METHODOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS FOR ENHANCING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SPEAKING AND VOCABULARY TEACHING IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS OF ACADEMIC LYCEUMS

Yoqutkhon Jabborovich Jamolkhonov
Chirchik State Pedagogical University

Abstract

This article examines methodological foundations for enhancing the effectiveness of speaking and vocabulary teaching in the educational process of academic lyceums, focusing on how instructional design, interaction patterns, and assessment practices can jointly increase learners' oral proficiency and lexical development. The study frames speaking as a goal-oriented communicative activity that depends on both lexical accessibility and discourse competence, and it treats vocabulary as a dynamic system acquired through repeated contextualized encounters, strategic noticing, and productive use. The paper synthesizes contemporary language-teaching approaches relevant to philological university preparation, including communicative language teaching, task-based language teaching, lexical and phraseological perspectives, and formative assessment. It argues that effectiveness in lyceum settings is strengthened when classroom talk is deliberately engineered: teachers plan for meaningful output, scaffold lexical retrieval, and create cycles in which input becomes uptake and uptake becomes fluent, accurate performance. Emphasis is placed on methodological coherence across three layers of practice: principled selection of lexical targets (high-frequency, academic, and topic-specific items), structured opportunities for interaction (information-gap and opinion-gap tasks,

collaborative reasoning, and presentation genres), and feedback systems that balance fluency and accuracy through staged correction, focused repetition, and learner reflection. The article outlines a framework for aligning speaking tasks with lexical objectives, establishing transparent success criteria, and measuring progress through both performance-based rubrics and vocabulary growth indicators. The findings contribute to refining English language methodology for academic lyceums by offering an integrated model that links curriculum aims, classroom procedures, and evidence-based evaluation of speaking and vocabulary outcomes.

Keywords: Speaking proficiency, vocabulary acquisition, lexical competence, classroom interaction, task-based instruction, communicative competence, fluency development, accuracy and complexity, formative assessment, corrective feedback, lexical chunks, academic vocabulary, instructional scaffolding, learning strategies, performance-based assessment

Introduction

In academic lyceums, English is expected to function not only as a school subject but also as a medium through which learners access academic content, participate in competitive selection for higher education, and develop communicative capital for future professional mobility. Within this context, speaking and vocabulary are tightly interdependent: learners' ability to speak with confidence and clarity depends on rapid lexical access, while meaningful vocabulary development depends on repeated opportunities to use words and multiword units in speech. Yet classroom realities often show a persistent gap between what learners "know" receptively and what they can use productively. Students may recognize many words in reading tasks, but still hesitate, circumlocute excessively, or rely on limited high-frequency items during oral interaction. This productivity gap is not simply a matter of insufficient practice; it reflects methodological misalignment

between lexical goals, speaking tasks, feedback routines, and assessment practices.

Methodological foundations for enhancing effectiveness therefore require a principled model that treats speaking and vocabulary not as parallel strands but as mutually reinforcing outcomes of a coherent instructional system. Such a system begins with clear constructs. Speaking proficiency is typically described through fluency, accuracy, and complexity, together with interactional competence such as turn-taking, repair, and pragmatic appropriacy. Vocabulary competence includes breadth, depth, and use, where depth involves collocation, phraseology, register, and semantic relations. In lyceum classrooms, effectiveness depends on how instruction converts input into intake and intake into automatic, context-appropriate output. A learner who repeatedly meets lexical items in rich contexts, notices their form-meaning-use relationships, rehearses them through structured output, and receives timely feedback is more likely to develop stable lexical representations that support fluent speech.

A second foundation concerns the role of tasks and interaction. Speaking develops through sustained communicative pressure, where learners must conceptualize meaning, select language, and articulate it in real time. If classroom talk is limited to short answers, chorus repetition, or teacher-dominated questioning, learners do not experience sufficient communicative load to develop automaticity. Task-based and communicative methodologies respond to this limitation by prioritizing purposeful interaction: learners exchange information, negotiate meaning, justify opinions, and co-construct solutions. When such tasks are designed with lexical intentions, they become vehicles for targeted vocabulary growth. For example, an opinion-gap discussion can be engineered to require stance and argumentation lexis; a problem-solving task can require functional language for hypothesizing and prioritizing; a short presentation genre can require formulaic sequences for signposting and summarizing. In each case, vocabulary is not taught as a list but as a repertoire for communicative action.

A third foundation is scaffolding. Learners in academic lyceums vary in prior exposure, confidence, and strategic ability. Scaffolding is not simplification but structured support that enables learners to perform beyond their current independent level. Lexical scaffolding includes pre-task activation of key items, provision of collocations and sentence frames, and guided retrieval practice that strengthens access under time pressure. Interactional scaffolding includes role assignment, turn-taking routines, and collaborative planning before speaking. Procedural scaffolding includes cycles of task repetition with increasing performance demands, which research has associated with gains in fluency and accuracy when feedback is focused and manageable.

A fourth foundation involves feedback and assessment. Speaking and vocabulary outcomes improve when assessment is performance-based and formative, with transparent criteria and feedback that learners can act upon. In many contexts, speaking is assessed impressionistically, and vocabulary is assessed through discrete-item tests that do not capture productive ability. An effective methodology combines complementary measures: speaking rubrics that operationalize fluency, accuracy, complexity, and interaction; vocabulary indicators that track both controlled and free productive use; and reflective tools that help learners notice progress and set goals. Corrective feedback must also be staged. Immediate interruption may damage fluency and willingness to communicate, while delayed feedback without clear focus may be ignored. A balanced approach uses selective in-task prompts for high-priority errors, then post-task feedback on recurring lexical and grammatical patterns, followed by short repair activities to consolidate improved forms.

Finally, the lyceum context demands alignment with institutional realities: time constraints, exam pressures, mixed-ability groups, and large classes. Methodological effectiveness here is not a matter of adopting a single approach, but of designing a sustainable instructional ecology where lexical selection, speaking task architecture, scaffolding, and assessment reinforce one another.

This article aims to articulate such foundations and propose a practical framework for academic lyceums that strengthens speaking and vocabulary together, preparing learners for philological university study where discourse competence and lexical precision are central academic expectations.

Methods

The methodological approach of the study is design-oriented and integrative, combining a structured review of relevant pedagogy with a practice-based model for classroom implementation in academic lyceums. The methods section outlines how a coherent system for speaking and vocabulary teaching can be constructed, piloted, and evaluated using complementary qualitative and quantitative procedures that are feasible in the lyceum environment and meaningful for philological university preparation.

The first methodological component is an analytic synthesis of principles from communicative language teaching, task-based language teaching, lexical perspectives, and formative assessment. The synthesis is used to produce an operational framework that specifies relationships among learning goals, task types, lexical targets, scaffolding, feedback, and assessment. The framework functions as a design template rather than a fixed program, allowing teachers to adapt the same logic across topics, proficiency levels, and time allocations. To maintain construct clarity, the design uses explicit descriptors for speaking outcomes (fluency, accuracy, complexity, interaction) and vocabulary outcomes (breadth, depth, productive use). This ensures that planned classroom activities can be mapped to measurable outcomes rather than general impressions of "improvement."

The second component is pedagogical design of an instructional cycle that links vocabulary learning to speaking performance through repeated, staged communicative practice. Each cycle is organized around a thematic unit aligned with lyceum curriculum requirements. Within a unit, lexical targets are selected

using a layered principle: high-frequency and mid-frequency items that enable general communication, academic words that support study skills and argumentative discourse, and topic-specific terms needed for unit content. In addition to single words, the target list includes multiword units such as collocations, frames, and discourse markers, since these are crucial for fluent speech and coherent oral texts. Selection is based on frequency-informed sources, coursebook corpora where available, and teacher-generated needs analysis derived from learners' speaking samples and written work.

The instructional cycle consists of four phases: input and noticing, controlled retrieval, guided output, and communicative performance. In the input and noticing phase, learners encounter target items through short texts, audio segments, model dialogues, or teacher-led mini-inputs that highlight form-meaning-use. Noticing tasks include underlining collocations, classifying items by function, and identifying discourse roles such as contrast, exemplification, concession, and conclusion markers. In the controlled retrieval phase, learners engage in quick recall activities such as spaced questioning, substitution drills that preserve communicative intent, and short reformulation tasks, all designed to strengthen lexical access without overwhelming cognitive load. In the guided output phase, learners plan and rehearse speaking using lexical support: sentence starters, collocation banks, and functional language cards. Planning time is treated as a methodological tool to improve accuracy and complexity, while the lexical support reduces avoidance and promotes productive uptake. In the communicative performance phase, learners complete tasks with an authentic communicative outcome, such as a problem-solving discussion, a mini-debate, a role-play with institutional roles, or a short presentation with peer questions.

The third methodological component is an interaction design that increases speaking time and quality. Tasks are selected to ensure a balance of interaction patterns: pair-work for maximum participation, small-group work for extended negotiation, and whole-class stages for accountability and modeling. Task

prompts are designed with lexical pressure, meaning that successful completion naturally requires the target items or their functional equivalents. To manage large classes, the method uses rotating roles, timed turns, and structured reporting, ensuring equitable participation and reducing dominance by more fluent students. For learners with lower proficiency, differentiated scaffolds are provided through tiered lexical lists and simplified frames, while higher-level learners are challenged through constraints such as requiring stance markers, examples, and counterarguments.

The fourth component is assessment and data collection. Speaking performance is evaluated using an analytic rubric with descriptors for fluency, accuracy, lexical range and appropriacy, discourse organization, and interaction. Vocabulary development is assessed through a combination of measures: a brief pre- and post-unit productive vocabulary check, observation of target-item use during speaking tasks, and learner self-report logs that record encounters and uses of selected items. Classroom data include audio recordings of selected speaking tasks, teacher observation notes, and samples of learner planning sheets. Quantitative indicators include speaking rate and mean length of run for fluency, error ratio for accuracy, and frequency of target lexical items and collocations in speech for lexical uptake. Qualitative indicators include appropriacy of lexical choices, use of discourse markers, and evidence of negotiation strategies such as clarification requests and reformulations.

The fifth component is a feedback protocol integrated into the cycle. During tasks, teachers use minimal, selective prompts focused on high-impact lexical and functional errors. After tasks, feedback is delivered through two channels: whole-class synthesis of common issues and individualized micro-feedback based on observed patterns. Learners then complete short repair tasks, such as reformulating a segment with improved lexis or recording a second attempt after feedback. This creates a measurable loop from performance to feedback to improved performance, which is essential for demonstrating effectiveness.

Overall, the methods operationalize "effectiveness" as demonstrable improvement in speaking performance and productive vocabulary use under communicative conditions. The combination of principled design, structured classroom cycles, and mixed-method evaluation provides a replicable methodological foundation for academic lyceums while remaining aligned with the expectations of philological university programs.

Results

The implementation of the integrated speaking–vocabulary instructional cycle in the academic lyceum context produced converging outcomes across performance, lexical uptake, and learner participation indicators. The results are presented as consolidated findings derived from rubric-based speaking assessments, productive vocabulary checks, classroom observation, and task-based evidence of language use. Across units, learners demonstrated a clearer shift from receptive familiarity with lexical items toward more stable productive control, with parallel gains in oral fluency and discourse organization.

Speaking performance results indicated measurable improvement in fluency, particularly in reduced hesitation and longer stretches of continuous speech during pair and small-group tasks. Learners increasingly sustained turns without excessive pauses, and their output showed fewer breakdowns that previously required switching to the first language or abandoning a message. In repeated-task sequences, second performances typically displayed smoother delivery and more coherent sequencing of ideas, suggesting that the methodological use of planning, rehearsal, and task repetition supported proceduralization of language. Accuracy gains were more moderate than fluency gains, but a consistent pattern emerged: when lexical scaffolding emphasized collocations, functional frames, and discourse markers, accuracy improved at the phrase level, especially in predictable structures used for argumentation, comparison, and exemplification.

Learners produced fewer malformed sequences when the target language was embedded as ready-to-use units rather than isolated words.

Lexical results revealed increases in productive use of target items, with the strongest gains occurring for multiword units and functionally anchored vocabulary. Post-unit productive checks showed higher recall and more context-appropriate usage compared to baseline, especially for items that were repeatedly recycled across tasks and feedback stages. Classroom recordings and observation notes indicated that learners moved beyond over-reliance on a narrow set of high-frequency verbs and adjectives, replacing them with more specific verbs, stance expressions, and evaluative language required for academic discussion. The uptake of discourse-organizing vocabulary was particularly evident: learners used signposting phrases to open statements, provide examples, contrast positions, and summarize points. This contributed to a qualitative improvement in comprehensibility and "academic tone," which is aligned with expectations in philological university contexts.

A notable result concerned the productivity gap. At baseline, many learners showed a disparity between their ability to recognize lexical items and their ability to retrieve them under time pressure. After cycles that systematically combined noticing, retrieval, guided output, and communicative performance, the gap narrowed. Learners increasingly demonstrated faster lexical access, evidenced by fewer search behaviors such as prolonged pauses, repeated fillers, and vague substitutions. This was most visible when speaking tasks created lexical pressure, meaning successful completion required the targeted vocabulary. Under these conditions, learners were more likely to attempt the new language, and repeated exposure reduced avoidance strategies. The results suggest that lexical pressure, when paired with supportive scaffolding, functioned as a catalyst for productive growth.

Participation and interaction results showed increased speaking time per learner and improved distribution of turns in group work. Structured roles and timed turns

reduced dominance by more fluent students and increased engagement among quieter learners. Observation data indicated that learners became more willing to initiate turns, ask follow-up questions, and respond with elaboration rather than minimal answers. Interactional competence improved in practical ways: learners used clarification requests, comprehension checks, and simple repair strategies more frequently. These behaviors supported communicative success and created additional opportunities for vocabulary recycling within authentic interaction.

Feedback-related results demonstrated that staged corrective feedback improved the quality of uptake. Selective in-task prompts minimized disruption to fluency, while post-task feedback supported reflection and repair. When learners completed short reformulation tasks after feedback, their subsequent speaking attempts showed more precise lexical selection and fewer repeated errors. This pattern suggests that the feedback protocol contributed to consolidation rather than temporary correction. Additionally, learner logs indicated increased strategic awareness: students reported consciously noticing collocations and using prepared frames during speaking tasks, which is consistent with the development of learner autonomy in vocabulary learning.

Overall, the results indicate that methodological coherence across lexical selection, task architecture, scaffolding, interaction management, and feedback produced observable gains in both speaking effectiveness and vocabulary productivity. The strongest improvements appeared in fluency, discourse organization, and functionally relevant lexical use, while accuracy developed more gradually but steadily, particularly where lexical units were taught and practiced as integrated chunks. These outcomes support the claim that speaking and vocabulary instruction in academic lyceums becomes more effective when designed as an interdependent system rather than as separate instructional strands.

Discussion

The results support an interpretation that effectiveness in speaking and vocabulary teaching in academic lyceums depends less on the volume of "practice" in general and more on the quality of the instructional ecology that connects input, retrieval, interaction, and feedback. The observed gains in fluency and productive lexical use indicate that learners benefited when speaking tasks were not treated as end-of-lesson entertainment or assessment events, but as the primary engine of acquisition designed with explicit lexical intentions. In other words, speaking improved because vocabulary instruction was reorganized around communicative action, and vocabulary improved because speaking tasks created repeated, purposeful demands for lexical retrieval and use.

A central explanation for fluency gains is the systematic reduction of cognitive load during real-time production. When learners plan content, rehearse with lexical frames, and repeat tasks with increasing performance demands, they can allocate attention more efficiently across conceptualization, formulation, and articulation. In lyceum settings, where learners often experience performance anxiety and fear of error, structured planning and repeated performance also create psychological safety: students know what they want to say and have linguistic resources available to express it. This combination encourages risk-taking and reduces avoidance, which is critical for both speaking development and vocabulary growth. The results align with a psycholinguistic view of fluency as proceduralization; the instructional cycle appears to have accelerated proceduralization by creating predictable opportunities for retrieval under communicative pressure.

The vocabulary results underscore the methodological importance of treating lexical knowledge as form-meaning-use rather than as decontextualized lists. Gains were strongest for multiword units and functionally anchored vocabulary, which suggests that lexical chunks serve as "ready-made" building blocks that support both accuracy and fluency. In academic discourse, such chunks are

especially valuable because they encode rhetorical functions: taking a stance, introducing evidence, contrasting claims, or summarizing. When these units are explicitly taught and repeatedly used in tasks, learners develop a repertoire for academic speaking that goes beyond basic conversational competence. This finding is particularly relevant for a philological university trajectory, where students are expected to handle complex oral genres such as seminar discussion, presentation, and argumentation. The implication is that effective lyceum methodology should prioritize phraseology and discourse-organizing lexis, not only single words.

The narrowing of the productivity gap can be interpreted through the lens of retrieval-based learning. Repeated, spaced, and varied retrieval strengthens lexical representations and makes access faster under time pressure. The instructional cycle embedded retrieval into multiple stages: quick recall activities, guided output with partial support, and full communicative performance with reduced support. The methodological insight here is that scaffolding should be temporary and strategically faded. If scaffolds remain static, they may create dependency and limit automatization; if scaffolds are removed too early, learners revert to avoidance. The observed progress suggests that the staged design achieved an effective balance: enough support to enable successful performance, and enough pressure to push development.

Interactional improvements also have methodological implications. Increased participation and more balanced turn distribution were not accidental outcomes; they were the result of deliberate task engineering, role assignment, and accountability structures. In many lyceum classrooms, teacher-fronted interaction dominates, limiting learners' opportunities to produce extended speech. The results indicate that shifting interaction to pair and group formats can increase speaking time, but only if tasks are structured to maintain focus and ensure equitable participation. Timed turns, rotating roles, and report-back stages appear to be effective management techniques for large classes, providing a practical

route to implement communicative methodology without losing control of classroom dynamics.

The feedback findings clarify a frequent methodological tension between fluency and accuracy. The results suggest that accuracy development does not require constant interruption; rather, it requires focused attention to high-impact forms and systematic opportunities for repair. Selective in-task prompts protected communicative flow, while post-task feedback and reformulation tasks created a "second chance" for more accurate production. This supports a pedagogical principle of timing and focus: feedback is most productive when it is aligned with task goals and followed by immediate application. In addition, feedback that targets lexical and phraseological patterns may be especially effective in speaking classes because these patterns are directly reusable and less cognitively demanding than abstract grammatical explanation during performance.

Contextually, the lyceum environment in Uzbekistan adds specific constraints and opportunities. Exam pressures may tempt teachers to prioritize discrete-item testing, yet the results demonstrate that performance-based assessment and communicative practice can still be aligned with institutional aims when designed carefully. The discussion therefore points toward a dual alignment strategy: maintain measurable progress through clear rubrics and vocabulary indicators, while also building communicative competence through task cycles. Teacher development is a necessary condition for sustainability, since the approach demands skill in lexical selection, task design, and feedback management. However, the model's emphasis on replicable cycles and adaptable templates can reduce teacher workload over time and standardize quality across classes.

Taken together, the findings suggest that methodological effectiveness emerges from coherence. When lexical targets, speaking tasks, scaffolds, interaction design, and feedback mechanisms reinforce one another, learners receive consistent signals about what matters and repeated opportunities to improve. This coherence is the main methodological foundation for strengthening speaking and

vocabulary teaching in academic lyceums and for preparing learners for the discourse demands of philological university study.

Conclusion

The study confirms that enhancing the effectiveness of speaking and vocabulary teaching in academic lyceums requires a methodological shift from fragmented practices toward an integrated instructional system in which lexical development and oral performance are designed to mutually reinforce one another. Effectiveness is achieved when vocabulary is taught not as isolated items for recognition, but as a functional repertoire for communicative action, and when speaking is organized not as occasional practice, but as a structured sequence of tasks that generate repeated, purposeful retrieval and use of lexical resources. The methodological foundations articulated in the article emphasize coherence across five core elements: principled lexical selection, task architecture aligned with lexical objectives, staged scaffolding and fading, interaction management that maximizes meaningful learner talk, and feedback–assessment routines that convert performance into measurable improvement.

A key conclusion is that productivity, not only knowledge, should be the central criterion of vocabulary instruction in lyceums. The persistent gap between receptive vocabulary and productive use can be narrowed when learners experience systematic cycles of noticing, retrieval, guided output, and communicative performance, supported by lexical pressure that makes targeted language necessary for successful task completion. Such cycles help stabilize lexical representations and accelerate access under time constraints, which directly improves fluency and reduces avoidance. The strongest gains are expected when instruction prioritizes multiword units, collocations, and discourse-organizing expressions, because these provide ready-to-use linguistic material that supports both accuracy and academic discourse quality. For lyceum learners aiming at philological university study, this focus is especially valuable:

it equips them with linguistic tools to justify opinions, structure arguments, and participate in seminar-style interaction.

Another conclusion is that classroom interaction must be engineered rather than assumed. Pair and group work can increase speaking time, but only when tasks are designed with clear outcomes, structured roles, and accountability mechanisms that ensure equitable participation. In large-class conditions, timed turns, rotating roles, and report-back stages make communicative work manageable and transparent. This interaction design also contributes to the development of interactional competence, including clarification strategies, repair, and responsive listening, which are essential for real-life and academic communication.

Feedback and assessment practices are likewise foundational. The results support the value of staged corrective feedback that protects fluency during performance while enabling accuracy gains through post-task reflection and repair. When feedback is selective, aligned with task goals, and followed by immediate reformulation, learners are more likely to consolidate improvements rather than repeat errors. Assessment should combine analytic speaking rubrics with vocabulary indicators that capture productive ability, including the use of target lexical items and phraseological patterns in speech. Such measurement provides evidence of progress for institutions while also guiding learners' self-regulation and strategy use.

In practical terms, the study proposes that academic lyceums can improve outcomes by institutionalizing integrated speaking–vocabulary cycles at the unit level, supported by shared task templates, agreed lexical selection procedures, and common assessment instruments. This approach is compatible with curriculum requirements and exam pressures when goals are operationalized and progress is documented through performance data. For sustainable implementation, methodological support for teachers is essential, particularly in task design, lexical scaffolding, and feedback management. When these

conditions are met, the lyceum classroom becomes a setting where learners not only accumulate vocabulary knowledge but also gain the ability to deploy vocabulary flexibly, accurately, and fluently in spoken academic discourse.

Overall, the methodological foundations advanced in this article indicate that speaking and vocabulary outcomes improve most reliably when they are treated as interdependent targets within a coherent pedagogical system. Such a system strengthens learners' communicative competence, supports their academic progression, and provides a realistic pathway for aligning lyceum English education with the discourse demands of philological university programs.

References

1. Alqahtani, M. (2015). The importance of vocabulary in language learning and how to be taught. International Journal of Teaching and Education, 3(3), 21–34.

2. Izaitullaeva, L. E. Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. JournalNX, 9(3), 62-68.

3. Izaitullayeva, L. (2025). Ways to develop students' creative competence. Til va adabiyot, 1(1), 225-227.

4. Izaitullayeva, L. (2025). Psychological Aspects of Educating a Sense of National Pride in Older Preschool Children. American Journal of Open University Education, 1(1), 13-15.

5. Izaitullayeva, L. (2025). Talabalarning ijtimoiy moslashuvida shaxslararo munosabatlar. Ilm-fan muammolari tadqiqotchilar talqinida, 1(1), 199-205.

6. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Ta'lim tizimida sun'iy intellektning ijobiy va salbiy jixatlari. European science international conference, 1(1), 144-147.

7. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Zamonaviy talaba va uning psixologik qiyofasi. ЛУЧШИЕ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНЫ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ, 1(1), 136-140.

8. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Sun'iy intelekt va zamonaviy kasblarning hayotimizda tutgan o'rni. Matematika va informatika fanlarining o'qitish istiqbollari, 1(1), 364-368.

9. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Communication and conflicts between high school students. International Journal of scientific researchers, 1(1), 577-580.
10. Quchqorova, D. (2024). Examples of increase and decrease of function. Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal, 2(11), 82-89.
11. Quchqarova, D. (2024). Pedagogika fanida qo'llaniladigan interaktiv metodikalar. Mugallim, 5(5), 120-123.
12. Eshimbaevna, I. L. (2023). Problems with children's upbringing in young families. Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research, 1(8), 152-156.
13. Shermirzayevna, I. D., & Eshimbayevna, I. L. (2023). Maktabgacha ta'lim tashkilotlarida ta'lim tarbiya jarayonini multemedia asosida takomillashtirish. Science and innovation, 2(Special Issue 10), 594-596.
14. Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. S. (1996). Language testing in practice: Designing and developing useful language tests. Oxford University Press.