

Application of Continuation Writing Tasks in English Teaching Practice from the Perspective of Dynamic Assessment System

Meidong Zhang*, Shenghua Yang

School of Foreign Languages, China West Normal University, Nanchong, 637000, China

* Corresponding author: Meidong Zhang (Email: 2694136767@qq.com)

Abstract: Continuation Writing Tasks, as an innovative teaching method, effectively integrates reading and writing, fostering students' comprehensive language proficiency and creative thinking. However, issues such as the disconnection between reading and writing and the lack of a diversified assessment system commonly exist in junior high school English writing instruction, significantly restricting students' writing ability development. This paper explores the application of dynamic assessment in Continuation Writing Tasks instruction. By emphasizing the learning process through teacher-student interaction and continuous feedback, dynamic assessment provides a powerful solution to these problems. Based on the theoretical foundations and core principles of dynamic assessment, this study delves into its practical value in Continuation Writing Tasks instruction and proposes student-centered dynamic assessment strategies. These strategies aim to stimulate students' interest in writing, enhance their autonomous learning ability, and comprehensively improve their overall English proficiency. This research also provides theoretical support and practical guidance for junior high school English teachers to optimize their teaching approaches.

Keywords: Continuation Writing Tasks, Dynamic Assessment, Writing Instruction.

1. Introduction

Writing instruction has always been a focal point in foreign language teaching. English writing proficiency serves as a comprehensive reflection of students' overall English competence. During this process, students must use language creatively to construct coherent texts that express their thoughts. Therefore, writing skill development holds a crucial position in junior high school English teaching. Continuation Writing Tasks, as an innovative teaching method, has garnered increasing attention. However, its implementation in actual teaching still faces multiple challenges, such as rigid evaluation criteria and lack of variation in writing topics. The dynamic assessment system offers new perspectives and approaches to addressing these issues by comprehensively and dynamically evaluating students' writing processes and outcomes. This approach can significantly enhance the effectiveness of Continuation Writing Tasks instruction, ultimately improving students' writing skills and fostering core literacy skills required for real-world writing contexts.

2. The Essence of Continuation Writing Tasks

Writing is not merely a product of language output but an ongoing process of meaning construction. Both reading and writing require students to interpret texts, construct meaning, and express ideas based on their prior knowledge. This means that students must adopt dual perspectives—both as authors and readers—to create meaningful and coherent texts. As Raimes (1983) states, "Writing means expressing thoughts, elaborating meaning; the process of writing is the process of thinking." Thus, writing should be driven by real communicative purposes and take audience awareness into account. Additionally, since writing is a process, it requires adequate linguistic and cognitive scaffolding as well as

dynamic assessment. Only with such support can students accurately convey their ideas through written language and improve their writing proficiency.

Continuation Writing Tasks is a language-integration teaching method in which students extend or rewrite a story, article, or passage based on the existing plot, characters, or background. The goal is to guide students in applying their linguistic knowledge, honing their creative thinking, and developing writing skills, with a focus on language comprehension and expression. By closely integrating reading and writing, Continuation Writing Tasks facilitates writing through reading, providing students with content, ideas, and linguistic models while deepening their comprehension of the original text during the writing process. This approach enhances students' language application skills, logical thinking, and creativity (Wang Chuming, 2012).

In China, the concept of Continuation Writing Tasks can be traced back to the 1990s with the "Extended Foreign Language Writing Method." Early foreign language teaching methods, such as the "Expanded Foreign Language Writing Method," laid the foundation for the development of Continuation Writing Tasks. Through continuous practical exploration and theoretical refinement, the modern Continuation Writing Tasks teaching model has gradually emerged (Wang Chuming, 2015). Since language is inherently interactive, writing serves as a process of comprehensive language application. Within Continuation Writing Tasks, linguistic elements (e.g., vocabulary, grammar) interact deeply with contextual knowledge, leading to more effective language acquisition for students.

3. Current State and Challenges of Continuation Writing Tasks in Junior High School

3.1. Current Teaching Situation

Following the “Learn-Use-Apply” principle, Wang Chuming (2012) conducted in-depth theoretical research on Continuation Writing Tasks, emphasizing its role in stimulating learners’ imagination, enhancing their motivation to express ideas, highlighting contextual factors, activating language production, reducing linguistic errors, and ensuring textual coherence. Continuation Writing Tasks is not only a method for improving language skills but also an integrated and developmental educational approach that plays a crucial role in cultivating students’ English core literacy. However, in actual classroom settings, traditional writing instruction concepts and models still pose significant challenges to its implementation.

3.2. Practical Challenges in Teaching

One major issue arises in the pre-writing stage, where reading materials are often confined to textbooks, lacking flexibility and real-life relevance, which makes it difficult to engage students in writing. Furthermore, the teaching topics are predominantly narrative, leading teachers to focus mainly on developing students’ narrative writing skills while neglecting other text types (Fu Shanyun, 2024). At the same time, teachers often limit reading instruction to grammar and lexical memorization, restricting reading to linguistic analysis and neglecting exploration of the text’s theme. This disconnects reading from writing, preventing students from deeply understanding the theme and weakening their linguistic scaffolding for writing. As a result, reading instruction and writing instruction remain largely separate, failing to maximize the facilitating role of reading in writing development (Ling Yong, 2016). Moreover, such an approach overlooks the cultivation of students’ thematic thinking and writing intent, making it difficult for them to develop clear direction in content planning and expression, resulting in superficial or uncreative writing.

Secondly, after the completion of writing tasks, the assessment process is predominantly teacher-centered, placing students in a passive role and preventing them from receiving personalized feedback, which in turn reduces their motivation and sense of achievement. For instance, in the writing review phase, teachers usually select exemplary compositions for evaluation, summarizing common issues, while other students’ mistakes may become entrenched due to delayed feedback. Additionally, assessment standards primarily focus on micro-skills such as grammar, while students’ writing strategies and progress are often overlooked. The lack of direct interaction during the writing process restricts students’ accuracy in language production and development of discourse-level thinking. Furthermore, the static and summative nature of the assessment results in untimely feedback, lacks personalized guidance, and limits interaction, failing to fully reflect students’ writing abilities and learning progression, thereby hindering their long-term writing improvement.

Lastly, students’ challenges in autonomous learning must be considered. Post-reading continuation writing demands a high level of self-regulation, including self-planning, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation. However, junior high school

students generally exhibit weaknesses in these areas. With single-dimensional assessment criteria and strong teacher dominance, students struggle to break free from the constraints of the original text, resulting in limited creative thinking and independent composition skills. In the absence of timely feedback and guidance, students fail to identify issues in their writing and lack effective strategies for improvement (Wang Chuming, 2015).

Given these challenges in Continuation Writing Tasks, introducing a dynamic assessment framework may offer solutions, enhancing students’ writing abilities and overall language proficiency.

4. Theoretical Foundations and Principles of Dynamic Assessment

Dynamic Assessment (DA), also referred to as “Learning Potential Assessment”, is an approach that explores and identifies learners’ potential development through interaction between the assessor and the student (Lidz, 2003). DA is learner-centered and emphasizes the organic integration of assessment and instruction. Unlike traditional static assessment, which is result-oriented, DA is process-oriented, focusing on continuous evaluation, feedback, and guidance through teacher-student and peer interactions. This ongoing assessment helps educators gain a dynamic understanding of students’ learning progress, identify their strengths and weaknesses, and adjust instructional strategies accordingly to facilitate their learning and development. As Poehner (2008) states, “The dynamic assessment system not only focuses on students’ learning outcomes but also pays close attention to their cognitive changes, strategic applications, and skill development during the learning process, aiming to cultivate learners’ autonomy and lifelong learning awareness.”

The theoretical foundation of DA is Vygotsky’s Socio-cultural Theory of Mind (SCT), particularly its core concept, the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). According to ZPD, a learner’s development consists of actual development level and potential development level, and the gap between the two is the zone of proximal development. To bridge this gap, assessors must understand the learners’ individual characteristics and real language proficiency, providing effective guidance and feedback through mediation and interaction to maximize their learning potential. Under this framework, DA is categorized into two main approaches: Interventionist Dynamic Assessment and Interactionist Dynamic Assessment (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004).

In addition to SCT, language acquisition theory suggests that language naturally develops in context through interaction and practice, rather than through mere rule memorization and imitation. Language learning requires constant feedback and refinement to ensure accurate expression of thought.

Furthermore, Input Hypothesis in English language teaching highlights that comprehensible input at an appropriate level enables learners to accumulate vocabulary, grammatical structures, and discourse knowledge, providing rich linguistic resources for written continuation tasks. This facilitates accurate and fluent writing while stimulating learners’ creative thinking and writing motivation. Through this process, learners develop a genuine writing drive by understanding story logic and emotional context, fostering creative reasoning and linguistic expression skills.

Additionally, based on the synergy effect, the degree of

integration between language comprehension and production significantly impacts learning efficiency. The closer the integration, the stronger the synergy effect. As Wang Chuming (2014) notes, "The language output gradually aligns with the comprehended input, advancing from lower to higher proficiency levels, thus narrowing the learning gap. The concept of 'written continuation' is derived from this principle."

5. Types and Principles of Dynamic Assessment System

5.1. Principles of Constructing the Assessment System

5.1.1. Student-Centered Approach

The dynamic assessment model should emphasize the learner's initiative in the post-reading writing process. In teaching, teachers should not simply grade the students' final outcomes, but rather interact with students during the writing process. Teachers can intervene selectively in the content and help students learn and reflect throughout the writing process, thus promoting the enhancement of their language skills, cognitive thinking, and core competencies. In a student-centered dynamic assessment approach, teachers should respect individual differences, and create evaluation standards based on each student's writing level, learning style, and progress space, avoiding a "one-size-fits-all" approach. The assessment should focus on students' unique expressions, encouraging individualized language use rather than rigid, formulaic expression. It is important to note that a student-centered assessment does not eliminate the teacher's evaluation; rather, it integrates both the teacher's evaluation and feedback, as well as peer assessments and self-assessments, creating a more diversified approach to dynamic evaluation in post-reading writing instruction.

5.1.2. Integration of Intervention and Interactive Assessment

The key distinction between the two primary models of Dynamic Assessment lies in their approaches to intervention. The interventionist model emphasizes following a pre-established procedure in teaching, which facilitates the implementation of practical teaching. In contrast, the interactionist model focuses on interaction between the learner and the mediator during the teaching process. In this interaction, learners internalize knowledge, enhance their language skills, effectively address learning challenges, and reflect on their learning process. Although these models differ in their intervention methods, both fundamentally apply Vygotsky's Socio-Cultural Theory, specifically the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). Therefore, in the application of dynamic assessment to post-reading writing instruction, this study adopts the "interventionist" model while incorporating ideas from the interactionist model to better meet teaching practical needs and promote the development of students' writing abilities.

5.1.3. Integration of Teaching and Assessment

The New Curriculum Standards advocate for a comprehensive English course evaluation system that promotes the effective formation of core competencies. Teachers are encouraged to "emphasize the role of assessment in promoting learning" (Ministry of Education, 2020). In traditional classroom teaching, teaching and assessment are often separate; evaluation is limited to final or summative

assessments, neglecting formative assessments. This lack of timely feedback means that students cannot improve based on their learning status, and "assessment-driven teaching" is not effectively realized. In dynamic assessment environments, teaching and assessment are inseparable—teaching is an ongoing process of evaluation. In actual teaching, teachers need to assume dual roles as both mediators and evaluators. They should combine both interventionist and interactive assessments to interact with students and provide feedback. This allows teachers to diagnose students' problems during the writing process and adjust their teaching strategies based on timely feedback, thereby integrating teaching and assessment, leading to mutual improvement.

5.2. Types of Dynamic Assessment Systems

In practice, dynamic assessment can take multiple forms. Lantolf and Poehner (2004) broadly categorize these models into two types: interventionist DA and interactionist DA, both of which are applications of Vygotsky's ZPD. The interventionist DA emphasizes assessing students along a fixed teaching process. For example, the "test-train-test" model proposed by Budoff et al. belongs to the interventionist evaluation approach. In this model, teachers guide students step by step during each assessment task, including both explicit and implicit guidance, similar to spreading icing on a cake, which is why it is also known as the "cake model" of evaluation (Han, 2007). In contrast, the interactionist DA focuses on interaction between the mediator and the learner during the writing process, providing targeted guidance through open interaction, which promotes the improvement of students' writing abilities.

Furthermore, based on the importance of feedback and interaction during the learning process, practices such as layered guidance and generative assessment can be introduced in post-reading writing classrooms. By providing differentiated writing support based on students' language proficiency and cognitive abilities, these methods help students improve their capabilities within their "Zone of Proximal Development."

6. Activity Design and Implementation of Dynamic Assessment

Introducing a dynamic assessment system into post-reading writing instruction helps improve teaching effectiveness. Dynamic assessment emphasizes continuous evaluation through interaction between teachers, students, and peers, providing feedback and guidance to promptly address writing issues and optimize classroom teaching. The core concept focuses on the student's learning process, encouraging independent exploration and innovation during writing, ultimately helping students develop core competencies. Based on this, this paper integrates the concepts of "intervention" and "interaction" from dynamic assessment theory into all stages of writing instruction, including reading the text, topic selection, first draft, self-assessment and peer assessment, teacher feedback, first revision, further peer feedback, further teacher feedback, second revision, final draft, and reflective learning. Teachers should design evaluation interventions according to students' actual writing needs to ensure the relevance and effectiveness of the assessment.

6.1. Pre-Writing Stage

Teachers should guide learners in completing three tasks. First, collaboratively establish unified, continuous, and diversified composition evaluation criteria, i.e., an assessment rubric. Clear and objective assessment criteria are key to “assessment-driven learning,” as they not only help students understand the writing requirements but also provide guidance for self-assessment and peer evaluation. Therefore, the evaluation should be integrated throughout the post-reading writing process and focus on both micro-level writing skills (vocabulary, grammar, discourse) and macro-level language learning abilities (self-reflection on learning and exploration of cultural awareness within the topic).

Second, guide learners to create a personalized writing growth portfolio. This should include the learner’s first draft, second draft, final draft, and various evaluation rubrics used during the writing process. By establishing a writing growth portfolio, learners can clearly see their progress, continually motivating them to engage with writing and overcome writing-related anxieties. At the same time, teachers can use the portfolio for personalized teaching to further enhance students’ writing abilities and contribute to the development of their core competencies.

The third task is to guide learners in reading the text. Text selection should meet three criteria: it should be engaging and extendable, the language difficulty should be appropriate, and the topic should be closely related to students’ lives. On this basis, teachers guide students in reading the text and constructing real-world contexts, fostering students’ writing thinking and language knowledge. According to Krashen’s (1985) Input Hypothesis, the key to second language acquisition is exposure to large amounts of comprehensible, interesting, and relevant target language input. Teachers should also guide students in analyzing sample writing related to the same topic, conducting close reading to summarize paragraph main ideas, and deeply interpreting the theme, discourse type, logical development, and structural arrangement of the text, as well as identifying effective language expressions. For example, when writing a continuation of a topic on parent-child relationships, such as “the breakfast on Mother’s Day,” the teacher can compile texts on similar themes, guide students to outline the story development, and then analyze the emotional changes within parent-child stories. Teachers should also encourage students to accumulate relevant vocabulary and sentence structures.

Through layered guidance (individual or small group instruction), teachers stimulate students’ thinking and guide them in brainstorming. They provide preliminary language and contextual scaffolding for writing, preparing students for subsequent writing tasks. For instance, using the 2020 Gaokao topic “The Breakfast on Mother’s Day,” teachers could lead a debate on “How much sacrifice did a mother make for the family, and was it worthwhile?” By delving into the story, not only does this spark students’ interest in writing, but it also effectively addresses the limitations of reading materials and provides ample preparation for the writing stage.

6.2. First Draft Writing

Based on their understanding of the text’s meaning and structure acquired during the reading stage, students engage in the continuation writing process. This may involve elaborating on a character’s psychological state, shaping the plot’s progression, or rewriting the ending, ultimately completing their first draft. Although students have already

read the text, they may still struggle to apply their understanding to writing and find it difficult to begin. This is where teacher intervention becomes essential, providing continuous guidance and assessment. For instance, teachers can instruct students to use mind maps to outline their continuation, helping them organize the storyline of *The Breakfast on Mother’s Day* and clarify the direction of their writing.

6.3. Self-Assessment and Peer Review

During the first draft writing process, teachers should monitor the classroom, address students’ concerns, and offer writing guidance. However, beyond teacher feedback, peer evaluation also plays a crucial role in fostering students’ writing awareness and improving their writing skills. Teachers can establish peer review groups, allowing students to collaborate, read, evaluate, and refine their compositions collectively. Before conducting peer reviews, teachers should select student samples and demonstrate the evaluation criteria, helping students understand the standards and enabling them to provide more precise feedback. This process enhances both their writing skills and their ability to communicate and collaborate effectively. To maximize peer learning, groups should follow the principle of “heterogeneous within groups, homogeneous across groups” (Zheng Jia, 2024), meaning that each group consists of students with varying proficiency levels while maintaining balance between groups. By exchanging ideas and providing feedback, learners can avoid the common issue in process writing, where students lack timely feedback.

When discussing and finalizing evaluation criteria with students, teachers should emphasize that Continuation Writing Tasks writing is not merely imitation but an opportunity for creative expression. While peer evaluation can increase students’ engagement, discrepancies in language proficiency may lead to incomplete or inaccurate feedback. Thus, teacher assessment remains indispensable. First, through interactive and interventionist evaluation, teachers can provide students with more personalized, comprehensive, and effective feedback. Second, students tend to rely on teachers’ authority and look forward to receiving their encouragement and guidance. Therefore, teacher feedback is essential. During peer evaluation, teachers should review students’ writing growth portfolios, assess the quality of peer reviews within groups, and assist groups that encounter difficulties in evaluation.

Ultimately, by integrating teacher feedback and peer review, students can more accurately identify issues in their writing and make targeted revisions. Since both teacher and peer feedback explicitly highlight errors (such as grammar and vocabulary usage), students can focus more on textual coherence during self-assessment, engaging in deeper reflection and refinement. This process fosters students’ self-evaluation skills, encouraging active participation in writing and reflection, thereby enhancing their overall writing awareness and proficiency.

6.4. Revision Stage

After peer review, the teacher guides students to further refine their compositions, making it clear that students can decide whether to incorporate peer feedback into their revisions. At this stage, the teacher can employ both interventionist and interactive evaluation approaches. For example, pre-writing model essays can be used to guide

students in analyzing their arguments, supporting evidence, reasoning logic, structure, and language. However, it is crucial that students engage in independent thinking before the model essays are introduced. The teacher should emphasize that these essays serve as references for writing strategies rather than templates to memorize. Presenting fixed patterns too early may constrain students' creative thinking (Schmidt, 1990: 129-158).

Alternatively, the teacher may interact with students individually, providing revision strategies to help them complete their modifications independently. With additional writing resources and strategic intervention, students can develop a more in-depth understanding of the writing process, making their revisions more targeted and effective.

Having gained initial writing experience, students will find the second draft and its revision process much easier. During this phase, the teacher can review students' writing portfolios and provide written feedback to facilitate the final assessment.

6.5. Final Draft and Independent Stage

In the final stage, the teacher evaluates students' completed drafts. This process should be conducted from both macro and micro perspectives. Macro-level assessment focuses on whether the theme aligns with the reading material, whether the text structure and logic are coherent, whether writing strategies are effectively applied, and whether supporting arguments are sufficiently developed. Micro-level assessment focuses on the accuracy of language use, including grammar, vocabulary choice, and sentence structures. Beyond assessing the composition itself, attention should also be given to students' overall writing progress. Only by accurately identifying students' current writing proficiency can the teacher help them advance to a higher level, fostering both writing ability and critical thinking.

During evaluation, positive reinforcement should be prioritized. The teacher can use different colors to highlight students' strengths, areas for improvement, and personalized suggestions. This approach enhances students' sense of achievement, fosters meaningful writing, and encourages them to engage more deeply in the writing process.

Once the final drafts have been reviewed, the class proceeds to post-writing reflection and peer-sharing activities. Since the four language skills-listening, speaking, reading, and writing-are interconnected, reading provides structural support for writing, while writing reinforces reading comprehension. This integrated approach not only enhances students' overall language proficiency but also encourages peer interaction, stimulating their enthusiasm for writing.

6.6. Post-Writing Showcase

At this stage, students' writing portfolios come into play. The teacher can use selected final works from different groups as teaching resources and conduct reading circle-style activities. Students from different groups are invited to collaboratively analyze the compositions from various aspects, such as fluency of expression, thematic depth, use of advanced vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and structural organization. Each group is assigned a specific focus and later presents their evaluations.

Additionally, common issues identified in students' writing should be addressed through targeted instruction, helping them continuously refine their writing skills. This structured feedback loop enables students to reflect on their writing more critically and further improve their overall proficiency.

7. Conclusion

As a promising writing instruction method, Continuation Writing Tasks writing plays a significant role in junior high school English teaching. However, there are certain shortcomings in current writing instruction and Continuation Writing Tasks practices. The dynamic assessment system, with its unique connotations, theoretical foundations, various forms, and evaluation criteria, provides strong support for addressing these issues.

By appropriately integrating the dynamic assessment system into junior high school Continuation Writing Tasks writing instruction, students' interest in writing can be stimulated, their autonomy can be enhanced, teaching evaluation can be improved, and their overall writing competence can be developed. However, the process of improving students' writing skills and core competencies through dynamic assessment is gradual and long-term. It cannot solely rely on teachers' classroom practices but requires collaborative efforts and continuous implementation.

Educational authorities should incorporate the concept of dynamic assessment into curriculum objectives and evaluation systems, while also providing teachers with necessary training and resource support. Additionally, improvements in teaching infrastructure, such as AI-assisted instruction, can enhance the efficiency and accuracy of assessment.

Ultimately, the dynamic assessment model is a product of the integration of theory and practice. Further research on its application in Continuation Writing Tasks writing, along with continuous refinement of evaluation criteria and methods, will help it better adapt to the evolving demands of language teaching.

References

- [1] Ariza Martínez A V. The process-writing approach: An alternative to guide the students compositions[J]. Profile Issues in TeachersProfessional Development, 2005 (6): 37-46.
- [2] Lantolf J P, Poehner M E. Dynamic assessment of L2 development: Bringing the past into the future[J]. Journal of applied linguistics, 2004, 1(1).
- [3] Lidz C. Dynamic assessment (Learning potential testing, testing the limits)[J]. Encyclopedia of Psychological Assessment, 2003, 337: 343.
- [4] Moore J B. A writing week[J]. English Journal, 1978, 67(8): 39-41.
- [5] Raimes,A.1983.TechniquesinTeaching Writing [M].London: OUP.
- [6] Raimes A. Techniques in teaching writing[J]. 1983.
- [7] Schmidt R W. The role of consciousness in second language learning1[J]. Applied linguistics, 1990, 11(2): 129-158.
- [8] Jia Aiwu. Improvement of English Writing Teaching: From Final Draft Writing Method to Process Writing Method [J]. Journal of PLA Foreign Languages Institute, 1998, (05): 75-78.
- [9] Ministry of Education. General Senior High School English Curriculum Standards (2017 Edition, Revised in 2020) [S]. Beijing: People's Education Press, 2020.
- [10] Ling Yong. Teaching Strategies for Post-Reading Writing [J]. Foreign Language Teaching in Primary and Secondary Schools (Secondary Section), 2016, 39(05): 31-35.

- [11] Shi Yu. English "Post-Reading Writing" Teaching and Its Evaluation [J]. Teaching and Management, 2020, (27): 109-111.
- [12] Wang Chuming. Post-Reading Writing—An Effective Method to Improve Foreign Language Learning Efficiency [J]. Foreign Language World, 2012, (05): 2-7.
- [13] Wang Chuming. Why Post-Reading Writing Effectively Promotes Learning [J]. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2015, 47(05): 753-762+801.
- [14] Wang Min, Wang Chuming. The Synergistic Effect of Post-Reading Writing [J]. Modern Foreign Languages, 2014, 37(04): 501-512+584.
- [15] Wang Qiang, Li Liang. Promoting the Integration of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment in English Classrooms under the Core Competency Framework: Significance, Theory, and Methods [J]. Curriculum, Teaching Materials, and Methods, 2019, 39(05): 114-120.
- [16] Xiao Dan, Yuan Zhuojun. The Construction and Practice of "Teaching-Learning-Assessment Integration" in High School English Writing Teaching [J]. Primary and Secondary School English Teaching and Research, 2022, (03): 64-67.
- [17] Zheng Jia. A Post-Reading Writing Dynamic Assessment Model Based on Dynamic Assessment Theory [J]. Primary and Secondary School English Teaching and Research, 2024, (04): 67-71.