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• What is speaking?
• Interaction in the assessment of speaking
• Interactional competence and nonverbal behavior
• Assessing nonverbal behavior
• Where to from here?
WHAT IS SPEAKING?

• Human thought made ‘audible’
• Primarily generative – allowing for novel thoughts to be shared with listeners
• Has a communicative intent
• Is contingent on the speaker’s on-going recognition of the interlocutor’s state of understanding
WHAT IS SPEAKING ASSESSMENT?

McNamara’s (1996) Model of Speaking Proficiency (modified)
FOCUS ON INTERACTION
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Interaction arrow between Interlocutor and Test Taker.
“... successful interaction presupposes not only a shared knowledge of the world, the reference to a common external context of communication, but also the construction of a shared internal context or ‘sphere of intersubjectivity’ that is built through the collaborative efforts of the interactional partners.”

Kramsch (1986)
## INTERACTION IN SPEAKING TESTS: RESEARCH STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galaczi (2008)</td>
<td>General patterns of interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducasse and Brown (2009)</td>
<td>Interactional features attended to by raters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks (2009)</td>
<td>Effects of the proficiency of one’s partner on the co-construction of discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis (2009)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May (2009, 2011)</td>
<td>The influence of a speaker’s L1 (or other languages) on the co-construction of interactional effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry (1994, 2007)</td>
<td>The effect of test taker extraversion or introversion on interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakatsuhara (2011)</td>
<td>The influence of extraversion or introversion and proficiency on conversational styles in two group sizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“…gesture is regarded as a central aspect of language in use, integral to how we communicate (make meaning) both with each other and with ourselves”.

Gulberg (2008, p. 133)
CREATING INTERACTION

Eye contact
Facial expressions
Head movement
Hand gestures
Posture
Paralinguistic cues

Signal Comprehension
Seek Clarification
Signal Support
Manage Turn-Taking

Echoes
Back-channels
Questions
Word supply
Sentence completion
Length of talk
Offer/Accept floor
INTERACTION IN THE CAMLA ECPE SPEAKING TEST

• Structured two on two, multi-stage test
• Requires examinees to interact with each other and with the examiner
• Decision-making task
• Five stages: linguistic and interactional demands progressively more difficult
  1. Introductions and small talk
  2. Summarize and recommend
  3. Negotiate
  4. Present and convince
  5. Justify and defend
• Interaction is co-constructed by the examinees
ASSESSING NVB

Jenkins and Parra (2003)
Local ITA test
Analysis
- Kinesic and paralinguistic features, nonverbal turn-taking, active listening strategies
- Evaluator comments
Findings
- Linguistically proficient passed regardless of NVB
- Linguistically weaker but used NVB also passed
Results: Incorporation of NVB into rater training and into scoring rubric

NVB consists of those “elements that we are at once consciously unaware and yet unconsciously, profoundly aware”.
Burgoon, Guerrero, and Floyd (2010, p. 374)
THE 'INCONVENIENT TRUTH'
WHERE TO FROM HERE?

- Criteria for interactional competence?
  - Lam (in press)
- Test delivery using video-conferencing (and other tools)
  - Nakatsuhara, Inoue, Berry, and Galaczi (2016 and 2017)
  - Davis, Timpe-Laughlin, Gu, and Ockey (2018)
- Scenario-based testing
- Avatars
  - Li, Shubeck, and Graesser (2016)
QUESTIONS? COMMENTS?
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