

From Silence to Voice: Enhancing English Majors' International Communication Competence through a 'Three-Phase, Four-Loop' Instructional Model - A Case Study of English Speaking and Debate Course

Conghong Shi

Yangtze University College of Arts and Sciences, Jingzhou, Hubei, China

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: This study addresses a critical gap in English language education at local application-oriented universities: how to enhance English majors' international communication competence (ICC) through a systematically designed public speaking and debate course. A pre-course survey revealed three major problems: low conceptual awareness of ICC, a severe skills imbalance between daily conversation and public persuasion, and a "China narrative void" where students could introduce traditional culture but not contemporary China. To address these gaps, a "Three-Phase, Four-Loop" instructional model grounded in the Production-Oriented Approach and Zone of Proximal Development theory was implemented in a 16-week course for second-year English majors. The model integrates an eight-module "China Topics" vocabulary bank, scaffolded skill training, and low-risk, high-fidelity simulation activities. A post-course survey showed significant improvements: ICC conceptual understanding rose from near zero to 87.21% high familiarity; confidence in formal debate reached 72.1%; constructive communication behaviors increased from under 20% to over 58%; and students became able to confidently introduce contemporary topics such as high-speed rail and rural revitalization. Overall course satisfaction was 89.54%, with core reform measures rated as helpful by over 90% of students. The study provides a replicable, evidence-based pathway for cultivating international communication competence in similar applied undergraduate institutions.

Keywords: International communication competence; English speaking and debate; Three-Phase Four-Loop model; English majors

Online publication: June 4, 2026

1. Introduction

In the current era of globalization, a nation's ability to communicate effectively across borders has become a

crucial measure of its soft power. For China, the “Culture Going Out” strategy and the call to “tell China’s stories well” have placed new demands on foreign language education. English majors, as potential bridges between China and the world, are expected not only to master the language but also to articulate China’s perspectives, values, and achievements in a way that is accessible and persuasive to international audiences ^[1]. However, research has shown that many English majors struggle with this task. Surveys indicate that students often lack confidence in public speaking, possess weak critical thinking skills, and have particular difficulty discussing contemporary Chinese topics in English ^[2,3]. A preliminary diagnosis conducted at a local application-oriented university ($n = 121$) further confirmed this pattern: over 70% of students reported little improvement in international communication competence (ICC) through existing courses, and most exhibited avoidance-oriented behaviors when facing intercultural disagreements.

These problems are not isolated. Recent studies on English majors’ cross-cultural and narrative competence have revealed a persistent “China narrative void”: students feel comfortable introducing traditional culture (e.g., food, festivals) but are ill-equipped to discuss modern achievements, social issues, or political values ^[4,5]. The causes are multifaceted: curricula remain heavily input-driven with limited structured oral output, students have almost no authentic international contact, and classroom environments often penalize mistakes rather than encourage risk-taking ^[6,7]. Consequently, existing public speaking and debate courses have fallen short of their potential to cultivate competent international communicators.

To address these gaps, this study proposes a “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” instructional model grounded in the Production-Oriented Approach and Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development ^[8,9]. The model is implemented in an English Public Speaking and Debate course for second-year English majors at a local application-oriented university. The research aims to: (1) diagnose the current state of students’ international communication competence; (2) design and implement a structured instructional model that integrates a “China Topics” vocabulary bank, scaffolded skill training, and low-risk, high-fidelity simulation activities; and (3) evaluate the model’s effectiveness through pre- and post-course surveys and qualitative feedback. The significance of this study lies in its practical, evidence-based response to a real classroom problem. Unlike purely theoretical discussions, it provides a replicable pathway for enhancing international communication competence in similar applied undergraduate institutions, which are often underserved in pedagogical research.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the survey design and the pre-course diagnosis of students’ international communication competence. Section 3 describes the construction of the “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” model. Section 4 details its implementation across three phases. Section 5 evaluates its effectiveness based on post-course survey data. Section 6 concludes with major findings, limitations, and directions for future research.

2. Analyzing the current state of English majors’ international communication competence

2.1. Survey design and implementation

To diagnose the current state of ICC among English majors, a self-administered questionnaire was designed and distributed to second- and third-year students at a local application-oriented university in central China. The questionnaire consisted of four sections: demographic information and international experience; self-assessment of ICC understanding and knowledge of international/Chinese affairs; confidence in English

communication skills and in introducing China-related topics; and behavioral tendencies when facing disagreements in intercultural encounters. Open-ended questions were also included to collect qualitative insights.

A total of 121 valid responses were collected. Among the participants, 67.77% were sophomores and 32.23% were juniors. Female students accounted for over 90% of the sample, reflecting the typical gender composition of the English major cohort. Most importantly, none of the respondents had ever participated in any form of international exchange activity, such as study-abroad programs, international conferences, or volunteer services involving foreigners. This complete lack of direct cross-cultural contact is a critical contextual factor that shapes all the findings reported below.

2.2. Survey results analysis

When asked to rate their understanding of “international communication competence,” 75% of the students chose “not very familiar,” and none chose “very familiar.” This indicates a widespread lack of conceptual clarity, consistent with previous observations that English majors often view ICC merely as language fluency rather than a multidimensional construct^[4]. Regarding knowledge of international political and economic patterns, over 70% reported “not very familiar,” and nearly 20% chose “completely unfamiliar.” No student selected “very familiar” or “somewhat familiar.” Similarly, when asked about China’s contemporary social development (e.g., technology, youth culture), more than 60% expressed low confidence in their ability to discuss these topics in English. These findings echo Luo’s conclusion that local university English majors exhibit significant gaps in both global affairs knowledge and modern China literacy.

Confidence in English communication skills showed a clear imbalance. While students reported relatively high confidence in daily social English (over 60% “somewhat confident” or above), their confidence dropped sharply for more demanding tasks. Only 10% felt “somewhat confident” or “very confident” in delivering a public speech on a complex issue; only 8% felt confident in participating in a formal English debate; and nearly 60% expressed low confidence in understanding different English accents (e.g., Indian, Japanese). These figures reveal a structural weakness: students can handle basic transactional communication but lack the higher-order skills required for persuasive argumentation, logical rebuttal, and adaptive listening—skills central to international communication^[7].

A striking contrast emerged when students rated their confidence in introducing different types of China-related content. For traditional culture—such as Chinese cuisine, tea culture, and traditional festivals—over 65% were “somewhat confident” or above. In contrast, for modern technological achievements (e.g., 5G, high-speed rail), major social issues (e.g., education reform, environmental protection), and China’s political system and core values, more than 60% selected “not very confident” or “not confident at all.” This pattern suggests that students are comfortable discussing “traditional China” but feel ill-equipped to talk about “contemporary China”—a finding that aligns with Peng’s analysis of English majors’ narrative competence gap. The lack of a ready vocabulary and contextual knowledge for modern Chinese topics creates what can be called a “narrative void.”

When asked how they would react if a foreigner challenged or disagreed with them, the majority chose avoidance-oriented strategies. Specifically, 73.55% selected “feel anxious and avoid the argument,” and nearly 70% selected “seek help from a third party or change the topic.” In contrast, only about 20% chose “listen patiently and try to understand the other’s perspective,” and fewer than 15% chose “respond with facts and data.” These results indicate that students lack not only linguistic and strategic competence but also the

psychological readiness to engage in constructive intercultural confrontation. Such avoidance behavior has been identified as a common symptom of foreign language anxiety and low intercultural self-efficacy^[7].

Finally, an overwhelming 73.55% of the respondents stated that the current English Public Speaking and Debate course had brought “little improvement” to their ICC. Only a negligible percentage reported “significant improvement.” When asked about their expectations for course reform, over 80% requested “more materials on contemporary Chinese issues,” and nearly 60% expressed the strongest need for training in “translating grand national narratives into personal, relatable stories.” These open-ended responses corroborate the quantitative findings: students recognize that their deficit is not merely in language fluency but in the ability to frame, narrate, and deliver China’s stories in a way that resonates with international audiences.

2.3. Major problems and their causes

Based on the survey results, three major problems can be identified.

The first problem is low conceptual awareness and fragmented knowledge structures. Students lack a systematic understanding of ICC as a multidimensional construct. Their knowledge is skewed toward traditional cultural symbols while remaining shallow regarding contemporary China and global affairs. This is partly attributable to curricula that focus heavily on basic language skills and classic literature, with insufficient integration of current affairs and international communication theories^[4].

The second problem is severe skills imbalance—“daily talk” versus “public persuasion.” While students can handle routine social conversations, their public speaking and debate skills are markedly underdeveloped. They struggle with logical structuring, evidence-based argumentation, and impromptu rebuttal. This imbalance reflects the dominance of teacher-centered, input-heavy instruction in previous English courses, where opportunities for structured oral output and critical thinking training have been limited^[6].

The third Problem is “China narrative void” and avoidance-oriented intercultural behavior. Students are willing to share Chinese culture but lack the vocabulary, case knowledge, and narrative strategies to discuss contemporary China. When faced with disagreement, they tend to avoid rather than engage. These problems stem from three sources: (a) the absence of authentic intercultural contact experiences (all 121 participants had zero international exposure), (b) a classroom environment that penalizes mistakes rather than encouraging risk-taking, and (c) the lack of a structured “scaffolding” system to help students move from simple cultural introductions to complex issue-based discussions^[5,7].

Taken together, these findings call for a systematic pedagogical intervention—one that integrates content knowledge (especially on contemporary China), skill development (public speaking and debate), psychological support (reducing communication apprehension), and authentic practice opportunities. The following sections present the “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” instructional model designed to address these gaps.

3. Constructing the “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” instructional model

3.1. Model design philosophy

To address the three major problems identified in the previous section—low conceptual awareness, skills imbalance, and the “China narrative void”—this study proposes a “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” instructional model implemented in an English Public Speaking and Debate course for second-year English majors.

The model is grounded in three interconnected theoretical pillars. First, the Production-Oriented

Approach (POA) emphasizes “learning by using” and reverses the traditional input-then-output sequence. It consists of three stages: motivating (driving students to recognize their gaps), enabling (providing scaffolded input), and assessing (evaluating output). This framework directly addresses the learn-use divide prevalent in conventional English courses^[8]. Second, the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and scaffolding theory suggest that learners can achieve tasks beyond their independent ability with appropriate support. Scaffolding is systematically built into every stage—from structured templates and vocabulary banks to peer collaboration and teacher feedback—and gradually removed as students gain competence^[9]. Third, constructivist learning theory posits that knowledge is actively constructed by learners through meaningful interaction with content, peers, and authentic tasks. The model therefore prioritizes student-centered, inquiry-driven, and collaborative learning over passive reception of decontextualized rules^[10]. Together, these foundations support an output-driven, cyclic refinement approach: students learn by doing, receive immediate feedback, and repeatedly cycle through mini-tasks that progressively build confidence and competence.

3.2. The three-phase macro progression

The 16-week course is divided into three macro phases, each with a distinct learning focus.

The first phase is foundation—imitation and knowledge accumulation (weeks 1–5). The objective is to build basic knowledge of public speaking and debate structures and to introduce the “China Topics” vocabulary bank. Key activities include reverse engineering of model speeches (e.g., TED Talks, speeches from Understanding Contemporary China), scaffolded analysis using structured observation checklists, and low-stakes individual tasks such as one-minute self-introduction videos and mini-presentations on familiar cultural topics. By the end of this phase, students can produce a basic two-minute informative speech on a familiar China-related topic using the provided templates.

The second phase is skill tempering—practice and internalization (weeks 6–13). This is the core of the model, where the four-loop micro-cycle (see **3.3.**) operates repeatedly. The objective is to internalize public speaking and debate skills through intensive, low-risk, high-fidelity classroom activities. Key activities include simulated press conferences, four-corner debates on culturally sensitive issues, personal story workshops, expert talk shows, and cultural misunderstanding mediation rooms. By the end of this phase, students can independently deliver a four-minute persuasive speech or participate in a structured debate on a contemporary Chinese issue.

The third phase is comprehensive demonstration—transfer and creative application (weeks 14–16). The objective is to synthesize and showcase the skills and knowledge acquired. Key activities include a culminating event—a “China Story” English speaking contest or a cross-cultural debate open to other classes—and real-world transfer tasks such as recording a three-minute video introducing a local development achievement for an international audience. By the end of the course, students can independently produce a five-minute persuasive speech on a complex China-related topic, handle Q&A, and demonstrate audience awareness.

3.3. The four-loop classroom micro-cycle

The skill tempering phase is driven by a four-loop micro-cycle that repeats every two to three class sessions. Each loop takes approximately 30–40 minutes and ensures that every student produces output, receives feedback, and refines performance in a supportive environment. The diagram below illustrates the cycle.

The first loop is micro-task triggering (3–5 minutes). The instructor gives a highly focused, low-stakes output task, such as “Deliver a 90-second rebuttal to the claim that technology alienates people.” The task is specific, time-bound, and designed to activate prior knowledge.

The second Loop is time-bound collaborative preparation (10–12 minutes). In small groups of three to four, students brainstorm, organize ideas, and rehearse. They use the provided scaffolding—sentence stems, argument templates, vocabulary cards. The instructor circulates to provide just-in-time guidance.

The third Loop is spotlight performance (10–12 minutes). One or two groups are randomly selected (or volunteer) to present their output to the whole class. Performances are short (60–120 seconds) to maximize frequency and reduce anxiety. The rest of the class acts as the audience.

The fourth Loop is instant precision feedback (8–10 minutes). Feedback is immediate and follows the “1+1 rule”: one genuine compliment plus one specific, actionable suggestion. Feedback comes from three sources: peers (using a simple rubric), the instructor (focusing on strategic issues), and self-reflection (students watch a short video of their own performance via mobile phone). After Loop 4, the cycle either repeats with a new micro-task or the instructor introduces a brief micro-lecture to address common gaps observed during the performances. Over eight weeks of Phase 2, a student may experience 15–20 such micro-cycles, resulting in substantial cumulative progress.

3.4. Supporting teaching resources

To operationalize the model, three sets of resources were developed. First, an eight-module bilingual (Chinese–English) vocabulary bank covering: Traditional Culture and Philosophy, Festivals and Customs, Social Development and Daily Life, Political and Economic Development, Science and Technology, Environmental Governance, Education and Youth, and Responding to International Concerns. Each module contains 20–30 core terms, sample sentences, and discussion questions. Second, a scaffolding toolkit including speech outline templates, argument mapping worksheets, peer feedback rubrics, and Q&A bridging phrase cards. Third, five detailed simulation activity guides (each 2–3 pages) for simulated press conferences, four-corner debates, cultural misunderstanding mediation rooms, personal story workshops, and expert talk shows. Each guide includes learning objectives, role descriptions, step-by-step procedures, timing, language support, and debriefing questions.

Together, the Three-Phase progression, the Four-Loop micro-cycle, and the supporting resources form a coherent, replicable instructional system. Section 4 provides concrete implementation cases for each phase.

4. Implementing the “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” model

4.1. Implementation in the foundation phase

In the foundation phase (weeks 1–5), the focus was on building basic knowledge and reducing anxiety through structured imitation. Students first analyzed model speeches from *Understanding Contemporary China: An English Public Speaking Course* and TED Talks using a guided observation checklist. They identified hooks, thesis statements, supporting evidence, transitions, and conclusions. The instructor then introduced the eight-module “China Topics” vocabulary bank, devoting one week to each module. For example, in the “Social Development and Daily Life” module, students learned terms such as “mobile payment,” “high-speed rail,” and “shared bikes,” and practiced using them in short sentences.

To lower the entry barrier, students completed low-stakes tasks: recording one-minute self-introduction

videos at home, presenting a familiar festival (e.g., Spring Festival) to a partner, and writing a simple two-minute speech about a local dish using a provided template. Peer feedback was limited to one compliment per performance. By week 5, every student had delivered at least three short speeches in small groups. This phase successfully established a classroom culture where mistakes were expected and preparation was valued over perfection ^[11].

4.2. Implementation in the skill tempering phase

The skill tempering phase (weeks 6–13) was the core of the course, where the four-loop micro-cycle operated repeatedly. Three activities best illustrated the model.

Activity 1: Simulated Press Conference. Students were assigned roles as government spokespersons or journalists. The topic was “Introducing a new environmental protection policy in our city.” Journalists prepared challenging questions in advance. Following the four-loop cycle: (1) Micro-task: the spokesperson team had 90 seconds to state the policy’s key points. (2) Collaborative preparation: teams worked for 12 minutes, using vocabulary cards on “ecological civilization” and “carbon neutrality.” (3) Spotlight performance: two teams presented; the rest acted as journalists asking follow-ups. (4) Instant feedback: the instructor praised specific use of evidence (“The data about air quality improvement was powerful”) and suggested one improvement (“Next time, pause after a tough question”). Students reported that this activity taught them to stay calm under pressure ^[12].

Activity 2: Four-Corner Debate. The motion was “Should China prioritize high-speed rail expansion over regional aviation?” Students moved to corners labeled “strongly agree,” “agree,” “disagree,” and “strongly disagree.” After a 10-minute team discussion, each corner presented a two-minute opening statement. Then students could change corners if persuaded. The instructor emphasized using the vocabulary bank (e.g., “cost-benefit analysis,” “carbon footprint,” “connectivity”). Many students switched positions during the debate, showing genuine engagement. The “1+1 feedback rule” was applied after each round.

Activity 3: Personal Story Workshop (“Understanding China”). Students were asked to tell a three-minute personal story related to a national development theme, such as “how high-speed rail changed my family’s travel” or “my grandmother’s experience with poverty alleviation.” Before telling the story, they completed a story map worksheet (setting, conflict, resolution, meaning). They practiced in pairs, then two volunteers shared with the whole class. The instructor highlighted specific narrative techniques: using concrete details, showing emotions, and connecting personal experience to broader social change. This activity directly addressed the “China narrative void” by transforming abstract national narratives into relatable individual experiences ^[13].

Across these activities, the four-loop cycle was repeated 16 times during the phase. Each student produced at least 12 short speeches or debate segments and received immediate multi-source feedback.

4.3. Implementation in the comprehensive demonstration phase

In the final phase (weeks 14–16), students applied their skills to a culminating event: a “China Story” English speaking contest open to other classes. Each student chose a contemporary Chinese topic not previously covered in class—for example, “China’s Beidou Navigation System,” “Rural E-commerce in the Digital Age,” or “How My Hometown Achieved Carbon Neutrality.” They had two weeks to prepare a five-minute speech, with one round of peer feedback and one instructor consultation.

On the contest day, students delivered speeches to an audience of about 40 peers and three teacher judges. They were required to handle a two-minute Q&A session afterward. Evaluation criteria included content depth (30%), logical structure (25%), delivery and language (25%), and Q&A performance (20%). The top three speeches were video-recorded and shared on the class learning platform.

Students who had been silent in the foundation phase spoke confidently. One student, who had previously rated herself “not at all confident” in public speaking, delivered a well-researched speech on poverty alleviation in her village and answered three questions clearly. The contest not only demonstrated individual growth but also built a sense of collective achievement ^[11].

5. Evaluating the effectiveness of implementation

5.1. Pre-test and post-test comparative analysis

A pre-course survey ($n = 121$) and a post-course survey ($n = 86$) using the same questionnaire were conducted to assess changes in students’ international communication competence. The results showed significant improvement across multiple dimensions.

First, the understanding of the concept of “international communication competence” increased dramatically. In the pre-test, 75% of students were “not very familiar” and none were “very familiar.” In the post-test, 17.44% chose “very familiar” and 69.77% chose “somewhat familiar,” totaling 87.21% at high familiarity levels. Only 12.79% remained at “average” or below.

Second, confidence in English communication skills showed notable gains. For daily social English, over 93% reported high confidence in the post-test. For formal debate participation, 72.1% reported high confidence, compared to only 35% in the pre-test. However, public speaking on complex issues remained challenging: only 11.63% felt “very confident,” though the overall high confidence rate improved. Understanding different English accents still needed work, with 25.58% rating themselves as “average.”

Third, knowledge of international and Chinese affairs shifted toward a strong preference for contemporary Chinese topics. In the post-test, 90.7% of students were “very familiar” or “somewhat familiar” with contemporary Chinese social development (technology, fashion, youth culture), significantly higher than their familiarity with international political patterns or foreign cultures.

Fourth, behavioral tendencies changed from avoidance to constructive engagement. The proportion of students who would “feel anxious and avoid the argument” dropped from 73.55% to 8.14%. Meanwhile, 69.77% chose “listen patiently and try to understand,” and 58.14% chose “respond with facts and data”—both up from under 20% in the pre-test.

These improvements align with Wang’s finding that structured exposure to contemporary China topics significantly enhances students’ readiness for international communication ^[14].

5.2. Satisfaction with the curriculum reform

Overall course satisfaction was high: 27.91% were “very satisfied,” 61.63% “somewhat satisfied,” totaling 89.54%. Only 3.49% were “somewhat dissatisfied.”

Students rated the specific reform measures highly. The “China Topics” vocabulary bank, scaffolding training, and personal story workshop each received over 90% positive ratings (“very helpful” or “somewhat helpful”). Simulated press conferences and group collaboration received about 75% positive ratings, while online resources received 60%.

In terms of ability improvement, 88% of students reported that the course helped them “tell China’s stories in English”—the highest-rated item. Public speaking confidence (82%), logical thinking (78%), and team collaboration (75%) also showed strong gains.

When asked about areas for improvement, 66.28% requested more class hours, and 55.81% wanted more varied classroom activities. Only 12.79% asked for more specific teacher feedback, suggesting that the “1+1 feedback rule” was largely effective.

5.3. Qualitative feedback and discussion

Open-ended responses provided rich evidence of the model’s impact. Students most frequently mentioned being able to confidently introduce rural revitalization (8 mentions), high-speed rail (7 mentions), mobile payment (6 mentions), and poverty alleviation (5 mentions)—topics they had previously avoided. One student wrote: “Before this course, I could only introduce Chinese food. Now I can explain why high-speed rail matters to my family.”

Reflecting on communication experiences, students identified adequate preparation, team collaboration, and repeated practice as key success factors. Those who failed often attributed it to insufficient preparation. The “1+1 feedback rule” was mentioned several times as reducing anxiety: “I knew I would get a compliment first, so I was not afraid to speak.”

Gender differences emerged. Female students (89.53% of the sample) dominated high-understanding, high-satisfaction, and constructive-behavior groups. Male students were overrepresented among those with low understanding and low satisfaction, suggesting a need for differentiated support.

Overall, the qualitative feedback corroborates the quantitative findings: the “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” model effectively reduced communication apprehension, filled the “China narrative void,” and equipped students to tell contemporary China’s stories in English. The main remaining challenge is insufficient class hours, as noted by two-thirds of the students ^[15].

6. Conclusion

This study set out to diagnose the international communication competence of English majors at a local application-oriented university and to evaluate a “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” instructional model implemented in an English Public Speaking and Debate course. The pre-test ($n = 121$) revealed three major problems: low conceptual awareness of ICC, a severe skills imbalance between daily conversation and public persuasion, and a “China narrative void” where students could introduce traditional culture but not contemporary China. After the 16-week intervention, the post-test ($n = 86$) showed significant improvement. ICC conceptual understanding rose from near zero to 87.21% high familiarity. Confidence in formal debate reached 72.1%, and constructive communication behaviors increased from under 20% to over 58%. Most importantly, students became able to confidently introduce contemporary topics such as high-speed rail, mobile payment, and rural revitalization—topics they had previously avoided. Overall course satisfaction was 89.54%, and the core reform measures (vocabulary bank, scaffolding training, personal story workshop) were rated as helpful by over 90% of students.

The study makes both theoretical and practical contributions. Theoretically, it operationalizes ICC for the specific context of Chinese English majors, identifying the “China narrative void” as a distinct competence gap. The “Three-Phase, Four-Loop” model provides a concrete pedagogical instantiation of the POA and

ZPD theory, demonstrating how output-driven, scaffolded, low-risk practice can produce measurable gains. Practically, the study offers ready-to-use resources: an eight-module bilingual vocabulary bank, a scaffolding toolkit, and five simulation activity guides. These can be directly adopted or adapted by similar institutions. The findings also suggest that curriculum designers should expand class hours, incorporate more contemporary China content, and provide differentiated support for male students who underperformed in this study.

Several limitations must be acknowledged. The study used a single-group pre-test/post-test design without a control group, so causal claims are tentative. The sample was drawn from one university with predominantly female students (89.53%) and zero prior international experience, limiting generalizability. The post-test relied on self-reported confidence rather than behavioral observation or external assessment. No long-term follow-up was conducted. Future research should employ quasi-experimental designs with control groups, include multiple institutions and more balanced samples, incorporate objective performance measures, and track students longitudinally to examine skill retention and transfer to authentic intercultural settings.

Funding

This article was supported by the Teaching Research Project “Research on the Cultivation Path of International Communication Competence for English Majors in the New Era: A Case Study of the English Speaking and Debate Course” (Grant No. WL202409) and the University-Level First-Class Course “English Speaking and Debate” at Yangtze University College of Arts and Sciences.

Disclosure statement

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Ding Y, Zhang Y, 2026, A Multi-Dimensional Examination and Advanced Pathways for the Construction of China’s International Communication Competence in the New Era. *International Communication*, (03): 71–75.
- [2] Yang L, Zhang H, Liu X, 2025, Exploring the Integration Pathway of International Communication Competence and Foreign Language Talent Cultivation. *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies*, (01): 34–42.
- [3] Xiao J, Xiao Z, 2026, A Survey on the Cultivation of Cross-Cultural Communicative Competence of English Majors in the Context of Telling China’s Stories Well. *Language and Culture Studies*, 34(02): 135–138.
- [4] Zhao L, Yang T, 2022, Telling China’s Stories Well in English: A Study on the Current State of Cross-Cultural Competence of English Majors. *Cultural Innovation and Comparative Studies*, 6(29): 153–156.
- [5] Peng X, 2024, A Study on the Linguistic and Narrative Competence of English Majors in “Telling China’s Stories Well.” *Education Observation*, 13(19): 118–122.
- [6] Luo Q, 2025, An Analysis of the Current State and Improvement Strategies for the International Communication Competence of Huxiang Culture Among English Majors in Local Undergraduate Institutions. *Journal of Hunan University of Science and Engineering*, 46(01): 116–121.
- [7] Hu X, 2023, An Exploration of the Current State and Improvement Strategies of Cross-Cultural Communicative

- Competence Among University Students. *Cultural Innovation and Comparative Studies*, 7(32): 170–175.
- [8] Wen Q, 2015, Constructing the Theoretical System of the Production-Oriented Approach. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 47(04): 547–558 + 640.
- [9] Gao R, 2025, A 30-Year Review of the Application of Zone of Proximal Development Theory in Foreign Language Teaching. *Journal of University of Shanghai for Science and Technology (Social Sciences Edition)*, 47(05): 446–454.
- [10] Zhang Y, 2021, On the Application of Constructivist Learning Theory in College Foreign Language Teaching. *English Square*, (35): 125–127.
- [11] Chen Y, 2025, A Study on the Cultivation Path of International Communication Competence for English Majors Based on English Speaking Competitions. *Journal of Jilin Provincial Institute of Education*, 41(11): 110–115.
- [12] Tian W, Du L, Xu Y, 2024, An Analysis of Classroom Instructional Design Paths for Integrating the “Three Entries” Work into the “Understanding Contemporary China: English Public Speaking” Course. *English Square*, (31): 60–64.
- [13] Mu Y, 2024, From Fine Traditional Chinese Culture to “Understanding Contemporary China”: A Case Study of Instructional Design in an English Public Speaking Course. *Chinese Journal of ESP*, (01): 1–10 + 125.
- [14] Wang D, 2024, An Evaluation Study of the “Understanding Contemporary China” English Public Speaking Textbook under the Cultivation of International Communication Competence, dissertation, Xi’an International Studies University.
- [15] Huo W, 2024, A Study on College Students’ Oral English Anxiety Based on the Production-Oriented Approach. *Shipbuilding Vocational Education*, 12(02): 37–40.

Publisher’s note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.