceted speaking. Participation was voluntary and anonymous, and no personal identifiers were collected. *Mentimeter* was chosen because it enables anonymous, immediate whole-group responses and efficient aggregation of descriptive results (Armstrong et al., 2024).

Analysis drew on *Mentimeter* summaries. Counts and percentages were calculated for closed and multiple-response items. Open comments were analyzed using inductive thematic coding, with brief notes kept for consistency. The instructor designed and facilitated the task and acted as researcher; to limit bias and social desirability, data collection was anonymous, and reporting focused on aggregated patterns. With an intact cohort and no comparison group, findings are presented as exploratory evidence of student perceptions rather than causal effects.

4. Results

Descriptive analyses of the post-activity questionnaire indicate positive evaluations of the panel discussion task, perceived development of key communicative skills, and coherent themes in open comments. Unless stated otherwise, N (number) = 68. Small variations reflect occasional non-response.

4.1. Closed items: perceptions of the panel discussions

Overall evaluations were high. The overall experience had an 83% top two endorsement, comprising 26% good and 57% excellent, with 1% selecting a negative option. Indicators of engagement and learning quality were similarly strong. Learning engagement reached 93% in the top two categories, 56% engaged and 37% highly engaged, with 3% negative and 4% neutral. Motivation to learn more increased for 86% of respondents, 49% slightly, and 37% greatly, with 0% reporting decreases and 15% no change. Communication-focused items were also robust. Panellists conveyed points effectively with 94% in the top two categories, clarity of discussion reached 92%, and information value reached 86%, each with negligible negative selections.

Two decision-relevant items were used with 65 respondents. The likelihood of transfer, defined as applying strategies from the panel to other speaking genres, was 85% in the top two categories, 63% likely, and 22% highly likely. Preference for more panels was positive at 70% top two, 45% probably yes, and 25% definitely yes, with 28% not sure. This profile suggests the format is valued and stretching, while a sizeable group is still calibrating its challenge and benefit balance (Table 1).

Table 1. Student perceptions of panel discussions (source: created by author)

Category	Number	Negative	Somewhat negative	Neutral	Positive	Strong positive
Overall experience	68	0% (very poor)	1% (poor)	15% (average)	26% (good)	57% (excellent)
Learning engagement	68	0% (not at all engaged)	3% (somewhat engaged)	4% (neutral)	56% (engaged)	37% (highly engaged)
Motivation to learn more	68	0% (greatly decreased)	0% (slightly decreased)	15% (no change)	49% (slightly increased)	37% (greatly increased)
Panellists conveyed points	68	0% (not effective)	1% (somewhat effective)	4% (neutral)	56% (effective)	38% (highly effective)
Clarity of discussion	68	0% (very unclear)	0% (somewhat unclear)	9% (neutral)	43% (clear)	49% (very clear)
Information value	68	0% (not valuable)	3% (somewhat valuable)	10% (neutral)	57% (valuable)	29% (extremely valuable)
Likelihood of transfer	65	0% (not likely)	3% (somewhat likely)	12% (neutral)	63% (likely)	22% (highly likely)
Preference for more panels	65	0% (definitely not)	3% (probably not)	28% (not sure)	45% (probably yes)	25% (definitely yes)

Note: number varies due to occasional non-response. Top two denotes the two most positive categories.

4.2. Multiple response items: skills developed and sources of enjoyment

Students reported perceived development across a cluster of communicative capabilities. The most frequently selected were communication and public speaking at 23% each, followed by

active listening at 20%, collaboration at 19%, and critical thinking at 15%. Enjoyment drivers centred on real-life examples at 24% and hearing different viewpoints at 23%, with additional emphasis on opportunities to ask questions at 21%, the interactive element at 18%, and the conversational tone at 14% (Table 2).

Table 2. Skills developed and enjoyment of panel discussions (source: created by author)

Category	Number	1	2	3	4	5
Skills developed	67	Communication: 23%	Public speaking: 23%	Active listening: 20%	Collaboration: 19%	Critical thinking: 15%
Enjoyment	68	Real-life examples: 24%	Hearing different viewpoints: 23%	Opportunities to ask questions: 21%	Interactive element: 18%	Conversational tone: 14%

Note: multiple responses were permitted.

4.3. Open responses: thematic synthesis

Inductive coding of brief comments yielded five themes. First, confidence for English medium discussion, with students reporting reduced anxiety and a greater readiness to contribute. Second, real-time reasoning, including quicker organization of ideas and handling unexpected questions. Third, audience alignment, including active listening, clean entry to turns, and focused follow-ups. Fourth, field-specific language in use, with freer retrieval and reformulation of programme vocabulary. Fifth, enjoyment and authenticity, including a supportive atmosphere and a sense of speaking as an expert on a prepared topic (Table 3).

Table 3. Themes from open responses with illustrative quotations (source: created by authors)

Theme	Indicative behaviours	Illustrative quotations
Confidence for English medium discussion	Willingness to speak; reduced anxiety; positive affect.	"I realized that being put on the spot is not that scary and I can speak confidently"; "Yes, I feel more confident and comfortable".
Real-time reasoning	Quick organization of ideas; responding to unexpected questions.	"It was challenging to answer unexpected questions, but rewarding when ideas came naturally"; "I had to organize my thoughts fast".
Audience alignment	Active listening; clean entry to turns; focused follow-ups.	"Everyone had the opportunity to share opinions, and I listened carefully so I could add something".
Field-specific language in use	Retrieval and reformulation of programme vocabulary	"I can speak more freely"; "It improved my academic English because of the topic we discussed".
Enjoyment and authenticity	Perceived relevance; supportive atmosphere.	"Welcoming and warm"; "It was fun and informative. I liked feeling like an expert in my topic".

Note: quotations are reproduced verbatim with minor anonymisation for clarity.

5. Discussion

The study examined how a live moderated panel could advance prepared speaking in ESP and foster creative communication. Closed items showed a consistently positive pattern, and open comments indicated that students saw the panel as demanding but worthwhile: it required quick response, attentive listening, and confident use of programme vocabulary in front of peers.

The distributions also revealed variation. Willingness to repeat the format was positive overall, yet 28% selected “not sure” and 3% “probably not”, and neutral groups appeared in ratings of experience, motivation, and perceived transfer. For a minority, the panel was productive but taxing, with perceived benefit shaped by role confidence, topic familiarity, and comfort with spontaneous exchange.

The pattern fits the panel design, which deliberately links preparation to live engagement. Learners arrived with concise topic briefs and explicit language aims and then had to use this preparation in interaction. High ratings for clarity, effectiveness, and information value, together with frequent selections for communication and public speaking, suggest that rehearsal supported clean entry into turns and coherent development of points once questions began, rather than encouraging memorized delivery. Students also reported gains in interactional competence, mentioning attentive listening, engagement with peers’ ideas, focused follow-up, and balanced turn-taking, practices that reflect the norms of academic and professional discussion.

Although the evidence is perception-based and cannot support causal claims, the convergence between questionnaire patterns and comment themes allows a mechanism-based interpretation. Moderation, visible roles, and sequencing created a predictable frame that made routines such as turn entry, uptake, clarification, and repair more frequent and teachable (Young, 2011; Lam et al., 2023). The move from rehearsed production to responding to questions and peer comments required rapid retrieval and reformulation, while pre-panel language aims and structured turn-taking acted as scaffolds that kept cognitive load manageable. Reports of faster vocabulary retrieval, greater readiness to move beyond memorized phrasing, and improved capacity to respond under pressure are consistent with processing and retrieval accounts (de Jong & Perfetti, 2011; Nation, 2001; Qin & Zhang, 2022; Ellis, 2005; Skehan et al., 2012; Zhang & Jun Zhang, 2022).

The same design features help to explain the creative communication described in the comments. Students referred to reframing points after challenge, linking contributions to peers’ examples, and offering short syntheses that moved the discussion forward. Enjoyment clustered around real-life examples, exposure to different viewpoints, and opportunities to question and be questioned, supporting gains in confidence.

Pedagogically, the panel acts as a hinge task between prepared monologic delivery and the unscripted exchanges. It relies on many of the same moves used in pitches and critiques, but adds the constraint of responding immediately to an audience. This design makes multifaceted speaking visible: prepared contribution anchors content and language, responsive reasoning addresses questions, audience alignment keeps contributions relevant, and collaborative weaving moves the argument forward. These effects, however, depend on how the

task is run. Visible roles, timed openings, and a brief post-panel debrief supported balanced participation and clear chairing, while students' descriptions of a welcoming atmosphere help to explain the perceived gains in speaking, listening, and public engagement.

The findings align with research showing that panel discussions can strengthen confidence and perceived gains in academic speaking when roles, facilitation, and preparation are explicit (Anwar, 2016; Nasiri & Khojasteh, 2024), and converge with ESP work indicating that realistic, scaffolded, problem-framed tasks support communication and creativity when participation is managed equitably (Šliogerienė et al., 2025). Neutral responses on repeat preference and perceived transfer add nuance and are consistent with processing accounts highlighting the attentional and time pressure costs of interaction (Ellis, 2005; Skehan et al., 2012; Zhang & Jun Zhang, 2022).

Taken together, the inquiry captures dynamics of classroom practice and proposes a panel format that can be adapted in ESP settings. As an exploratory design based on anonymous self-report, it may reflect social desirability or enjoyment, and transfer is reported as perceived likelihood rather than demonstrated uptake, so future work with recorded performance and longitudinal or comparative designs would be valuable.

6. Conclusions

This study shows that a live moderated panel can link prepared work with real-time interaction in ESP and make creative communication visible through four facets of multifaceted speaking: prepared contribution, responsive reasoning, audience alignment, and collaborative weaving. The format is workable with large groups, as long as roles, language aims, and moderation are clearly planned, and it can feed directly into allied ESP genres such as pitches, critiques, and short presentations. Overall, the findings support the panel as a repeatable, high-engagement task that helps students carry prepared ideas and vocabulary into responsive dialogue in English.

Acknowledgements

The author gratefully acknowledges the participation of the first-year Creative Industries students (2024–2025) at VGTU, whose engagement made this study possible.

References

- Anderson, Ch. (2016). *TED talks: The official TED guide to public speaking*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Anwar, K. (2016). Panel discussion and the development of students' self confidence. *English Language Teaching*, 9(4), 224–229. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n4p224>
- Armstrong, E. J., Rogers, L, Lyon, M., & Selway, J. L. (2024). *Mentimeter* improves student engagement in online clinical anatomy revision sessions: A programme evaluation. *Cureus*, 16(11). <https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.74178>
- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518>
- Bhatia, V. K. (2014). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315844992>

- Cui, R., & Teo, P. (2023). Thinking through talk: Using dialogue to develop students' critical thinking. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 125. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104068>
- Ellis, R. (2005). *Language learning and language teaching: Vol. 11. Planning and task performance in a second language*. N. Spada & J. H. Hulstijn (Series Eds.). John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.11>
- Fisher, R., Ury, W., & Patton, B. (2011). *Getting to Yes: Negotiating agreement without giving in*. Penguin Books.
- Gallo, C. (2014). *Talk like TED: The 9 public speaking secrets of the world's top minds*. St. Martin's Press.
- Gallo, S. A., Schmaling, K. B., Thompson, L. A., & Glisson, S. R. (2020). Grant reviewer perceptions of the quality, effectiveness, and influence of panel discussion. *Research Integrity and Peer Review*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-020-00093-0>
- Hadjipanteli, A., & Vrikki, M. (2023). Conceptualising teacher dialogic artistry: A nexus of pedagogical dispositions and language qualities. *Frontiers in Education*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2023.1205501>
- Hyland, K. (2022). English for specific purposes: what is it and where is it taking us? *ESP Today: Journal of English for Specific Purposes at Tertiary Level*, 10(2), 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.18485/esptoday.2022.10.2.1>
- Iyer, M. S., Way, D., Overholser, B., & Spector, N. (2024). "How to Article": Guidelines for serving on an expert panel. *Medical Education Online*, 29(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/10872981.2024.2316986>
- Jong, de N., & Perfetti, Ch. A. (2011). Fluency training in the ESL classroom: An experimental study of fluency development and proceduralization. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, 61(2), 533–568. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2010.00620.x>
- Kriauciūnienė, R., & Arcimavičienė, L. (2023). *English for academic purposes and research (C1)*. Vilnius universiteto leidykla.
- Lam, D. M. K., Galaczi, E., Nakatsuhara, F., & May, L. (2023). Assessing interactional competence: Exploring ratABILITY challenges. *Applied Pragmatics*, 5(2), 208–233. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ap.00014.lam>
- Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203809433>
- Nasiri, E., & Khojasteh, L. (2024). Evaluating panel discussions in ESP classes: An exploration of international medical students' and ESP instructors' perspectives through qualitative research. *BMC Medical Education*, 24. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05911-3>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *The Cambridge applied linguistics series. Learning vocabulary in another language*. M. H. Long & J. C. Richards (Series Eds.). Cambridge University Press.
- Paltridge, B., & Starfield, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Blackwell handbooks in linguistics. The handbook of English for specific purposes*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Qin, J., & Zhang, Y. (2022). Pre-task planning and discourse cohesion: Analysis of Chinese EFL learners' referential use in oral narratives. *Language Teaching Research*, 26(1), 60–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168819883896>
- Rapanta, Ch., Botturi, L., Goodyear, P., Guàrdia, L., & Koole, M. (2020). Online university teaching during and after the COVID-19 crisis: Refocusing teacher presence and learning activity. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 2, 923–945. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42438-020-00155-y>
- Sawyer, K. (2017). *Group genius: The creative power of collaboration*. Basic Books.
- Skehan, P., Xiaoyue, B., Qian, L., & Wang, Zh. (2012). The task is not enough: Processing approaches to task-based performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 16(2), 170–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168811428414>
- Šliogerienė, J., Darginavičienė, I., Suchanova, J., Gulbinskienė, D., & Jakučionytė, V. (2025). Problem-based learning in developing students' communicative skills and creativity in teaching English for specific purposes. *Creativity Studies*, 18(1), 30–42. <https://doi.org/10.3846/cs.2025.22343>
- Wiśniewska, K. (2022). *English for speeches and presentations: A practical guide*. Poltext.
- Young, R. F. (2011). Interactional competence in language learning, teaching, and testing. In H. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 426–443). Routledge.
- Zhang, W., & Jun Zhang, L. (2022). Understanding assessment tasks: Learners' and teachers' perceptions of cognitive load of integrated speaking tasks for TBLT implementation. *System*, 111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2022.102951>